



B U S I N E S S P L A N · I N D I A

Dairy Farm

Milk production with the numbers the cows cannot speak

DAIRY

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

This document is confidential and prepared for planning purposes. All financial figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian MSME context and must be validated against live quotes, local rates and professional advice before any investment or borrowing decision.

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out a **Commercial Dairy Farm** in India — a housed and semi-grazed herd of crossbred and indigenous cattle producing raw milk for processors, cooperatives and direct institutional buyers, with an owned parlour, bulk chilling, fodder cultivation, a herd-health and breeding programme, and manure and biogas management.

This plan is the anchor of the dairy vertical: the conventions it establishes are inherited and cross-referenced by the nine plans that follow rather than re-derived. They are set here because this is the first business in the library whose central cost is borne by something that cannot report its own condition — and because every downstream dairy business, from the processor to the ice-cream brand, ultimately buys the consequences of decisions taken on a farm floor.

☐ **THE ANIMAL CANNOT COMPLAIN, CANNOT LEAVE, AND ITS SUFFERING IS INVISIBLE IN THE PRODUCT.** Milk from a cow in chronic pain looks identical, tastes identical and passes the same tank tests as milk from a healthy one. Welfare is therefore a pure cost with no product signal whatever — the same structure the drone plan identified for aviation compliance, and it produces the same result: a market that systematically rewards the operator who spends less. So this plan measures and publishes what the animal cannot say: lameness score, body condition score, mastitis incidence, somatic cell count, calving interval, average age at culling and mortality — because "we treat our animals well" is an adjective and a somatic cell count of 168,000 is a number. The general rule the vertical inherits: **WHERE THE PARTY BEARING THE COST CANNOT REPORT ITS OWN CONDITION, THE ONLY HONEST OPERATOR IS ONE WHO MEASURES AND PUBLISHES ON ITS BEHALF.**

☐ **OXYTOCIN, ANTIBIOTIC RESIDUE AND THE WITHDRAWAL PERIOD.** Illegal oxytocin injection to force let-down is widespread, painful, and completely undetectable in a bulk tank; and an antibiotic-treated cow returned to the tank before her withdrawal period expires puts residue into the food chain and contributes to resistance — with the harm landing on a consumer who will never trace it to anybody. Both are invisible to every buyer downstream. So treated animals are **PHYSICALLY SEGREGATED** with a marked leg band and a **SYSTEM LOCK** on their milk in the parlour software, the withdrawal calendar is enforced by the system rather than by memory, and residue testing is run with **FAILURES REPORTED** — 6 in Year 1 falling to none, because a testing regime that has never found anything is not testing.

☐ **And two facts this trade never prints: THE MALE CALF AND THE END OF LACTATION.** A dairy herd produces male calves that will never give milk, and cows whose yield eventually falls below their feed cost, and every dairy business in the country has a policy on both which it does not publish. This plan states its policy plainly — male calves reared and sold for draught or beef-market channels per the applicable state law rather than neglected, and culling decided on welfare and productivity together with the average lactation at culling reported (3.1 rising to 4.6) — because an unstated policy is a policy nobody has had to defend.

This plan models an operator requiring **₹8.60 crore** (₹2.80 crore investor + ₹1.60 crore working-capital facility + ₹2.20 crore promoter + ₹2.00 crore term loan), moving from **₹4.20 crore revenue and a ₹68 lakh loss** to **₹12.60 crore revenue and ₹1.51 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 12.0% net margin, 24.6% return on capital, and margin over feed cost rising from ₹16.40 to ₹24.80 per litre. (Commercial dairy farm — figures illustrative.)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A dairy farm that publishes the numbers its cows cannot speak.

Vision: To be the supplier a processor's quality team stops auditing because the data arrives first.

Mission: Never inject oxytocin; band the treated cow and let the software refuse her milk; test for residue and report what we find; score every animal for lameness and condition every month; publish the cell count; state what happens to the male calves; and measure margin over feed cost, not the milk price.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended at this scale. Institutional supply agreements, term lending against livestock and infrastructure, subsidy and scheme access, and outside capital all require it.
- **Proprietorship or partnership** — the form most Indian dairy farms use; **the consequence is that herd records, treatment logs and residue results exist only in somebody's memory, which is precisely why the sector cannot demonstrate anything about itself.**
- **Employed herdsmen, milkers and a retained veterinarian**, with the treatment register held by the vet and the herd manager — **because the person under pressure to fill the tank cannot be the person who decides a cow's milk may go into it.**

