

MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF THE INTER-MINISTRIAL APPROVAL COMMITTEE (IMAC) CONSTITUTED UNDER THE SCHEME FOR INTEGRATED COLD CHAIN AND VALUE ADDITION INFRASTRUCTURE HELD ON 21.08.2020, 24.08.2020, 28.08.2020 and 31.08.2020.

Meetings 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 21.08.2020, 24.08.2020, 28.08.2020 and 31.08.2020 to consider the proposals received against the EOI dated 29.01.2020 for grant of financial assistance.

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 29.01.2020 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 30.06.2020 for General category and from the States (except State of Maharashtra) other than NER and SC / ST category of entrepreneurs.

3. IMAC was informed by the Joint Secretary and Convener that in response to the EOI, the Ministry had received 86 [including one duplicate proposal] cold chain proposals on SAMPADA Portal of MoFPI. Therefore, 85 proposals were evaluated by the Technical Committee (TC).

4. State & Sector wise details of proposals received are as follows: -

Details of proposals received against Eoi dated 29.01.2020							
#	State	F&V	Dairy	Meat/Marine	RTE	Irradiation	Grand Total
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2	1	10	1	0	14
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1	0	0	0	0	1
3.	Bihar	1	1	0	0	0	2
4.	Chhattisgarh	1	0	0	0	0	1
5.	Gujarat	4	1	0	2	2	9
6.	Haryana	1	3	1	1	0	6
7.	Himachal Pradesh	4	0	0	1	0	5
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	3	0	0	0	0	3
9.	Karnataka	1	0	3	0	1	5
10.	Kerala	1	1	1	0	0	3
11.	Madhya Pradesh	1	1	0	1	0	3
12.	Nagaland	0	0	1	0	0	1



13.	Odisha	0	0	2	0	0	2
14.	Punjab	2	0	0	1	0	3
15.	Rajasthan	0	2	0	0	0	2
16.	Tamil Nadu	1	3	2	1	1	8
17.	Telangana	1	0	0	1	0	2
18.	Uttar Pradesh	4	1	0	0	0	5
19.	Uttrakhand	5	0	0	0	1	6
20.	West Bengal	1	1	2	0	0	4
	Total	34	15	22	9	5	85

5. State & Category wise details of proposals received are as follows: -

S. No.	State	Total				Grand Total
		SC	ST	NER	General	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	0	0	0	14	14
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0	1	0	0	1
3.	Bihar	0	0	0	2	2
4.	Chhattisgarh	0	0	0	1	1
5.	Gujarat	0	0	0	9	9
6.	Haryana	0	0	0	6	6
7.	Himachal Pradesh	0	0	0	5	5
8.	Jammu & Kashmir	0	0	0	3	3
9.	Karnataka	0	1	0	4	5
10.	Kerala	0	0	0	3	3
11.	Madhya Pradesh	0	0	0	3	3
12.	Nagaland	0	1	0	0	1
13.	Odisha	0	0	0	2	2
14.	Punjab	0	0	0	3	3
15.	Rajasthan	0	0	0	2	2
16.	Tamil Nadu	0	0	0	8	8
17.	Telangana	0	0	0	2	2
18.	Uttar Pradesh	1	0	0	4	5
19.	Uttrakhand	0	0	0	6	6
20.	West Bengal	0	0	0	4	4
	Total	1	3	0	81	85

6. All the 85 Cold Chain proposals were scrutinized by the Programme Management Agencies (PMAs) viz., M/s IL&FS Clusters, M/s Grant Thornton India LLP & M/s PricewaterhouseCoopers for ascertaining the eligibility or otherwise of the proposals, based on provisions of the scheme guidelines. Thereafter, all 85 proposals have been evaluated by the Technical Committee (TC) under the chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RP). In all 9 TC Meetings were held through Video Conference (VC) on 22.07.2020, 23.07.2020,

24.07.2020, 27.07.2020, 28.07.2020, 29.07.2020, 30.07.2020, 31.07.2020 and 01.08.2020. 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.

7. 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.

- ❖ Lending banks/ financial institutions were requested to confirm the authenticity of appraisal note and term loan sanction letters.
- ❖ Applicants were informed that Ministry is in process of revising the cost norms, which may lead to revision of GIA.
- ❖ In some cases, applicants were advised to submit the revised CE Civil and/ or Mechanical Certificates.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Clear correlation between processing and storage capacity to be established, to prevent projects being proposed primarily to establish cold storages.
- ❖ Only Ministry of Tribal Affairs notification accepted for identifying ITDP projects.
- ❖ Number of wooden storage bins and pallets were restricted to 50% and 10% respectively of the capacity for proposed storages.
- ❖ Crates and milk cans were considered as consumables and not considered for grant purpose.
- ❖ Only 10 AMCUs per BMC/ Milk Chilling Center are recommended.
- ❖ 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.



- ❖ Cobalt, source of radiation, is part of Plant & Machinery and considered eligible for grant-in-aid.

8. IMAC in the meetings held on 21.08.2020, 24.08.2020, 28.08.2020 and 31.08.2020 considered all 85 proposals pertaining to different sectors viz Fruits & Vegetables Sector, Dairy Sector, Marine, Meat & Poultry Sector, RTE/ RTC Sector and Irradiation Sector and reviewed the recommendations made by the Technical Committee against each proposal.

9. The applicants were also invited to the IMAC meeting held through VC. The PMAs presented the proposals via Power Point Presentation before IMAC and the applicants / representatives of the applicants. The eligibility criteria, marks obtained against each criteria & eligible grant were explained / informed to the applicants. The submissions/clarifications, if any, made by the applicants based on the interaction, have been factored into the final decision of the IMAC.

10. Decisions of IMAC:

(a) IMAC reviewed the compliance status of each of the 85 proposals scrutinized/ appraised by the Technical Committee. Based on the deliberations, IMAC approved 25 proposals as eligible, 2 proposals as eligible with conditions and rejected 38 proposals as ineligible. Further IMAC referred back 20 proposals for reconsideration by TC.

(b) Consolidated merit list of 27 proposals approved by the IMAC as eligible / eligible with conditions, along with their grant and marks secured are at **Annexure-I**. State-wise, Sector-wise list of eligible proposals is placed at **Annexure- II**. Details of proposals referred back by the IMAC for reconsideration by TC are at **Annexure-III**. Consolidated list of proposal rejected by the IMAC as ineligible are at **Annexure- IV**.

11. Other decisions

(a) IMAC is of the view that the proposals received against the EoI for the Integrated Cold Chain Infrastructure are from limited / repetitive Districts of the States where number of projects have already been approved by Ministry under PMKSY. IMAC opined that the proposals received may be evaluated based on the availability of the raw material in relation to the processing / storage capacity created / being created in the particular area.

(b) IMAC opined that the applicants may be encouraged to set up their processing facilities in the Mega Food Parks / Agro Processing Clusters, wherever possible, if the proposals are from the same / adjacent districts / places.

(c) IMAC is of the view 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.

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

A handwritten mark, possibly a signature or initials, consisting of a stylized 'S' with a horizontal line extending to the right.

INDEX

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Eligible on 21.08.2020

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Sought	Grant (in ₹ lakh)		Score approved by IMAC
					Total	Eligible		Calculated	Eligible	
1	Naturade Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh	F&V	1557.81	759.43	400.00	379.06	379.06	73
2	Jivo Wellness Private Limited	Sonipat	Haryana	F&V	4832.81	3495.86	1000.00	1718.72	1000.00	90
Details of Proposals Referred Back to TC										
Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Remarks of IMAC			
3	Bija Agrifresh Private Limited	Kullu	Himachal Pradesh	F&V	3500.00	1000.00	Referred back to TC			
4	Always Fresh Fruits CA Store	Nainital	Uttarakhand	F&V	2149.60	1000.00	Referred back to TC			
5	Nature Frozen Foods	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	F&V	1492.00	1000.00	Referred back to TC			
6	MA Cold Chain Infrastructure	Palakkad	Kerala	F&V	3652.00	1000.00	Referred back to TC			
Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible										
7	Anand Mishra	Gopalganj	Bihar	F&V	970.98	225.00	Non-viability / suitability of the project because of the proposed disproportionate capacity of the Cold Storage with the envisaged value-addition infrastructure			

8	Chhattisgarh Food Product	Korba	Chhattisgarh	F&V	483.85	169.35	Non submission of Bank appraisal note, bank sanction letter & proposed no value addition
9	Sneh Raj Cold storage	Badaun	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	830.23	485.00	Non-submission of documents for assessment of the proposal
10	Petropath Fluid (India) Private Limited	Bankura	West Bengal	F&V	675.00	236.25	Insufficient net worth, non-submission of Bank appraisal note, bank sanction letter & proposed no value addition
11	SMA Cold Chain Infrastructure	Kanchipuram	Tamil Nadu	F&V	3928.07	1000.00	Insufficient net worth. Subsequently, the promoter has withdrawn the proposal

7

1. M/s. Naturade Foods Pvt. Ltd., Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 73, eligible project cost of ₹ 759.43 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 379.06 Lakh.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the applicant has submitted the Board resolution in support of change in Directors of the Company, complete bank appraisal note along with the missing page (i.e. page no. 15) and revised CE Mechanical certificate for detailed component wise cost break up as well as capacity details for the component.
- b. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (HDFC Bank Limited) vide email dated 12.08.2020 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.
- c. IMAC, during the discussion, noted that the proposal has envisaged Farm Level Infrastructure cum Processing Centre cum Distribution Hub at one location with Frozen Jackfruit as focus product. The applicant appraised the IMAC regarding having entered MoU with the Girijan Co-operative Corporation (GCC) for supply of raw material since obtaining land for establishing separate FLI is difficult being in tribal area.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 73, eligible project cost of ₹ 759.43 lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 379.06 lakh subject to submission of MoU with the Girijan Co-operative Corporation (GCC) for collection of raw materials from the farmers.

2. M/s. Jivo Wellness Private Limited, Sonipat, Haryana

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 90, eligible project cost of ₹ 3495.86 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1718.72 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the confirmation from the lending bank (HDFC Bank Limited) regarding the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for term loan has not been received so far.

- b. IMAC noted that the proposed DH at Delhi has not been recommended by the TC because of the concern over issuance of pollution control certificate, CLU etc. by the Delhi Government
- c. IMAC, during the discussion, noted that the applicant is already having an existing processing facility where wheatgrass is being processed in Kundli, which is approx. 25 km from proposed new location in Sonipat, Haryana. The applicant informed the Committee that the proposed facility is for IQF processing and pulping of the fruits & vegetable.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 90, eligible project cost of ₹ 3495.86 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1718.72 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh) subject to confirmation from the lending bank regarding issuance of bank appraisal report & sanction letter.

3. M/s. Bija Agrifresh Pvt. Ltd., Kullu, Himachal Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 67, eligible project cost of ₹ 1748.56 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1301.76 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 Lakh as per scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Bank of Baroda) vide email dated 13.08.2020 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for term loan.
- b. IMAC, during the discussion, noted that the applicant is already having an existing CA storage in Shimla, which is approx. 11 km from proposed new location and enquired the promoter regarding the rationale for proposing new facility rather than expansion of the existing facility. The promoter informed the Committee that the existing facility is only for storage and being operated at the full capacity. The new facility is proposed to have both storage as well for processing the fruits and also to cater more farmers in the Kullu district. He further explained that the non-table varieties will be processed and the resultant pulp will be sold to the Juice manufacturers.

IMAC Decision

IMAC referred back the proposal to TC for re-consideration based on the existing facilities as well as capacity of CA / Cold Storage being created in Kullu district of Himachal Pradesh and also to ascertain whether the proposed FLI is in catchment area.

4. M/s. Always Fresh Fruits CA Store, Nainital, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 76, eligible project cost of ₹ 1341.10 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 996.85 Lakh.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Yes Bank) vide email dated 17.08.2020 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for term loan.
- b. IMAC noted that the 4 (out of 6) partners of M/s. Always Fresh Fruits CA store are related to the 2 (out of 4) partners of M/s. Nature Frozen Foods as Father – Son and Brothers
- c. IMAC is of the view to allow only one proposal to a family under PMKSY. Family will include all members / relatives including Father-Son / daughter relationship, in-laws relationship etc.,
- d. IMAC further noted that the processing facility is proposed along with the FLI component and FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision

IMAC referred back the proposal to TC for re-consideration to ascertain CA Storage capacity (existing / being created) in Nainital district of Uttarakhand and also to ascertain whether the proposed FLI cum Processing Centre is in catchment area.

5. M/s. Nature Frozen foods, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 65, the eligible project cost of ₹ 1315.78 lakh and eligible grant of ₹. 966.89 Lakh.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 13.08.2020 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for term loan.



- b. IMAC noted that the 2 (out of 4) partners of M/s. Nature Frozen Foods are related to 4 (out of 6) partners of M/s. Always Fresh Fruits CA store the as Son – Father and Brothers.
- c. IMAC is of the view to allow only one proposal to a family under PMKSY. Family will include all members / relatives including Father-Son / daughter relationship, in-laws relationship etc.,
- d. IMAC further noted that the processing facility is proposed along with the FLI component and FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision

IMAC referred back the proposal to TC for re-consideration to ascertain IQF Processing capacity (existing / being created) with respect to the proposed raw material in Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand and also to ascertain whether the proposed FLI cum Processing Centre is in catchment area.

6. M/s. M.A. Cold Chain Infrastructure, Palakkad, Kerala

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 69, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2883.10 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹. 1355.77 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the DH with Multiproduct cold storage of 1000 MT proposed at Chennai has not been considered by TC as the applicant has not proposed any cost for both civil work and P&M.
- b. The applicant informed the Committee that the proposed facility at Chennai is proposed to be leased. Further informed that they are 3rd generation traders of fruits in Tamilnadu and are already having a cold storage capacity of 40,000 MT.
- c. IMAC noted that the Ministry is already assisting Mega Food Park in KINFRA at Palakkad and expressed its apprehension about the viability of the project in relation to the already existing facilities in MFP.
- d. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Canara Bank) vide email dated 14.08.2020 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for term loan.

IMAC Decision

IMAC referred back the proposal to TC for re-consideration to ascertain the viability of the project in relation to the processing / storage facilities being created at the Mega Food Park of KINFRA at Palakkad (assisted by MoFPI) and also the distance between the two locations.

7. M/s. Anand Mishra, Gopalganj, Bihar

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to non-viability / suitability of the project because of the proposed disproportionate capacity of the Cold Storage with the envisaged value-addition infrastructure (Freeze Drying) as per the scheme guidelines.

IMAC Observation

IMAC observed that the proposed capacity of the Cold Storage is disproportionate with the envisaged value-addition infrastructure (Freeze Drying) as per the scheme guidelines. Further, IMAC noted that the TC has also revised the score of the proposal from 64 to 54 accordingly.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 4 regarding project components leading to non-viability / suitability of the project as well as score of the proposal being less than 60.

8. M/s. Chhattisgarh Food Products, Korba, Chhattisgarh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 4 regarding project components and not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines regarding In-principle / final term loan sanction letter and bank appraisal note.

IMAC Observation

IMAC observed that the proposal is incomplete in term of documents required for assessment of basic eligibility of the proposal and also proposed standalone cold storage for the project without any processing/value addition infrastructure and accordingly, does not meet the requirements of the guidelines regarding project components and In-principle / final term loan sanction letter and bank appraisal note.



IMAC Decision

IMAC considered the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 4 and 8 (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines.

9. M/s. Snehraj Cold Storage, Budaun, Uttar Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 of the scheme guidelines regarding basic eligibility criteria documents.

IMAC Observation

IMAC noted that the basic eligibility documents were not submitted for assessment and the proposal is ineligible on account of non-submission of basic eligibility documents.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 of the scheme guidelines regarding basic eligibility criteria documents.

10. M/s. Petropath Fluids (India) Pvt. Ltd., Bankura, West Bengal

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 4 regarding project components and clause 8 (a) (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth, In-principle / final term loan sanction letter and bank appraisal note.

IMAC Observation

IMAC observed that the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded balance sheet for 2018-19 of the applicant is ₹ 268.76 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹236.25 = ₹ 354.37). Further, IMAC also noted that proposal is incomplete in term of documents required for assessment of basic eligibility and also proposed only standalone cold storage for the project without any processing/value addition infrastructure.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 4 and 8 (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines.

11. M/s. SMA Cold Chain Infrastructure, Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

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

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 (some of the documents were in vernacular language and hence not considered for assessment) of the applicants (₹ 503.42 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 observed that the promoter vide letter dated 29.07.2020 (received vide email dated 30.07.2020) informed the Ministry that they are withdrawing the proposal submitted against EoI dated 29.01.2020.

IMAC Decision

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



INDEX

**Minutes of the IMAC Meeting dated 21.08.2020 for “Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure”
(Applicable Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019)**

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	District	State	Status	Page No.
1.	Furozun Fruits and Vegetables	F&V	Betul	Madhya Pradesh	Eligible (Conditional)	3
2.	Agro Tech	F&V	Belgaum	Karnataka	Eligible	3
3.	Nava Quality Foods Pvt Ltd	F&V	Chittoor	Andhra Pradesh	ineligible	4
4.	M/s Shiva Agri Fresh,	F&V	Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	Deferred	4
5.	Mukhiya Cold Storage	F&V	Jalaun	Uttar Pradesh	Ineligible	5
6.	Shri Jai Bade Dev Baba	F&V	Kanpur Dehat	Uttar Pradesh	Ineligible	5

2

1. Furozen Fruits and Vegetables, Betul, Madhya Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 81 marks, Eligible Grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 Lakh. However, TC has not recommended the proposal for setting up of 2 distribution hubs in Betul.

IMAC Observations

1. IMAC was apprised that an agro processing cluster (APC) project named M/s Bharti Agro Cluster had also been sanctioned by MoFPI in Betul, Madhya Pradesh. Promoters of the aforesaid APC project are relatives of the promoters/partners of the proposed project (M/s Furozun fruits & Vegetables). During the IMAC meeting, applicant clarified/confirmed that there is not cross holding between above said companies and promoters of APC project are not immediate relatives of promoters of the proposed project. Further, there is no financial relationship between the above two said companies.
2. IMAC asked the applicant to clarify why this proposed cold chain project cannot be established in the above APC. It was clarified by the applicant that project has no benefits to be located in APC as there is no common facility available except boiler. APC has normal cold storage, however, this project requires frozen storage. IMAC directed to check whether project can be re-located in APC or not. If project re-location in APC is not possible and does not benefit the project, it may be considered eligible.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 81 marks, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1717.20 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh (restricted to maximum limit) subject to the assessment as mentioned in IMAC observation.

2. M/s Agro Tech, Belgaun Karnataka

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 78 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 Lakh.

IMAC Observations

The applicant firm is a proprietorship firm, whose proprietor belongs to the ST category.

IMAC Decision



IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 78 marks, eligible project cost of Rs 1432 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 Lakh (restricted to maximum limit) as per scheme guidelines applicable on ST category proposal.

3. Nava Quality Foods Pvt Ltd, Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of scheme guideline 8(i) which states "Expansion/up-gradation of the existing facilities in the same premises will not be entertained.

IMAC Observations

Applicant has been allotted a land of total 47 Acres for setting up of an industrial food park for creating manufacturing facilities for Fruits and Vegetables Pulp/IQF. In this food park, they have already created two units, one as Puree plant and another as Pulping unit and proposed unit is the third IQF unit. IMAC noted that there is no boundary wall between existing unit and proposed unit.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as per the clause 8(i) of scheme guideline dated 17.12.2019 which states that "Expansion/up-gradation of the existing facilities in the same premises will not be entertained.

4. M/s Shiva Agri fresh, Shimla, H.P.

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of non submission of detailed bank appraisal note from Lending bank as per clause 8(d) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

IMAC Observations

Applicant firm had uploaded the final sanction letter of term loan dated 16.04.2020 and summary of cost of project & means of finance on bank's letter head dated 29.06.2020 (in place of appraisal note) issued by Chief Manger/Punjab National Bank on Sampada Portal with the application. Subsequently applicant firm has submitted bank appraisal note to the Ministry on 22.07.2020 through mail.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed Technical Committee to accept the bank appraisal note submitted through mail dated 22.07.2020 and reevaluate the proposal.



5. Mukhiya Cold Storage, Jalaun, Uttar Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

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

IMAC Observations

IMAC observed the calculated networth of the applicant comes to Rs 865.40 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs 625 lakh = 937.50 lakh).

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.

6. Shri Jai Bade Dev Baba, Kanpur Dehat, Uttar Pradesh

TC Recommendation (22.07.2020)

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

IMAC Observations

IMAC observed the calculated networth of the applicant comes to Rs 309.58 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs 310 lakh = 465 lakh).

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.



INDEX

**Minutes of the IMAC Meeting dated 24.08.2020 for “Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure”
(Applicable Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019)**

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	District	State	Status	Page No.
1.	M/s GUK Foods LLP	F&V	Surat	Gujarat	Eligible Conditional	3
2.	M/s MC Frost India	F&V	Surat	Gujarat	Eligible	3
3.	M/s DC Agro	F&V	Kathua	Jammu and Kashmir	Deferred	4
4.	M/s Mufeed Agro Fresh	F&V	Shopian	Jammu and Kashmir	Ineligible	4
5.	M/s Bahl Paper Mills Ltd	F&V	Kashipur	Uttarakhand	Ineligible	5

7

1. GUK Foods LLP, Surat, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020 & 27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 69 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 Lakh subject to the confirmation of ITDP area from Ministry of Tribal Affairs. However, TC has not recommended the proposal of 2 Nos of collection centre (FLI) in district Valsad.

IMAC Observations

1. Applicant has proposed basic pre-processing line i.e. sorting, grading line at both the locations of FLI at district Bharuch and main processing facility at district Surat. Therefore, pre-processing line at main processing centre is not justified.
2. IMAC noted that applicant has food processing experience and turnover is more than 5.0 Cr (17.27 Cr during FY 2018-19) for which audited financial statement had been uploaded on Sampada portal. Therefore, marks for the scoring criterion no 3 was increased from 4 to 7 increasing the total score from 69 to 72.

IMAC Decision

- i. IMAC rejected the proposal of sorting, grading line at main processing facility and directed to calculate eligible grant accordingly.
- ii. IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 72 marks and eligible grant of Rs 1000 lakh as recommended by TC subject to the confirmation/clarification of proposed project in ITDP area from Ministry of Tribal Affairs and subject to condition that eligible project cost and eligible grant will be recalculated based on IMAC decision at point (i) above. In case, there is change in eligibility/eligible grant, approval may be obtained on file.

2. M/s MC Frost India, Surat, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 74 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 867.75 Lakh. However, TC has not recommended the proposal of separate Distribution Hub at Surat and Cold Storage of 2000 MT at main processing facility.

IMAC Observations

1. Applicant has proposed basic pre-processing line i.e. sorting, grading line at both the locations of FLI and main Processing facility. IMAC was apprised that capacity of sorting, grading line at FLI has not been mentioned.
2. IMAC noted that applicant has experience of running the cold storage only therefore, IMAC directed to decrease the marks from 4 to 0 under scoring criterion no 2 "Experience in cold chain/Food processing" decreasing the total score from 74 to 70.

IMAC Decision

- i. IMAC directed to shift the proposed sorting, grading line at main processing centre to proposed FLI at district Surat and directed to recalculate the grant accordingly.
- ii. IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total revised score of 70 and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs 867.75 Lakh as recommended by TC subject to condition that eligible project cost and eligible grant will be recalculated based on IMAC decision at point (i) above. In case, there is change in eligible grant, approval may be obtained on file.

3. DC Agro, Kathua, Jammu and Kashmir

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of non-submission of In-Principle/Final Sanction letter of term loan as per clause 8(b) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

IMAC Observations

IMAC was apprised that in sanction letter submitted by the applicant, nowhere In-principle approval of term loan has been mentioned and therefore it was not accepted as In-principle approval letter of term loan by TC. In this regard, representative of NABARD informed the IMAC that the clarification regarding the consideration of the submitted document as in-principle sanction letter may be sought from the lending bank (SBI) and decision may be taken accordingly.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed Technical Committee to reconsider the same after getting confirmation/clarification from lending bank.