Regulatory anchor: a business regulated simultaneously as a food producer, an animal enterprise and an effluent generator. **The first exposure is food safety: FSSAI standards apply to raw milk including limits on antibiotic and pesticide residues and on adulteration, and residue in a bulk tank is a food-safety failure regardless of whether anybody intended it. The second is animal law: the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and its rules cover housing, transport and treatment, and the administration of oxytocin to livestock for milk let-down is prohibited under the Drugs and Cosmetics framework and prosecuted as cruelty — this is not a grey area, it is an offence that is widely committed because it is invisible. The third is environmental: manure, effluent and washdown from a housed herd are a real pollution load requiring management, and state pollution-control consents apply.** Then: state cattle-transport and slaughter laws, which differ sharply between states and directly determine what may lawfully be done with male calves and cull cows; land use and building approvals; feed and fodder regulation; GST treatment of agricultural produce; and EPF/ESI and POSH across a resident workforce.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with dairy, veterinary or livestock-management background. Three competences decide outcomes. *Feed economics*, because feed is roughly two-thirds of the cost of a litre and the business is won or lost in ration formulation and fodder cultivation rather than at the milk price. *Reproductive management*, since a cow that does not conceive on schedule is a cow eating without producing, and the calving interval is the single most powerful lever on herd output. And *the discipline to cull and to segregate* — removing an animal that is losing money, and holding a treated cow's milk out of the tank on a day when the collection target is short. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **the treatment register and the withdrawal lock sit with the veterinarian and the herd manager, never with the person accountable for daily collection volume.**

4. Market Analysis — India

India is the world's largest milk producer and one of its least organised, which means the opportunity is not in producing milk but in producing milk somebody can verify.

Demand drivers

- **Structural demand growth** from population, income and the persistent centrality of dairy in Indian diets.

- **Processor demand for consistent, testable supply** — plants need reliable volume at reliable quality, and smallholder aggregation delivers neither predictably.
- **Quality-linked pricing** on fat, SNF and increasingly on somatic cell count, which converts herd health into revenue.
- **Value-added dairy growth** — paneer, curd, cheese and premium milk — all of which are more sensitive to raw-milk quality than liquid milk is.
- **Institutional and direct channels** — hotels, hospitals, schools and premium retail willing to pay for traceability.
- **Traceability requirements** arriving through export-oriented and organised buyers, which favour farms that keep records at all.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Raw milk demand across the served procurement region	Enormous; overwhelmingly smallholder-supplied
SAM	Buyers paying a premium for tested, traceable, quality-linked supply	Bounded by HERD SIZE and YIELD, not by demand
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Milk delivered across processor, institutional and direct channels	₹4.2cr → ₹12.6cr; 220 → 480 milking animals

Why the organised farm exists at all

	Smallholder supply (2-5 animals)	Organised farm
Cost per litre	Often lower — family labour is unpriced	Higher on paper; measurable
Quality consistency	Highly variable between collections	Controlled, tested, recorded
Traceability	Effectively none beyond the collection centre	Animal-level, retained
Residue & oxytocin risk	Unmonitored and unmonitable	Segregated, locked, tested
Welfare visibility	Invisible to everybody	Measured and published

The left-hand column deserves respect rather than dismissal: Indian smallholder dairy is genuinely efficient in cash terms, and an organised farm that assumes it can simply outcompete it on cost per litre will fail. What the smallholder system cannot do is demonstrate anything — not about residue, not about oxytocin, not about welfare, not about the individual animal a litre came from. So the organised farm's proposition is verifiability rather than cheapness, and it is viable only where a buyer will pay for it: quality-linked processor contracts, institutional supply and premium direct channels. A farm built on the assumption that everybody wants what it is selling will discover that most buyers are content with milk that merely passes.

Constraints

- **Feed and fodder cost**, roughly two-thirds of production cost and exposed to rainfall, land availability and commodity prices.
- **Skilled herdsman and milkers**, scarce and hard to retain in a job that runs seven days a week before dawn.
- **Milk price volatility**, largely outside the operator's control, which is precisely why margin over feed cost is the metric that matters.
- **Heat stress and disease**, which reduce yield and conception across whole seasons.

5. Competition & Position

Competitor type	Strength	Weakness this plan exploits
Smallholder aggregation via cooperatives	Unbeatable cash cost; enormous scale; established	Cannot demonstrate anything about any individual litre
Other commercial farms	Similar scale and infrastructure	Records kept for lenders, not published to buyers
Contract-farming aggregators	Asset-light, wide catchment	Control over practice ends at the collection centre
Imported and reconstituted product	Price stability, long shelf life	No fresh-milk channel; no local traceability story
This plan	Animal-level records, welfare metrics published, residue tested and reported, no oxytocin ever	Higher cost per litre; needs a buyer who values verification

The positioning claim is narrow, checkable and deliberately unglamorous: not "our milk is purer", which every dairy in India claims and none can prove, but "you may audit any litre back to an animal, and here is her cell count, her treatment history and her lameness score". A processor's quality team can test that assertion on any working day by picking a tanker and asking — which is exactly why it is worth making, and why almost nobody in the sector can.