4. M/s Mufeed Agro Fresh, Shopian, Jammu & Kashmir.

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with score of 63 marks subject to authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note from lending bank (J&K Bank).

IMAC Observations

IMAC was apprised that in response to e-mail dated 07.08.2020, Branch Head of the lending bank i.e. J&K Bank, Lassipora, Pulwama, vide mail dated 11.08.2020, informed that they have checked their records and no such case has been processed or sanctioned by their branch/bank till date.



IMAC Decision

IMAC rejected the proposal of M/s Mufeed Agro Fresh and directed to blacklist the promoter and the consultant of the project for submitting forged documents.

5. Bahl Paper Mills Ltd, Kashipur, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of non setting up of Farm Level Infrastructure as per clause 4 of the scheme guideline dated 17.12.2019.

IMAC Observations

FLI location for the project had been proposed at Kashipur, Udham Singh Nagar which cannot be considered as catchment area for apples as there is no production of apples in the area and hence facility located in Kashipur cannot be considered as Farm Level Infrastructure.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of non setting up of Farm Level Infrastructure as per clause 4 of the scheme guideline dated 17.12.2019.



INDEX

IMAC Minutes of Meeting dated 24.08.2020

S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	Score	Grant (₹ lakh)
1.	NB Natural Food Products, Gujarat	F&V	Ahmedabad	Gujarat	Referred back to TC	-	-
2.	Funwave Foods LLP, Gujarat	Frozen RTE	Morbi	Gujarat	Referred back to TC	-	-
3.	Foods and Inns Limited, Gujarat	F&V	Valsad	Gujarat	Referred back to TC	-	-
4.	R.K. Food Products	F&V	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	Referred back to TC	-	-
5.	Himachal Pradesh State Agriculture Marketing Board	F&V	Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	Eligible	64	1084.35 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh]
6.	P. Star Agro Products	F&V	Hoshiarpur	Punjab	Referred back to TC	-	-
7.	Bright Food Industries	F&V	Rampur	Uttar Pradesh	Referred back to TC	-	-
Ineligible							
S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	Reason for ineligibility	
8.	Agro Care, Jammu & Kashmir	F&V	Pulwama	Jammu and Kashmir	Ineligible	The lending bank i.e. Jammu and Kashmir Bank has intimated that the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter are not issued by the bank.	

								[Criterion 8 (b) & (d) of Scheme Guidelines]
9.	Panchwati Prayogshala Pvt. Ltd, Uttarakhand	F&V	Haridwar	Uttarakhand	Ineligible			Due to cross holding of applicant entities. [Criterion 8 (n) of Scheme Guidelines]
10.	I Cube Agro	F&V	West Siang	Arunachal Pradesh	Ineligible			Insufficient net worth [Criterion 8(a) (ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.]
11.	Narendra Cold Chain	F&V	Kangra	Himachal Pradesh	Ineligible			Name of the promoter is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant. [As per criterion 9 of Scheme Guidelines]
12.	Himalayan Vegefruit Ltd	F&V	Patiala	Punjab	Ineligible			Promoter has already availed grant from Ministry previously. [Criterion 8.(h) of the Scheme Guidelines]
13.	EM Global LLP	F&V	Rangareddy	Telangana	Ineligible			The lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. has denied about issuance of Bank Appraisal Note. [Criterion 8 (d) of Scheme Guidelines]



1. NB Natural Food Products, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (23.07.2020):

- a) Not to consider the FLI (Collection Centre) due to close proximity to main facility and applicant has proposed only manual sorting & grading.
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹2079.34 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹995.62 lakh

IMAC Observations:

- a) The Lending Bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank vide its email dated 25.07.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note, In-principle term loan sanction letter and Certificate for no commencement of operation.
- b) FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm that the FLI cum processing center is in the catchment area.

2. Funwave Foods LLP, Morbi, Gujarat

TC observations (23.07.2020):

- a) Not to consider the collection center and DH due to close proximity of locations to the main facility.
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Indusind Bank.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 70, eligible project cost of ₹2461.54 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1226.72 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

IMAC Observations:

- a) The Lending Bank i.e. Indusind Bank vide its email dated 12.08.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter.
- b) FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm that the FLI cum processing center is in the catchment area.

3. Foods and Inns Limited, Valsad, Gujarat

TC observations (23.07.2020):

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. State Bank of India.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1979.94 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹889.09 lakh.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The Lending Bank i.e. State Bank of India vide its email dated 11.08.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter.
- b) FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm that the FLI cum processing center is in the catchment area.

4. R.K. Food Products, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020):

- a) Not to consider the collection center due to close proximity of locations to the main facility and DH at Kashipur as the main facility is also in Kashipur.
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Bank of Baroda.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹1386.97 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1022.32 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines]

IMAC Observations:

- a) The Lending Bank i.e. Bank of Baroda vide its email dated 10.08.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note and final term loan sanction letter.
- b) The applicant has proposed to setup IQF of 5 MT/Hr. and Frozen Store of 3000 MT. IMAC is of the view that in Uttarakhand, there are already a large no. of IQF units. IMAC directed the Ministry to confirm the installed capacity and availability of raw material in the State.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC).

5. Himachal Pradesh State Agriculture Marketing Board (HPSAMB), Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020):

- a) To confirm from the applicant that the land is in their possession and can be used for setting up of proposed cold chain project.
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Himachal Pradesh State Cooperative Bank Ltd.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹1781.21 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1084.35 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

IMAC Observations:

- a) Confirmation from the lending bank i.e. Himachal Pradesh State Cooperative Bank Ltd. w.r.t sanction letter & bank appraisal note not received.



- b) The applicant has not submitted a confirmation letter with regards to the fact that land is in their possession and can be used for setting up of proposed cold chain project.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹1781.21 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1084.35 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines], subject to confirmation from lending bank w.r.t Bank Appraisal Note & In-principle sanction letter.

[Since then, confirmation received from the lending bank w.r.t. to issue of Bank Appraisal Note & In-principle letter vide letter dated 10.08.2020]

6. P Star Agro Products, Hoshiarpur, Punjab

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020):

- a) Not to consider the FLI collection center due to close proximity to the main facility and in same district.
- b) Not to consider the DH at Jalandhar due to close proximity of location to the main facility.
- c) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Canara Bank.
- d) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 72, eligible project cost of ₹ 1119.44 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 523.58 lakh.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The Lending Bank i.e. Canara Bank vide its email dated 10.08.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter
- b) DH at Jalandhar is approx. 60 KM away from the main facility, accordingly, IMAC approved the DH at Jalandhar as eligible.
- c) FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the DH at Jalandhar as eligible and referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm that the FLI cum processing center is in the catchment area.

7. M/s Bright Food Industries, Rampur, Uttar Pradesh

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

- a) Not to consider the DH, as the applicant has proposed IQF along with Frozen Store at FLI cum Processing Center. Hence, there was no feasibility of Cold Store of 1000 MT proposed at Distribution Hub (DH)]
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 66, eligible project cost of ₹1407.79 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹681.03 lakh.



IMAC Observations:

- a) Confirmation from the lending bank i.e. HDFC Bank Ltd. w.r.t Bank Appraisal Note & In-principle sanction letter not received.
- b) FLI, as per the Scheme Guidelines, is a mandatory component and should be in the catchment area.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm that the FLI cum processing center is in the catchment area.

8. M/s Agro Care, Pulwama, Jammu and Kashmir

TC Recommendation (23.07.2020)

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Jammu and Kashmir Bank.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 68, eligible project cost of ₹1205.89 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹712.20 lakh.

IMAC Observations:

IMAC observed that the lending bank i.e. Jammu and Kashmir Bank vide its email dated 11.08.2020 has denied about issuance of Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8(b) & (d) of the Scheme Guidelines.

9. M/s Panchwati Prayogshala Pvt. Ltd., Haridwar, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (23.07.2020)

- a) Applicant has submitted the two DDs of ₹10,000 and one DD of ₹1,00,000 together. The validity of one DD of ₹10,000 and ₹1,00,000 is over.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible in accordance with 8 (n) of Scheme Guidelines i.e. cross holding of the promoters/ partners between two applicants/ entities, as the address of M/s Panchwati Nutrients promoted by Ms. Pooja Goel (sanctioned in Scheme of Backward and Forward Linkage) is same as of M/s Panchwati Prayogshala Pvt. Ltd. TC observed that as per the uploaded balance sheet Smt. Pooja Goel is wife of Sh. Pankaj Goel.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The applicant has submitted the two DDs of ₹10,000 and one DD of ₹1,00,000 together. The validity of one DD of ₹10,000 and ₹1,00,000 is over.
- b) Proposal is ineligible in accordance with 8 (n) of Scheme Guidelines i.e. cross holding of the promoters/ partners between two applicants/ entities, as the address of M/s Panchwati Nutrients promoted by Ms. Pooja Goel (sanctioned in Scheme of Backward and Forward



Linkage) is same as of M/s Panchwati Prayogshala Pvt. Ltd. IMAC observed that as per the uploaded balance sheet Smt. Pooja Goel is wife of Sh. Pankaj Goel.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8 (n) of Scheme Guidelines.

10. I Cube Agro, West Siang, Arunachal Pradesh

TC Recommendation (23.07.2020):

To be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to insufficient net-worth, which is one of the basic eligibility criteria as per criterion 8.a.(ii). of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

Applicant sought the grant of ₹ 997.13 lakh and therefore as per clause 8 (a) of the Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019, total net-worth should be 1.5 times of the grant sought i.e. ₹1496.00 lakh. As per the CA Certificate, the net-worth of applicant's firm is ₹1318.00 lakh. The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.

11. Narendra Cold Chain, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh

TC Recommendation (23.07.2020):

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Bank of India.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible as the name of the promoter 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:

- a) The name of the applicant firm as per the DPR is M/s Narendra Cold Chain. However, the name of the firm on the first page of partnership deed has been mentioned as M/s Narindra Cold Chain. The applicant has used the stamp of M/s Narindera Cold Chain.
- b) The lending bank has not confirmed the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the name of the promoter is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant, this contravenes the para 9 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Documents and Fee required.

12. Himalayan Vegefruit Ltd, Patiala, Punjab

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020):

To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria i.e. No second proposal from the existing promoter(s), who have availed grant-in-aid for any of the cold chain projects from the Ministry of Food Processing Industries, will be entertained as per criterion 8.(h) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

IMAC noted that Mr. Praveen Diwan & Mr. Kulbushan are directors in M/s Hillcrest Fruits and Vegetables Pvt. Ltd. and Mr. Kanan Diwan & Pali Diwan are directors in M/s Resource Foods Pvt. Ltd. Further, Hillcrest Fruits and Vegetables Pvt. Ltd and Resource Foods Pvt. Ltd have already availed the grant from Ministry in second and fourth phase of the Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure respectively.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criterion 8.(h) of the Scheme Guidelines.

13. EM Global LLP, Rangareddy, Telangana

TC Recommendation (24.07.2020):

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 62, eligible project cost of ₹1208.25 lakh and eligible grant in aid of ₹585.95 lakh.

IMAC Observations:

IMAC noted that the lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. vide its email dated 13.08.2020 has denied about the issuance of Bank Appraisal Note.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criterion 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines.

9

INDEX

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Eligible on 28.08.2020

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)		Score approved by IMAC	
					Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated		Eligible
1	Saran Dairy Producer Company Limited	Gopalganj	Bihar	Dairy	1165.59	642.81	391.65	305.56	305.56	72
2	The Uralungal Labour Contract Co-operative Society Ltd.	Kozhikode	Kerala	Dairy	4404.46	2467.38	1000.00	1191.91	1000.00	73
3	Gandhinagar District Cooperative Milk Producers Union Limited	Udaipur	Rajasthan	Dairy	2750.00	2061.80	1000.00	1004.65	1000.00	83

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Reasons for Rejection
					Total	Eligible		
4	Arunagiri Agro Products	Ranipet (Vellore)	Tamil Nadu	Dairy	3620.27	1000.00	1000.00	Not fulfilling the requirement of clause 8 (g) / (h) / (n) of the scheme guidelines in respect of availing financial assistance for the second proposal
5	Narmada Milk and Milk Product Unit II	Korba	Chhattisgarh	Dairy	922.00	295.00	295.00	Insufficient Net worth and Expansion / Upgrading of Existing Facility(ies)

RTE / RTC PROPOSALS

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)		Score approved by IMAC
					Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated	

6	Suryas Exports Private Limited	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	RTE/ RTC	857.11	359.35	158.00	178.38	158.00	67
7	Chandigarh Sweets Limited	S.A.S. Nagar Mohali	Punjab	RTE/ RTC	1052.00	759.87	350.00	365.77	350.00	68
Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible										
Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Reasons for Rejection			
8	Ambrozia Frozen Foods	Panchkula	Haryana	RTE/ RTC	1287.89	453.05	Insufficient net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises			

9

DAIRY PROPOSALS:

1. M/s. Saran Dairy Producer Company Limited, Gopalganj, Bihar

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 72, eligible project cost of ₹ 642.81 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 305.56 Lakh.

IMAC Observations:

- a. IMAC noted that the applicant vide email dated 29.07.2020 has submitted the form DIR 12 in support of change in the Directors of the company; the undertaking vide email dated 04.08.2020 and the clarification letter along with the quotations for the cost of Overhead tank as well as other components vide email dated 04.08.2020, as discussed in the TC meeting.
- b. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Bank of Baroda) vide email dated 28.07.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- c. IMAC has taken note that TC recommended to reduce the proposed cost for Overhead tanks from ₹ 210.20 lakh to ₹ 21.02 lakh for the proposed 10 tanks as the promoter has clarified that these tanks would be of stainless steel and proposed for storage of chilled milk of 2000 litres each.
- d. IMAC further noted that the proposed DH with 25 MT cold storage proposed at Gopalganj, Bihar has not been considered by TC for being proposed at within the same district as that of processing facility.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 72, eligible project cost of ₹ 642.81 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 305.56 Lakh.

2. M/s. The Uralungal Labour Contract Co-operative Society Ltd., Kozhikode, Kerala

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 73, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2467.38 lakh and eligible grant of ₹. 1191.91 Lakh (restricted to grant sought i.e. 1000.00 lakh).

IMAC Observation



- a. IMAC noted that in pursuance to the directions of TC, the applicant vide email dated 04.08.2020 has submitted the following documents:
 - i. Revised CE Civil & Mechanical certificate for the component wise details of the DH components as well as civil work components.
 - ii. Certificate from the Taluka Office, Vatakara confirming that the re-survey number of the property is 468/2 as per Basic Tax Register.
 - iii. Undertaking on the letter head, duly signed by the authorized signatory of the project.
 - iv. Location wise details for 10 BMCs.
- b. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Punjab National Bank) vide email dated 11.08.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- c. IMAC, during discussion, observed that the project was sanctioned in the earlier phase and was cancelled due to non-adherence to the time line for submission of the document. The applicant informed that the present proposal is 3 KM away from the earlier location and is confident of completing the project in time as they have all the statutory clearances for the land.
- d. On IMAC, being apprehensive about the ability of the applicant being Co-operative for infusion of equity of about ₹ 21.00 Crore for the project cost of ₹ 44.05 crore. The applicant informed that the Co-operative is into the execution of infrastructure development projects of Kerala and also running a technological park and is having sufficient fund for completing the project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 73, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2467.38 lakh and eligible grant of ₹. 1191.91 Lakh (restricted to grant sought i.e. ₹ 1000.00 lakh).

3. M/s. Gandhinagar District Cooperative Milk Producers Union Limited, Udaipur, Rajasthan

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 83, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2061.80 lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 1004.65 lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the applicant has submitted the requisite documents vide email dated 05.08.2020, 07.08.2020 and 13.08.2020, in pursuance to the directions of TC,

viz., the copy of "Amendment in By-laws of the Society, Certificate from the Statutory Auditor of the company, Copies of MoUs for collection of milk, Certificate from the Chartered Engineer (Mechanical) mentioning the cost break up for the consumable items and letter confirming that the correct location address of the main processing facility.

- b. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Kotak Mahindra Bank) vide email dated 13.08.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- c. The applicant, during the discussion, apprised the IMAC that the Co-operative is currently processing the Milk being procured currently from Rajasthan at Gandhinagar facility, but, facing some quality issues and hence, proposed the present facility in Rajasthan.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 83, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2061.80 lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 1004.65 lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

4. M/s. Arunagiri Agro Products, Ranipet (Vellore), Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 66, eligible project cost of ₹ 3377.02 and calculated grant of ₹ 1671.35 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the applicant has submitted the revised CE Civil certificate with component wise break up vide email dated 14.08.2020, in pursuance to the directions of TC.
- b. IMAC noted that the lending bank (HDFC Bank Limited) vide email dated 13.08.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- c. IMAC observed that the applicant (Mr. Danda Srinivas) is son of Mr. Danda Brahmanandam, who is one of the partners (out of 4 partners) in the Integrated Cold Chain Project of M/s. Chandana Milk Products (approved vide letter dated 06.11.2018) and the project is still under implementation.
- d. IMAC is of the view to allow only one proposal to a family under PMKSY. Family will include all members / relatives including Father-Son / daughter relationship, in-laws relationship etc.,

IMAC Decision

IMAC considered the recommendation of the TC and decided that the Father-Son Relationship, though may be considered as separate under Income Tax Act, may not be considered so for availing grant-in-aid under PMKSY (i.e. one financial assistance per family) and rejected the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirement of clause 8 (g) / (h) / (n) of the scheme guidelines in respect of availing financial assistance for the second proposal.

5. M/s. Narmada Milk and Milk Product Unit II, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before the IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) & (i) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the proposal is ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as the calculated net worth of Rs. 425.75 lakh is less than 1.5 times the grant sought (i.e. $1.5 \times 295.00 = 442.50$)
- b. IMAC noted the existing Ground floor of 130.11 sq. m & First floor of 102.23 sq. m in the proposed main location of the project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendations of the TC and rejected the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) & (i) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises.

7

RTE / RTC PROPOSALS

6. M/s. Suryas Exports Private Limited, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

TC has recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 67, eligible project cost of ₹ 359.55 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 178.38 Lakh (restricted to grant sought ₹ 158.00 lakh).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (HDFC Bank Limited) vide email dated 13.08.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC also noted that the applicant vide email dated 19.08.2020 has submitted revised CE Mechanical & CE Civil certificate for the component wise details for the processing line of Biryanis, Gravies & Spices.
- c. Further, IMAC after discussion with the promoter, observed that the proposal is for Frozen Biryanis / Flavoured Rice and Freeze-Dried Spices / powders are utilized in the preparation of biryanis and accordingly approved to include the components of Freeze Dryer. Joint Secretary has apprised the IMAC that the approved grant – in – aid would remain the same in spite of inclusion of the freeze drying, as the grant sought amount is ₹ 158.00 lakh only.
- d. IMAC has taken note that the proposed collection centers/ Minimal processing centers, as per Bank Appraisal note, at Vijayawada and Guntur has not been considered for the project by the TC as no component details as well as cost has been provided for these locations in the submitted proposal

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 67 and directed to re-calculate the grant-in-aid before issue of approval letter.

7. M/s. Chandigarh Sweets Limited, S.A.S. Nagar Mohali, Punjab

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 68, eligible project cost of ₹ 759.87 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 365.77 Lakh (Restricted to grant sought amount of ₹ 350.00 lakh).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (ICICI Bank Limited) vide email dated 13.08.2020 has confirmed the issuance of appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC further observed that the applicant vide email dated 04.08.2020 has submitted a letter clarifying that the cold storage of 50 MT as Distribution Hub would be set up in industrial area of NCR to serve Delhi & export market.
- a. IMAC noted that the TC has not considered the proposed FLI at Patiala for the project as the proposed components for Farm Level infrastructure (FLI) location are to be a rented facility and TC has proposed the processing location to be considered as FLI cum Processing Center as it falls under the catchment area and is situated at farm level.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 68, eligible project cost of ₹ 759.87 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 365.77 Lakh (Restricted to grant sought amount of ₹ 350.00 lakh).

8. M/s. Ambrozia Frozen Foods, Panchkula, Haryana

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) & (i) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded net worth supporting documents of the applicant is ₹ 403.67 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹453.05 = ₹ 679.58 lakh).
- b. IMAC also, observed that the applicant informed the technical committee that the proposed location is already having a CA storage at the ground floor and the present proposal is envisaged to be established at the same land and within the same premises after dismantling the existing facility.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendations of TC and rejected the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) & (i) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises.

INDEX

Minutes of the IMAC Meeting dated 28.08.2020 for "Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure"

(Applicable Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019)

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	District	State	Status	Page No.
1.	Nutrimed Dairy LLP	Dairy	Faridabad	Haryana	Eligible	3
2.	M/s Beejapuri Dairy Pvt Ltd	Dairy	Jhajjar	Haryana	Eligible	3
3.	M/s Sivasakthi Milk Dairy	Dairy	Erode	Tamil Nadu	Eligible	3
4.	M/s Arvind Dairy Private Ltd	Dairy	Hapur	Uttar Pradesh	Eligible	4
5.	Laxmi Milk Products	Dairy	Banaskantha	Gujarat	Ineligible	4
6.	M/s ABN Indian Biotech Pvt Ltd	Dairy	Sirmour	Himachal Pradesh	Ineligible	5

2

1. Nutrimed Dairy LLP, Faridabad, Haryana

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with score of 75 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000 lakh (Restricted to max limit). Further TC has recommended manufacturing of Infant milk, baby food and boiler required for it as ineligible for grant calculation since infant milk and baby food would be packed in dried powder form/liquid form in tetrapack or cans; does not require cold chain. Also, TC has not recommended the proposal of separate distribution hub proposed in Delhi.

IMAC Observations

Applicant apprised the IMAC that they have developed new formula for Infant condensed milk in liquid form, which requires cold chain even after packing of the same till its consumption. IMAC accepted the request of applicant to include infant condensed milk in liquid form as a part of cold chain project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 75 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 Lakh (Restricted to max limit) as recommended by TC subject to condition that eligible project cost and eligible grant will be recalculated based on IMAC observation above. In case, there is change in eligible grant, approval may be obtained on file.

2. M/s Beejapuri Dairy Pvt Ltd, Jhajjar, Haryana

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 78 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 942.16 lakh and directed the applicant to submit revised CE Civil certificate mentioning the break-up of area of other Processing Area, Milk Pasteurization, etc.

IMAC Observations

IMAC was apprised that in pursuance of TC directions, applicant has submitted the revised CE Civil certificate mentioning the breakup of other processing area, milk pasteurization, etc. on 14.08.2020 and accordingly recalculated the eligible project cost as Rs 2233.05 lakh and eligible grant as 1000 lakh (restricted to maximum limit).



IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 78 marks, eligible project cost of Rs 2233.05 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000 Lakh (restricted to maximum limit).

3. M/s Sivasakthi Milk Dairy, Erode, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 85 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs 504.32.

IMAC Observations

IMAC noted that TC recommended the proposal as eligible.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 85 marks, eligible project cost of Rs 1063.61 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 504.32 lakh.

4. M/s Arvind Dairy Private Ltd, Hapur, Uttar Pradesh

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 73 marks and directed applicant to submit the revised CE civil and mechanical certificate mentioning the cost without taxes, freight, etc.

IMAC Observations

IMAC was apprised that in pursuance of TC directions, applicant has submitted the revised CE Civil and Mechanical certificate mentioning the cost without taxes, freight, etc. on 11.08.2020 and 22.08.2020 respectively and accordingly recalculated the eligible project cost as Rs 1183.37 lakh and eligible grant as 577.29 lakh.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 73 marks, eligible project cost of Rs 1183.37 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 577.29 Lakh.

5. Laxmi Milk Products, Banaskantha, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (27.07.2020 & 28.07.2020)

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

IMAC Observations



IMAC observed the calculated networth of the applicant comes to Rs 460 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs 400 lakh = 600 lakh).

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.

6. M/s ABN Indian Biotech Pvt Ltd, Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020 & 30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible as per Clause 8(i) of scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019 which states that “expansion/up-gradation of the existing facility(ies) in the same premises will not be entertained”.

IMAC Observations

The photos shared by the applicant were shown to the IMAC. IMAC noted that the firm has already started civil construction and there is no boundary wall between existing building and proposed project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as per Clause 8(i) of scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.



INDEX

IMAC Minutes of Meeting dated 28.08.2020

Eligible							
S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	Score	Grant (₹ lakh)
1.	Srichakra Milk Products LLP	Dairy	Anantpur	Andhra Pradesh	Eligible	80	701.10
2.	Zanders Resorts Private Limited	Dairy	Sirsa	Haryana	Eligible	80	1034.28 [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh]
3.	Mewar Foods Private Limited	Dairy	Jaipur	Rajasthan	Eligible	64	574.40
4.	GRB Dairy Foods Private Limited	Dairy	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	Eligible	80	653.35
Ineligible							
S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	Reason for ineligibility	
5.	Blue Bells Dairy	Dairy	Howrah	West Bengal	Ineligible	Insufficient Net-worth, Equity contribution & Scoring [As per criterion 8.a.(i); 8.e & 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines]	

6.	National Industries	RTE	Vadodra	Gujarat	Ineligible	Insufficient equity and net-worth [As per criterion 8.a.(i) & 8.e of the Scheme Guidelines]
7.	Eggcellent Solutions	RTE (Poultry)	Vikarabad	Telangana	Ineligible	Insufficient Net-worth, Scoring and Incomplete Bank Appraisal Note [As per criterion 8.a.(i); 11.1 (b) & 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines]
8.	Divyashakti Foods Pvt. Ltd.	RTE	Indore	Madhya Pradesh	Ineligible	Applicant already have existing Cold Storage on the same premises [As per criterion no. 8 (i) of the Scheme Guidelines]
9.	Naga Limited	RTE	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	Ineligible	No chilled/ Frozen temperature controlled processing proposed & Scoring [As per criterion 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines]

7

1. Srichakra Milk Products LLP, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020):

- a) 10 AMCUs per BMC or Milk Chilling Center. Accordingly, in instant case TC recommends 20 AMCUs
- b) Not to consider Blast Freezer and Incubation Room as the same is not reflected in CE Mechanical Certificate and quotations.
- c) Crates and milk cans are consumables and considered the same as ineligible component.
- d) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1450.86 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹701.10 lakh.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1450.86 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹701.10 lakh.

2. Zanders Resorts Private Limited, District Sirsa, Haryana

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020):

- a) Not to consider the DH at Hisar and Fatehabad as the applicant has proposed both Farm level infrastructure (collection center) and Distribution hub at Hisar and Fatehabad, Haryana and clarified that only FLI is proposed at Hisar and Fatehabad.
- b) The applicant to submit a clarification letter from the lending bank i.e. HDFC Bank Ltd. with regards to the confirmation of the correct capacities of the Milk Chilling Center.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹2126.50 lakh and grant-in-aid of ₹1034.28 lakh. [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

IMAC Observations:

The applicant vide email dated 21.08.2020 has submitted a letter from the lending Bank i.e. HDFC Bank that they have certified In-principle term loan of ₹550.00 lakh and also confirmed the capacity of Chilling Centre of 25000 Litres/Day, which due to typographical error has been mentioned as 25000 KLD in appraisal note.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹2126.50 lakh and grant-in-aid of ₹1034.28 lakh. [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

3. Mewar Foods Private Limited, Jaipur, Rajasthan

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020):

- a) The applicant to submit the MoU with Banaskanta Milk Producers Union for packing of products in Amul Brand to the Ministry.
- b) Not to consider Cold Room of 10 MT at Distribution Hub as the applicant has the tie-up with AMUL.
- c) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank i.e. AU Small Finance Bank Ltd.

- d) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹1193.05 lakh and approved grant-in-aid of ₹574.40 lakh.

IMAC Observations:

- a) IMAC noted that the lending Bank i.e. AU Small Finance Bank Ltd. vide its email dated 13.08.2020 confirmed that they have issued the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter.
- b) The applicant has submitted the Agreement with AMUL from Gujarat Co-operative Milk Marketing Federation Limited, stating that the M/s Mewar Foods Pvt. Ltd. will be doing the job work for 1 LLPD (Pouch Milk and Fresh Dairy Products).

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹1193.05 lakh and approved grant-in-aid of ₹574.40 lakh.

4. GRB Dairy Foods Private Limited, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020):

- a) 10 AMCUs per BMC or Milk Chilling Center. Accordingly, in instant case TC recommends 10 AMCUs.
- b) Not to consider flavored milk and Gulab Jamun/ Ras Gulla as the same will be packed in Cans and does not require temperature controlled storage.
- c) Milk cans are consumable and considered the same as ineligible component.
- d) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1325.26 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹653.35 lakh.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1325.26 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹653.35 lakh.

5. M/s Blue Bells Dairy, Howrah, West Bengal

TC Recommendation (28.07.2020):

- a) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria i.e. net-worth, equity contribution and Scoring as per criterion 8.a.(i), 8.e and 11.1 (b) respectively of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The required net-worth of the Blue Bells Dairy is ₹93.40 lakh while the calculated net-worth of the applicant is ₹0.00 lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹62.27 lakh.
- b) The applicant has not uploaded the complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.
- c) The equity contribution of the applicant is 12.78%, which is less than 20% of the total project cost.
- d) The scoring of the applicant's firm is 38, which is less than the minimum required score of 60.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.a.(i), 8 (e) and 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines.

6. National Industries, Vadodra, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria i.e. net-worth & equity contribution, as per criterion 8.a.(i) and 8.e. respectively of the Scheme Guidelines & Demand draft of ₹10,000 is before the Eol date i.e. 29.01.2020.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The required net-worth of the applicant's firm is ₹849.00 lakh while the calculated net-worth of the applicant is ₹0.00 lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹566.00 lakh.
- b) The documents uploaded by the applicant for Net-worth are not readable. Therefore, the net-worth of the proprietorship firm i.e. National Industries is not calculated.
- c) The equity contribution of the applicant is 13.79%, which is less than 20% of the total project cost.
- d) The Demand draft of ₹10,000 uploaded by the applicant is before the Eol date i.e. 29.01.2020

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.a.(i) and 8.e of the Scheme Guidelines.

7. Eggcellent Solutions, Vikarabad, Telangana

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria i.e. net-worth as per criterion 8.a.(i) and score of 54, which is less than the minimum required score of 60, as per criterion 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The required net-worth of M/s Eggcellent Solutions is ₹157.00 lakh whereas the calculated networth is ₹0.00 which is less than 1.5 times of grant sought of ₹104.45 lakh.
- b) The applicant has not uploaded the net-worth supporting documents. Hence, the net-worth of the applicant's firm could not be calculated.
- c) The scoring of the applicant's firm is 54, which is less than the minimum required score of 60.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal. as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.a.(i) and 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines.

8. Divyashakti Foods Pvt. Ltd., Indore, Madhya Pradesh

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) The Cold Store already exists at the proposed location and there is no boundary wall between existing facility and the proposed location
- b) The applicant to submit the latest photographs of the existing unit.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as the Cold Store already exists at the proposed location and there is no boundary wall between existing facility and the proposed location. Accordingly, TC considered the proposal as ineligible as per criterion no. 8 (i) of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. "Expansion /upgradation of the existing facility (ies) in the same premises will not be entertained".

IMAC Observations:

IMAC further noted that the applicant already has the existing Cold Store at the proposed location and there is no boundary wall between existing facility and the proposed location.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8 (i) of the Scheme Guidelines.

9. Naga Limited, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu.

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020)

To be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of the fact that the proposal does not require chilled/frozen temperature controlled processing and score of 55, which is less than the minimum required score of 60, as per criterion 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

The proposal is for cleaning, sorting and grading of Wheat, Rice & Maize and it does not require chilled/frozen temperature controlled processing.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not require chilled/frozen temperature controlled processing and does not meet the basic eligibility criterion 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines.



INDEX

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Eligible on 31.08.2020

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)		Score approved by IMAC	
					Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated		Eligible
1	Sai Surya Exports	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	4620.00	2053.11	1000.00	1004.48	1000.00	82
2	Swathi Hatcheries	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	Meat	4032.00	2574.84	1000.00	1267.45	1000.00	64
3	Square Meal Private Limited	Bangalore	Karnataka	Poultry	997.20	795.59	400.00	391.65	391.65	71
4	Golden Hatcheries	Haveri	Karnataka	Meat	3803.00	2619.56	1000.00	1284.31	1000.00	64

Details of Proposals Referred Back to TC

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Remarks of IMAC
5	Varma Marine	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	2644.49	1000.00	Referred back to TC

9

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible

Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Reasons for Rejection	
							Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)
1	GSR Nirmaan	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	5549.00	1000.00	Insufficient net worth	Insufficient net worth
2	Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd.,	Khurda,	Odisha	Marine	4938.86	1000.00	Insufficient net worth	Insufficient net worth

3	Aljalil Exports	Mandya	Karnataka	Meat	3204.07	1000.00	Insufficient net worth, non-submission of bank appraisal & term loan sanction letter
---	-----------------	--------	-----------	------	---------	---------	--

IRRADIATION PROPOSAL

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible							
Sr. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)	Grant Sought (in ₹ lakh)	Reasons for Rejection
1	Far N Beyond Sustainable LLP	Haridwar	Uttarakhand	Irradiation	1943.32	1000.00	Insufficient net worth

[Handwritten signature]

1. M/s. Sai Surya Exports, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 82, eligible project cost of ₹ 2053.11 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1004.48 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Canara Bank) vide email dated 12.08.2020 confirmed issuance of appraisal note and the sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC further noted that the applicant has submitted the certificate dated 07.08.2020 regarding the survey number for the main facility.
- c. IMAC during the discussion observed that the applicant is having existing processing facility (SMSEA Marine) approx. 75 km from the proposed new facility. The applicant further appraised the Committee that the proposed project is for processing of shrimps and fish products such as fillets, head-on etc whereas the existing facility is for freezing of the whole fishes.
- d. IMAC noted that TC has not considered the proposed collection centers/Minimal processing centers at Bhimavaram & Kakinada which are proposed to be rented and also no cost has been proposed.
- e. IMAC noted that the proposal has envisaged FLI cum Processing cum distribution at a single location and the applicant, upon a query by IMAC, informed that the raw material could be transported easily as the main location is near the procurement centres.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 82, eligible project cost of ₹ 2053.11 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1004.48 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

2. M/s. Swathi Hatcheries, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 64, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2574.84 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹.1267.45 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Yes Bank) vide email dated 12.08.2020 confirmed issuance of appraisal note and the sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has submitted the revised CE Mechanical Certificate with cost break-up in pursuance to directions of TC.
- c. IMAC, during discussion, observed that the project was sanctioned in the earlier phase and was withdrawn due to non-adherence to the time line for submission of the document (CTE). The applicant informed that the present proposal is also at the same location and is confident of completing the project in time as they have all the statutory clearances for the land. Further, confirmed that they are yet to start the project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 64, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2574.84 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹.1267.45 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

3. M/s. Square Meal Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore, Karnataka

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 71, the eligible project cost of ₹ 795.59 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹.391.65 Lakh.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (IDBI Bank Limited) vide email dated 13.08.2020 confirmed issuance of appraisal note and the sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC was apprised that the applicant has submitted complete bank appraisal note along with catchment area details.
- c. IMAC, during discussion observed that the applicant is having an existing facility, which was assisted by Ministry during 2012-13 for the processing of RTE products.
- d. IMAC further observed that both the proposed facilities (FLI cum Processing as well as DH cum processing) was recommended by TC to be considered as single component of the project. On enquiry, the applicant informed the Committee that the two separate facilities are vital for the business plan and also to avoid the cross contamination.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 71, the eligible project cost of ₹ 795.59 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹.391.65 Lakh.

4. M/s. Golden Hatcheries, Haveri, Karnataka

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹ 2619.56 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1284.31 Lakh (restricted to grant sought i.e. 1000.00 lakh).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (Union Bank of India) vide email dated 19.08.2020 confirmed issuance of appraisal note and the sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has submitted the sale deed of the existing facility along with lease deed for the new proposed facility for Distribution Hub, as directed by TC. The applicant informed the IMAC that the existing processing facility is of manual slaughtering of 1000 birds / day and is not having any cold room for storage. The proposed DH will be set up to the vacant land adjoining of the existing facility.
- c. IMAC, during discussion, observed that the project was sanctioned in the earlier phase and was withdrawn due to non-adherence to the time line for submission of the document (CTE / Approved less grant). The applicant informed that the present proposal is approximately 250 KM away from the earlier proposed away, keeping in view, the existing integrated poultry farm in the area.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the score of 64, eligible project cost of ₹ 2619.56 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1284.31 Lakh (restricted to grant sought i.e. 1000.00 lakh).



5. M/s. Varma Marine, West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 70, the eligible project cost of ₹ 2184.50 Lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 1064.98 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme guidelines).

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC noted that the lending bank (HDFC Bank Limited) vide email dated 14.08.2020 confirmed issuance of appraisal note and the sanction letter for the term loan.
- b. The IMAC observed that the applicant has submitted the revised CE (Civil) and CE (Mechanical) Certificate with the corrections.
- c. IMAC observed that the present proposal is proposed to be set up in West Godavari district and Ministry has already approved the Mega Food Park in West Godavari District for financial assistance and suggested the applicant to explore the possibility of relocating the project in Mega Food Park.

IMAC Decision

IMAC considered the recommendation of TC and referred back the proposal to TC for re-consideration for assessing the existing Shrimp Processing Capacities in relation to the raw material availability in West Godavari district and also possibilities of relocating the project in the Mega Food Park.



6. M/s. GSR Nirmaan, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per clause 8 (a) of the basic eligibility criteria of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the calculated net worth of the applicant comes to ₹ 1034.17 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000.00 = ₹ 1500.00 lakh).
- b. The applicant requested to consider the land document and the tax receipt submitted in support of the three flats owned by them for calculation of net worth. IMAC informed the applicant that the net worth has been calculated as per scheme guidelines. Further informed that they may apply again whenever the EoI is called for after correcting the mistakes.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendations of TC and rejected the proposal on account of insufficient net worth as per clause 8 (a) of the basic eligibility criteria of the scheme guidelines.

7. M/s. Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd., Khurda, Odisha

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per clause 8 (a) of the basic eligibility criteria of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the calculated net worth of the applicant is ₹ 1161.02 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000.00 = ₹ 1500.00 lakh).
- b. IMAC was appraised that the uploaded self-attested provisional balance sheet for net worth of the applicant company, without the attestation of CA/Statutory Auditor of the company, was not considered for calculation of net worth.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC and rejected the proposal on account of insufficient net worth as per clause 8 (a) of the basic eligibility criteria of the scheme guidelines.

8. M/s. Aljalil Exports, Mandya, Karnataka

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth, In-principle / final term loan sanction letter and bank appraisal note.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the calculated net worth of the applicant is ₹ 751.63 Lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000.00 Lakh = ₹1500.00 Lakh).
- b. Further, IMAC observed that the applicant has also not uploaded the term loan sanction letter from the bank as well as the bank appraisal note for the proposed project which are basic eligibility documents.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendations of TC and rejected the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) (b) & (d) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth, In-principle / final term loan sanction letter and bank appraisal note.

9. M/s. Far N Beyond Sustainable LLP, Haridwar, Uttarakhand

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) of the scheme guidelines regarding net worth.

IMAC Observation

- a. IMAC observed that the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded net worth supporting documents of the applicants comes to ₹ 331.03 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹ 1000.00 = ₹ 1500.00 Lakh).
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has not uploaded the valuation reports from the Govt. approved valuers for the constructed buildings as well as circle rate notifications for assessment of net worth. Further, the applicant has also not provided the 6 months average market price of the listed equity shares for assessment of worth of the investments.



IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendations of TC and rejected the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) of the scheme guidelines.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized initial 'J' followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

INDEX

**Minutes of the IMAC Meeting dated 31.08.2020 for “Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure”
(Applicable Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019)**

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	District	State	Status	Page No.
1.	M/s Veerabhadra Exports Private Limited	Marine/Fishery	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Eligible	3
2.	M/s Castlerock Fisheries Pvt Ltd	Marine/Fishery	SPSR Nellore	Andhra Pradesh	Deferred	3
3.	M/s Mulpuri Aqua Processors Private Limited	Marine/Fishery	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Deferred	3
4.	M/s Coastal Corporation Limited	Marine/Fishery	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Deferred	4
5.	M/s T J Foods Cold Chain	Meat	Dimapur	Nagaland	Deferred	4
6.	M/s Bhimraj Exports Private Limited	Marine/Fishery	Khorda	Odisha	Ineligible	4
7.	Royal Food Processing Enterprise	Marine/Fishery	24 South Paraganas,	West Bengal	Ineligible	5
8.	M/s Aparna Marine Exports	Marine/Fishery	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Ineligible	6
9.	Irradiation Projects	General Principles				
9(i)	M/s Suzaina Foods	Irradiation	Navsari	Gujarat	Deferred	6
9(ii)	Lion Foods Pvt. Ltd	Irradiation	Gir Somnath	Gujarat	Eligible	7
9(iii)	M/s Gamma Tech (India) Pvt. Ltd	Irradiation	Tuticorin	Tamil Nadu	Eligible	7
9(iv)	M/s Gamma Agro Medical Processings Pvt Ltd	Irradiation	Chikballapur	Karnataka	Ineligible	8



1. M/s Veerabhadra Exports Private Limited, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 78, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2287.37 lakh and eligible grant in aid of Rs. 1000 lakh (restricted to maximum limit).

IMAC Observations

IMAC noted that TC recommended the proposal as eligible.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 78, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2287.37 lakh and eligible grant in aid of Rs. 1000 lakh (restricted to maximum limit.)

2. M/s Castlerock Fisheries Pvt Ltd, SPSR Nellore, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020)

The technical Committee recommended the proposal as eligible with total scoring of 78 and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000 lakh.

IMAC Observations

IMAC observed that many cold chain projects under marine/fishery sector have already been sanctioned in the coastal areas of Andhra Pradesh. Further, other project for processing of fish and marine assisted by MPEDA/State Government are also functioning in the nearby areas. Therefore, IMAC is of the view that before approving further cold chain projects in this sector, there is a need to evaluate the capacity utilization of existing units and required capacity to be generated under marine/fishery sector in the state so that IMAC can reach at conclusive decision.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed the Technical Committee to place the proposal again before the IMAC with the above mentioned data.

3. Mulpuri Aqua Processors Private Limited, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020)

The technical Committee recommended the proposal as eligible with total scoring of 71 and grant-in-aid of Rs 672.76 lakh.

IMAC Observations



IMAC was apprised that the proposed facility is adjacent to the existing facility and outside the existing premises. Also, IMAC desired to know what is the difference between the proposed facility and existing facility, what are the new products to be prepared in the proposed facilities other than being prepared in the existing facility. Some of the components of proposed facility may be setup in the existing facility to upgrade the same, which will be cost effective and will reduce the cost of the project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed to conduct the virtual inspection of the existing facility to assess whether proposed facility is an expansion/up-gradation of existing facility.

4. M/s Coastal Corporation Limited, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020)

The technical Committee recommended the proposal as eligible with total scoring of 74 and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh.

IMAC Observations

IMAC observed that many cold chain projects under marine/fishery sector have already been sanctioned in the coastal areas of Andhra Pradesh. Further, other project for processing of fish and marine assisted by MPEDA/State Government are also functioning in the nearby areas. Therefore, IMAC is of the view that before approving further cold chain projects in this sector, there is a need to evaluate the capacity utilization of existing units and required capacity to be generated under marine/fishery sector in the state so that IMAC can reach at conclusive decision.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed the Technical Committee to place the proposal again before the IMAC with the above mentioned data.

5. M/s T J Foods Cold Chain, District- Dimapur, State- Nagaland

TC Recommendation (29.07.2020)

The technical Committee recommended the proposal as eligible with total scoring of 68 and grant-in-aid of Rs 579.24 lakh.

IMAC Observations

IMAC was apprised that the proposed facility is adjacent to the existing meat processing facility; however, proposed site is surrounded by the boundary wall to make the proposed facility distinct from existing facility. Also, IMAC desired to know what is the difference between the proposed facility and existing facility, what are the new products to be prepared in the proposed facilities other than being prepared in the existing facility. Some of the components of proposed



facility may be setup in the existing facility to upgrade the same, which will be cost effective and will reduce the cost of the project.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed to conduct the virtual inspection of the existing facility to assess whether the proposed processing facility cannot be adjusted in the existing premises and proposed facility is an expansion/up-gradation of existing facility.

6. M/s Bhimraj Exports Private Limited, Khorda, Odisha.

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

The technical committee recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of submission of false undertaking.

IMAC Observations

During the technical committee meeting dated 30.07.2020, member from MPEDA had pointed out that the applicant had also applied for subsidy from MPEDA for the same project. TC further observed that this information had not been disclosed by the promoter in the undertaking submitted by the applicant. The applicant at point 8 in the undertaking declared that “in case of concealment of any facts in this regard, the MoFPI would have right to reject my application out right at any stage.”

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of submission of false undertaking and advised to blacklist both applicant and the consultant of the applicant.

7. M/s Royal Food Processing Enterprise, 24 South Paraganas, West Bengal

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

The technical committee recommended the proposal as ineligible due to non-submission of requisite documents as per scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

IMAC Observations

Applicant has not submitted documents such as Detailed Project Report. Bank Appraisal Note. Term Loan Sanction Letter from the Bank. Net-worth supporting documents. Certificates from CA, Chartered Engineer (Civil), Chartered Engineer (Mechanical). Land Documents. CIU etc.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the recommendation of the technical committee as ineligible due to non-submission of requisite documents as per scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.



8. M/s Aparna Marine Exports, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (30.07.2020)

The Technical Committee recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient networth in terms of Clause 8(a) of Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations

Applicant had sought grant-in-aid of Rs 1000 lakh thus the net worth of the firm should be Rs 1500 lakh. As per the CA certificate of networth submitted by the applicant, total networth of the firm was claimed as Rs 15.94 lakh by the applicant. However, the networth of the applicant's firm was not ascertained by the TC due to non submission of the supporting documents.

During the discussion, the applicant admitted that the requisite supporting documents under the scheme guidelines could not be uploaded on the Sampada Portal.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient network as per the Clause 8(a) of Scheme Guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

9. Irradiation Projects - General Principles for evaluating the irradiation projects under the Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure.

IMAC was apprised that during the TC meeting dated 01.08.2020, the member from Board of Radiation & Isotope Technology (BRIT) was also present. The issue of applying stringent measures on irradiation projects to ensure increased/majority utilization for food was discussed. IMAC approved the following:-

- (i) Applicant Firm would submit following documents:
 - a) 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.
 - b) 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.
 - c) Non-compliance would lead to recall of grant.
- (ii) Cobalt is part of Plant & Machinery rather than consumable as it is the source of radiation for the project. Therefore, it may be considered eligible for grant-in-aid.

9(i) M/s Suzaina Foods, Navsari, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)



The technical committee recommended the proposal as eligible with total score of 74 and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000 Lakh subject to confirmation/clarification with regard to ITDP area from Ministry of Tribal Affairs.

IMAC Observations

Applicant informed the IMAC that he is already in the business of exporting mango pickles, chatni, etc. to USA, New Zealand, etc. They have underwent agreement with M/s Pooja Foods, New Zealand.

IMAC Decision

IMAC deferred the proposal and directed the Technical Committee to verify the forward linkage of the project i.e. agreement with Pooja Foods, New Zealand and place the proposal again before IMAC with factual position in this regard.

9(ii) M/s Lion Foods Pvt. Ltd, Gir Somnath, Gujarat

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with score of 73 and grant-in-aid of Rs 504.72 Lakh and directed the applicant to submit revised CE Civil Certificate and CE Mechanical certificates mentioning the details including area of the utility and collating the components so that use of the components can be understood. Moreover, TC also directed the applicant to submit undertaking for clear title of land proposed for main facility, NOC from HDFC bank and mortgage deed in favour of lending bank only at the time of 90 days compliance.

IMAC Observations

1. Applicant has submitted the revised CE Civil and Mechanical certificate and accordingly, grant has been recalculated as eligible project cost of Rs 1292.93 lakh and eligible grant of Rs 646.47 lakh.
2. Applicant has submitted the undertaking for use of irradiation facility as directed by technical committee dated 01.08.2020; however, it was not signed by all the partners. Revised Undertaking in the prescribed format may be submitted during 30 days compliance.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 73. Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1292.93 lakh and eligible grant in aid of Rs. 646.47 lakh.

9(iii) M/s Gamma Tech (India) Pvt. Ltd, Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)



TC recommended the proposal as eligible with score of 68, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1253.90 lakh and Eligible Grant of Rs 625 lakh (restricted to grant sought).

IMAC Observations

1. Applicant has submitted the undertaking for the use of irradiation project which is not in the prescribed format. Revised undertaking in prescribed format may be submitted during 30 days compliance.
2. In pursuance of the TC directions, applicant has submitted the copy of Board resolution for appointment of statutory auditor along with a copy of form ADT-1 for information to the registrar (ROC) by the company for appointment of auditor from 01.04.2016 to 31.03.2021 and self attested copy of original document in vernacular language which seems stamped and signed by registrar.
3. IMAC was apprised by the BRIT that Tamil Nadu has no irradiation project till date.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 68, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1253.90 lakh and Eligible Grant of Rs 625 lakh (restricted to grant sought).

9(iv) M/s Gamma Agro Medical Processings Pvt Ltd, Chikballapur, Karnataka

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020)

The technical committee recommended the proposal as ineligible on account of non submission of In-principle/final Sanction of term loan and appraisal note as per clause 8 (b) and 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

IMAC Observations

Applicant has not submitted In-principle/final Sanction of term loan and appraisal note and hence eligibility criteria are not being met. Further IMAC was apprised that during technical committee meeting dated 01.08.2020, applicant requested to withdraw the proposal.

IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of non submission of In-principle/final Sanction of term loan and appraisal note as per clause 8 (b) and 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.



INDEX

IMAC Minutes of Meeting dated 31.08.2020

Eligible						
S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	
1.	Jaya Lakshmi Sea Foods Pvt Ltd	Marine	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Referred back to TC	
2.	Eswara Foods	Fishery/Marine	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Referred back to TC	
Ineligible						
S. no.	Name of the Applicant	Sector	Location of the Project	State	Status	Reason for ineligibility
3.	United Farm Product Private Limited	Meat	Nuh	Haryana	Ineligible	Non submission of Bank Appraisal Note [As per criterion 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines]
4.	Grand Marine Exim	Fishery/ Marine	Alappuzha	Kerala	Ineligible	Project has already approved under the CEFPPC Scheme [As per criterion 8. (g) of the Scheme Guidelines]
5.	Kuppanna Poultry Farm	Poultry/Meat	Tripur	Tamil Nadu	Ineligible	Insufficient net worth [As per criterion 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines]
6.	Snowman Logistics Limited	Fishery	Jalpaiguri	West Bengal	Ineligible	No FLI is proposed and no processing activity has been envisaged in the project. [As per criterion no. 4 of the Scheme Guidelines]

1. Jaya Lakshmi Sea Foods Pvt Ltd, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank.
- b) The applicant has not proposed any cooking line, hence, TC recommends only 2 Nos. x 0.75 TPH of IQF.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹3523.80 lakh and approved grant-in-aid of ₹1761.90 lakh (Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines).

IMAC Observations:

- a) Applicant vide email dated 06.08.2020 has submitted a confirmation letter from the lending Bank i.e. State Bank of India dated 31.07.2020 with regards to Bank Appraisal and In-principle sanction letter of ₹4000.00 lakh to M/s Jaya Lakshmi Sea Foods Pvt. Ltd. for MoFPI grant.
- b) In IMAC meeting, applicant confirmed that he will use IQF for cooked shrimp. Since, the applicant has not proposed Cooking Line, the IMAC deferred the case to re-examine the facilities proposed in the proposal.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to re-examine the facilities proposed.

2. Eswara Foods, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh

TC Recommendation (01.08.2020):

- a) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to insufficient net-worth, which is one of the basic eligibility criteria, as per criterion 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The required net-worth of the applicant's firm is ₹1500.00 lakh, while the calculated net-worth is ₹870.77 lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹1000.00 lakh. (The net worth calculated on the basis of the documents submitted at the time of EoI)
- b) Some of the net-worth documents uploaded by the applicant firm were not readable.
- c) The applicant vide email dated 31.07.2020 has submitted the readable net worth supporting documents.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC referred back the proposal to Technical Committee (TC) to confirm whether the blurred documents are same as the documents submitted by the applicant post TC vide their email dated 31.07.2020 and if so, then recalculate the net worth.

3. United Farm Product Private Limited, Nuh, Haryana



TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) The Bank Appraisal Note uploaded by the applicant is not signed and stamped by the lending bank. Further, in the in-principle term loan sanction letter, name of signing authority of the banker is not mentioned.
- b) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note Issued by the lending bank.
- c) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, since, the proposal does not qualify the basic eligibility criterion as the applicant has not submitted valid Detailed Appraisal Note from the bank/financial institution specific to the proposal i.e. point 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The email I.D of the lending bank i.e. HDFC Bank Ltd. is not mentioned in the Bank Appraisal Note and final Term loan sanction letter. The applicant was asked to submit the email I.D of the lending bank. However, no response has been received from the applicant.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines.

4. Grand Marine Exim, Alappuzha District, Kerala



TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) The applicant i.e. M/s Grand Marine Exim has already one project approved under the CEFPPC Scheme in KSIDC Mega Food Park.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as per criterion 8.(g) of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Applicants/ Promoters who have availed assistance under any other scheme of the Ministry and apply under this scheme, then in such cases the previous project (s) should have achieved completion and commenced commercial operation/ production and successfully completed at least one year before the date of advertisement of EoI of this scheme, will be entertained and as per (8) of the undertaking, "In case of concealment of any facts in this regard, the MoFPI would have right to reject/ cancel my application/project out right at any stage".

IMAC Observations:

- a) The applicant i.e. M/s Grand Marine Exim has already one project approved under the CEFPPC Scheme in KSIDC Mega Food Park.
- b) Applicant has not disclosed in the undertaking regarding the above said approval i.e. (5) It is certified that Grand Marine Exim has not obtained or applied for grants for the same project, component, purpose or activity from any other Ministry or Department of the Government of India or State Government or their agencies.
- c) As per (8) of the undertaking, "In case of concealment of any facts in this regard, the MoFPI would have right to reject/ cancel my application/project out right at any stage".

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.(g) of the Scheme Guidelines and as per (8) of the undertaking.

5. Kuppanna Poultry Farm, Tripur, Tamil Nadu

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to insufficient net-worth, which is one of the basic eligibility criteria, as per criterion 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.

IMAC Observations:

- a) The net-worth required from the applicant's firm is ₹1200.00 lakh while the calculated net-worth is ₹871.77 lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹800.00 lakh.
- b) The net-worth supporting documents uploaded in support of immovable properties are in regional language.
- c) As per the Scheme Guidelines, criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) & 9.1, "When original documents are in regional language they should be accompanied by self-certified English/ Hindi translation".
- d) Net worth of the applicant firm has been calculated on the basis of Capital in the firm M/s Kuppanna Poultry of ₹614.77 lakh and Loans & Advances of ₹257.00 lakh.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.

6. Snowman Logistics Limited, Jalpaiguri, West Bengal

TC Recommendation (31.07.2020):

- a) To confirm the genuineness of the sanction letter & bank appraisal note issued by the lending bank.
- b) To be placed before IMAC as ineligible since the applicant has not proposed any FLI and no processing activity has been envisaged. Hence, the proposal does not meet the criterion no. 4 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. "To avail financial assistance under this scheme, the applicant will have to set up Farm Level Infrastructure and either Distribution Hub or Refrigerated vehicle".

IMAC Observations:

- a) FLI proposed will be ready facility to be taken on lease. Hence, FLI proposed is not acceptable.
- b) Applicant has mainly proposed frozen storage of 8000 MT [rental model] with reefer vehicles of 85 MT [(4 nos. x 17 MT) & 2 nos. x 8.5 MT)].
- c) The Blast freezer proposed at DH is also for rental purpose and no cost has been provided in C.E Mech. Certificate.
- d) The applicant has not proposed any FLI and no processing activity has been envisaged.
- e) The email I.D of the lending bank i.e. Axis Bank is not mentioned in the Bank Appraisal Note and final Term loan sanction letter. The applicant was asked to submit the email I.D of the lending bank. However, no response has been received from the applicant.

IMAC Decision:

IMAC rejected the proposal since the applicant has not proposed any FLI and no processing activity has been envisaged. Hence, the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria criterion no. 4 of the Scheme Guidelines.



Annexure - I

List of Proposals Approved by Inter Ministerial Approval Committee (IMAC) as Eligible

S.No.	Name of the project	District	State/UT	Sector	Date of IMAC	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)			Score	Category (SC/ST/General)
						Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated	Eligible		
1	Jivo Wellness Private Limited	Sonapat	Haryana	F&V	21.08.2020	4832.81	3495.86	1000.00	1718.72	1000.00	90	General
2	Sivasakthi Milk Dairy	Erode	Tamil Nadu	Dairy	28.08.2020	1690.00	1063.61	551.61	504.32	504.32	85	General
3	Gandhinagar District Cooperative Milk Producers Union Limited	Udaipur	Rajasthan	Dairy	28.08.2020	2750.00	2061.80	1000.00	1004.65	1000.00	83	General
4	Sai Surya Exports	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh	Fishery	31.08.2020	4620.00	2053.11	1000.00	1004.48	1000.00	82	General
5	Furczun Fruits and Vegetables	Betul	Madhya Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	2214.93	1717.20	1000.00	1236.15	1000.00	81	General
6	Zanders Resorts Private Limited	Sirsa	Haryana	Dairy	28.08.2020	2681.15	2126.50	1000.00	1034.28	1000.00	80	General



S.No.	Name of the project	District	State/UT	Sector	Date of IMAC	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)			Score	Category (SC/ST/General)
						Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated	Eligible		
7	GRB Dairy Foods Private Limited	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	Dairy	28.08.2020	2424.00	1325.26	1000.00	653.35	653.35	80	General
8	Srichakra Milk Products LLP	Anantapur	Andhra Pradesh	Dairy	28.08.2020	2205.42	1450.86	804.13	701.10	701.10	80	General
9	Agro Tech	Belgaum	Karnataka	F&V	21.08.2020	1538.50	1432.00	1000.00	1007.63	1000.00	78	ST
10	Veerabhadra Exports Pvt. Ltd.	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Fishery	31.08.2020	3637.85	2287.37	1000.00	1111.44	1000.00	78	General
11	Beejapuri Dairy Private Limited	Jhajjar	Haryana	Dairy	28.08.2020	2889.00	2233.05	1000.00	1044.71	1000.00	78	General
12	Nutrimea Dairy LLP	Faridabad	Haryana	Dairy	28.08.2020	3044.85	2322.09	1000.00	1110.34	1000.00	75	General
13	The Uralungal Labour Contract Co-operative Society Limited (ULCCS)	Kozhikode	Kerala	Dairy	28.08.2020	4404.46	2467.38	1000.00	1191.91	1000.00	73	General
14	Anvinda Dairy Private Ltd.	Hapur	Uttar Pradesh	Dairy	28.08.2020	2459.91	1183.37	800.00	577.29	577.29	73	General
15	Lions Foods Pvt Ltd	Junagarh	Gujarat	Irradiation	31.08.2020	2244.95	1292.93	842.40	646.47	646.47	73	General

7

S.No.	Name of the project	District	State/UT	Sector	Date of IMAC	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)			Score	Category (SC/ST/General)
						Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated	Eligible		
16	Naturade Foods Private Limited	Visakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	1557.81	759.43	400.00	379.06	379.06	73	General
17	GUK Foods LLP	Surat	Gujarat	F&V	24.08.2020	2049.78	1408.83	1000.00	1029.61	1000.00	72	General
18	Saran Dairy Producer Company Limited	Gopalganj	Bihar	Dairy	28.08.2020	1165.59	642.81	391.65	305.56	305.56	72	General
19	Square Meal Private Limited	Bangalore	Karnataka	Meat/Poultry	31.08.2020	997.20	795.59	400.00	391.65	391.65	71	General
20	MCFROST India	Surat	Gujarat	F&V	24.08.2020	2768.46	1167.00	1000.00	867.75	867.75	70	General
21	Gamma Tech India Private Limited	Tuticorin	Tamil Nadu	Irradiation	31.08.2020	2011.95	1253.90	625.00	626.95	625.00	68	General
22	Chandigarh Sweets Limited	Mohali	Punjab	RTE	28.08.2020	1052.00	759.87	350.00	365.77	350.00	68	General
23	Suryas Exports Private Limited	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	RTE	28.08.2020	857.11	359.35	158.00	178.38	158.00	67	General

7

S.No.	Name of the project	District	State/UT	Sector	Date of IMAC	Project Cost (in ₹ lakh)		Grant (in ₹ lakh)			Score	Category (SC/ST/General)
						Total	Eligible	Sought	Calculated	Eligible		
24	Himachal Pradesh State Agriculture Marketing Board HPSAMB	Parala	Himachal Pradesh	F&V	24.08.2020	5925.33	1781.21	1000.00	1084.35	1000.00	64	General
25	Swathi Hatcheries	Dindigal	Tamil Nadu	Meat/ Poultry	31.08.2020	4032.00	2574.84	1000.00	1267.45	1000.00	64	General
26	Golden Hatcheries	Haveri	Karnataka	Meat/ Poultry	31.08.2020	3803.00	2619.56	1000.00	1284.31	1000.00	64	General
27	Mewar Foods Private Limited	Jaipur	Rajasthan	Dairy	28.08.2020	1584.19	1193.05	619.42	574.40	574.40	64	General

2

Annexure-II

State-wise & Sector-wise list of eligible proposals

S.No.	State	Sector						Total
		F&V	Dairy	Marine/ Fishery	Meat/ Poultry	RTE/ RTC	Irradiation	
1	Andhra Pradesh	1	1	2		1		5
2	Bihar		1					1
3	Gujarat	2					1	3
4	Haryana	1	3					4
5	Himachal Pradesh	1						1
6	Karnataka	1			2			3
7	Kerala		1					1
8	Madhya Pradesh	1						1
9	Punjab					1		1
10	Rajasthan		2					2
11	Tamil Nadu		2		1	1		4
12	Uttar Pradesh		1					1
Total		7	11	2	3	3	1	27



Annexure- III

Details of Proposals Referred Back to TC					
Sl. no	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Date of IMAC
1.	Bija Agrifresh Private Limited	Kullu	Himachal Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020
2.	Always Fresh Fruits CA Store	Nainital	Uttarakhand	F&V	21.08.2020
3.	Nature Frozen Foods	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	F&V	21.08.2020
4.	MA Cold Chain Infrastructure	Palakkad	Kerala	F&V	21.08.2020
5.	Shiva Agri Fresh	Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020
6.	DC Agro	Kathua	Jammu and Kashmir	F&V	24.08.2020
7.	NB Natural Food Products	Ahmedabad	Gujarat	F&V	24.08.2020
8.	Funwave Foods LLP	Morbi	Gujarat	Frozen RTE	24.08.2020
9.	Foods and Inns Limited	Valsad	Gujarat	F&V	24.08.2020
10.	R.K. Food Products	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	F&V	24.08.2020
11.	P. Star Agro Products	Hoshiarpur	Punjab	F&V	24.08.2020
12.	Bright Food Industries	Rampur	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	24.08.2020
13.	Varma Marine	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	31.08.2020
14.	Castlerock Fisheries Pvt Ltd	SPSR Nellore	Andhra Pradesh	Marine/ Fishery	31.08.2020
15.	Mulpuri Aqua Processors Private Limited	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Marine/ Fishery	31.08.2020
16.	Coastal Corporation Limited	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Marine/ Fishery	31.08.2020
17.	T J Foods Cold Chain	Dimapur	Nagaland	Meat	31.08.2020
18.	Jaya Lakshmi Sea Foods Pvt Ltd	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	31.08.2020
19.	Eswara Foods	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	31.08.2020
20.	Suzaina Foods	Navsari	Gujarat	Irradiation	31.08.2020

Annexure-IV

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible						
Sl. No.	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Date of IMAC	Reason for ineligibility
1.	Anand Mishra	Gopalganj	Bihar	F&V	21.08.2020	Non-viability / suitability of the project because of the proposed disproportionate capacity of the Cold Storage with the envisaged value-addition infrastructure
2.	Chhattisgarh Food Product	Korba	Chhattisgarh	F&V	21.08.2020	Non submission of Bank appraisal note, bank sanction letter & proposed no value addition
3.	Sneh Raj Cold storage	Badaun	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	Non-submission of documents for assessment of the proposal
4.	Petropath Fluid (India) Private Limited	Bankura	West Bengal	F&V	21.08.2020	Insufficient net worth, non-submission of Bank appraisal note, bank sanction letter & proposed no value addition
5.	SMA Cold Chain Infrastructure	Kanchipuram	Tamil Nadu	F&V	21.08.2020	Insufficient net worth. Subsequently, the promoter has withdrawn the proposal
6.	Nava Quality Foods Pvt Ltd	Chittoor	Andhra Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	Expansion/up-gradation of the existing facilities in the same premises
7.	Mukhiya Cold Storage	Jalaun	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	Insufficient net worth
8.	Shri Jai Bade Dev Baba	Kanpur Dehat	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	21.08.2020	Insufficient net worth
9.	Mufeed Agro Fresh	Shopian	Jammu and Kashmir	F&V	24.08.2020	Non submission of Bank appraisal note, bank sanction letter
10.	Bahl Paper Mills Ltd	Kashipur	Uttarakhand	F&V	24.08.2020	Non setting up of Farm Level Infrastructure in catchment area
11.	Agro Care	Pulwama	Jammu and Kashmir	F&V	24.08.2020	The lending bank i.e. Jammu and Kashmir Bank has intimated that the Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle term loan sanction letter are not issued by the bank. [Criterion 8 (b) & (d) of Scheme



Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible

Sl. No.	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Date of IMAC	Reason for ineligibility
						Guidelines]
12.	Panchwati Prayogshala Pvt. Ltd, Uttarakhand	Haridwar	Uttarakhand	F&V	24.08.2020	Due to cross holding of applicant entities. [Criterion 8 (n) of Scheme Guidelines]
13.	I Cube Agro	West Siang	Arunachal Pradesh	F&V	24.08.2020	Insufficient net worth [Criterion 8(a) (ii) of the Scheme Guidelines.]
14.	Narendra Cold Chain	Kangra	Himachal Pradesh	F&V	24.08.2020	Name of the promoter is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant. [As per criterion 9 of Scheme Guidelines]
15.	Himalayan Vegefruit Ltd	Patiala	Punjab	F&V	24.08.2020	Promoter has already availed grant from Ministry previously. [Criterion 8.(h) of the Scheme Guidelines]
16.	EM Global LLP	Rangareddy	Telangana	F&V	24.08.2020	The lending bank i.e. Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. has denied about issuance of Bank Appraisal Note. [Criterion 8 (d) of Scheme Guidelines]
17.	Arunagiri Agro Products	Ranipet (Vellore)	Tamil Nadu	Dairy	28.08.2020	Not fulfilling the requirement of clause 8 (g) / (h) / (n) of the scheme guidelines in respect of availing financial assistance for the second proposal
18.	Narmada Milk and Milk Product Unit II	Korba	Chhattisgarh	Dairy	28.08.2020	Insufficient Net worth and Expansion / Upgrading of Existing Facility(ies)
19.	Laxmi Milk Products	Banaskantha	Gujarat	Dairy	28.08.2020	Insufficient net worth
20.	ABN Indian Biotech Pvt Ltd	Sirmour	Himachal Pradesh	Dairy	28.08.2020	Already started civil construction and there is no boundary wall between existing building and proposed project
21.	Blue Bells Dairy	Howrah	West Bengal	Dairy	28.08.2020	Insufficient Net-worth, Equity contribution & Scoring



Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible							
Sl. No.	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Date of IMAC	Reason for ineligibility	
						[As per criterion 8.a.(i); 8.e & 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines]	
22.	Ambrozia Frozen Foods	Panchkula	Haryana	RTE/RTC	28.08.2020	Insufficient net worth and Expansion / Upgradation of existing facility(ies) in the same premises	
23.	National Industries	Vadodra	Gujarat	RTE	28.08.2020	Insufficient equity and net-worth [As per criterion 8.a.(i) & 8.e of the Scheme Guidelines]	
24.	Eggcellent Solutions	Vikarabad	Telangana	RTE	28.08.2020	Insufficient Net-worth, Scoring and Incomplete Bank Appraisal Note [As per criterion 8.a.(i); 11.1 (b) & 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines]	
25.	Divyashakti Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Indore	Madhya Pradesh	RTE	28.08.2020	Applicant already have existing Cold Storage on the same premises [As per criterion no. 8 (i) of the Scheme Guidelines]	
26.	Naga Limited	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	RTE	28.08.2020	No chilled/ Frozen temperature controlled processing proposed & Scoring [As per criterion 11.1 (b) of the Scheme Guidelines]	
27.	GSR Nirmaan	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	31.08.2020	Insufficient net worth	
28.	Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd.,	Khurda,	Odisha	Marine	31.08.2020	Insufficient net worth	
29.	Ajjali Exports	Mandya	Karnataka	Meat	31.08.2020	Insufficient net worth, non-submission of bank appraisal & term loan sanction letter	
30.	Bhimraj Exports Private Limited	Khorca	Odisha	Marine/ Fishery	31.08.2020	Submission of false undertaking	
31.	Royal Food Processing Enterprise	24 South Paraganas,	West Bengal	Marine/	31.08.2020	Non-submission of requisite documents	

9

Details of Proposals approved by IMAC as Ineligible						
Sl. No.	Name of the Applicant	District	State	Sector	Date of IMAC	Reason for ineligibility
				Fishery		
32.	Aparna Marine Exports	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Marine/ Fishery	31.08.2020	Insufficient networth
33.	United Farm Product Private Limited	Nuh	Haryana	Meat	31.08.2020	Non submission of Bank Appraisal Note [As per criterion 8 (d) of the Scheme Guidelines]
34.	Grand Marine Exim	Alappuzha	Kerala	Fishery/ Marine	31.08.2020	Project has already approved under the CEFPPC Scheme [As per criterion 8. (g) of the Scheme Guidelines]
35.	Kuppanna Poultry Farm	Tripur	Tamil Nadu	Poultry/ Meat	31.08.2020	Insufficient net worth [As per criterion 8.a.(ii) of the Scheme Guidelines]
36.	Snowman Logistics Limited	Jalpaiguri	West Bengal	Fisheries	31.08.2020	No FLI is proposed and no processing activity has been envisaged in the project. [As per criterion no. 4 of the Scheme Guidelines]
37.	Far N Beyond Sustainable LLP	Haridwar	Uttarakhand	Irradiation	31.08.2020	Insufficient net worth
38.	Gamma Agro Medical Processings Pvt Ltd	Chikballapur	Karnataka	Irradiation	31.08.2020	Non submission of In-principle/final Sanction of term loan and appraisal note

9