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. Withholding treated animals' milk to the end of withdrawal discards roughly ₹34 lakh a year of saleable production at Year-3 scale, and the discarded volume is recorded rather than quietly re-entered. Refusing oxytocin costs perhaps 4-6% of measured yield against farms that use it, worth about ₹58 lakh a year. The welfare and testing programme — scoring, hoof trimming, cooling, veterinary cover and residue testing — costs ₹96 lakh a year. The offsetting return is a quality-linked price premium and institutional contracts worth ₹1.94 crore of Year-3 revenue that a farm without records cannot access at all, plus a materially lower cull rate and longer productive life, which is the second and self-interested justification that keeps these controls alive in a bad year.

6. The Animal Cannot Complain

Every business in this library has a party whose interests are least protected; this is the only one where that party is not a person.

Condition	What it does to the animal	What the buyer can detect
Chronic lameness	Continuous pain; reduced feeding and lying time	Nothing
Subclinical mastitis	Painful udder inflammation	An elevated cell count — <i>if anybody measures it</i>
Heat stress without cooling	Severe distress through long summers	Nothing; yield falls but so does everyone's
Poor body condition	Hunger, weakness, reproductive failure	Nothing
Oxytocin for let-down	Painful contractions; long-term reproductive harm	Nothing whatsoever

Read the right-hand column: with one partial exception, an animal's condition leaves no trace in the product a buyer receives. That is the same structure the drone plan found in aviation compliance — a cost that is invisible when incurred and invisible when avoided — and it produces the same market outcome, in which spending on welfare is a pure disadvantage and the operator who spends least has the best-looking numbers. The animal cannot report her own condition, will not be believed if she could, and has no route to any authority. **WHERE THE PARTY BEARING THE COST CANNOT REPORT ITS OWN CONDITION, THE ONLY HONEST OPERATOR IS ONE WHO MEASURES AND PUBLISHES ON ITS BEHALF.**

So the farm operates a measured welfare programme with the results published to buyers and to a lender, monthly, whether or not anybody asks. **LAMENESS SCORING** on every animal monthly by trained staff, with hoof trimming scheduled from the score rather than from a calendar (22% lame falling to 6%). **BODY CONDITION SCORING** against stage of lactation, so a thin cow is a management alarm rather than an observation (61% in range rising to 92%). **MASTITIS INCIDENCE** and **SOMATIC CELL COUNT** at bulk and individual-animal level (480,000 falling to 168,000). **CALVING INTERVAL**, **AVERAGE LACTATION AT CULLING** and **MORTALITY**, each reported as a number. And cooling — fans, foggers and shade — treated as production infrastructure rather than as a kindness, because in most of India it is both.

The somatic cell count deserves separate emphasis, because it is the rare case in this library where the honest measure and the commercial measure are identical. SCC is a direct indicator of udder inflammation — that is, of pain — and simultaneously the single most informative quality number in dairy, determining shelf life, cheese yield and processor price. A farm that drives its cell count down is relieving suffering and earning more for the same litre, with no trade-off to manage. Where such a metric exists, it should be the axis a business is run on, and every plan in this vertical inherits the instruction to look for one.

7. Oxytocin, the Withdrawal Period, and the Two Facts Nobody Prints

Three further problems are structural, invisible to buyers, and near-universal in the sector.

☐ **OXYTOCIN IS ILLEGAL, PAINFUL AND UNDETECTABLE IN THE TANK.** Injecting oxytocin to force milk let-down is prohibited, causes acute pain and long-term reproductive damage, and leaves no trace a processor could ever find — which is exactly why its use is widespread. It also raises apparent yield, so an operator who refuses it appears less productive than one who does not. This farm's position is absolute: no oxytocin, ever, for any reason, with veterinary use of the drug restricted to genuine obstetric indications recorded in the treatment register and countersigned. The control is not a rule but a supply chain — the drug is not held on the farm outside the veterinarian's locked stock, so a herdsman under pressure at four in the morning does not have the option. Remove the decision from the moment, per the drone plan.

☐ **THE WITHDRAWAL PERIOD IS WHERE RESIDUE ENTERS THE FOOD CHAIN.** A cow treated for mastitis must have her milk discarded for a stated period, and that milk is worth real money on a morning when collection is short — so the temptation is precise, recurring and easy to rationalise. The harm lands on a consumer who will never trace it, and on antimicrobial resistance, which lands on everybody. So a treated animal receives a **MARKED LEG BAND** at the moment of treatment, her identity is entered in the parlour software which then **LOCKS** her milk out of the bulk line until the withdrawal calendar clears her, and the discarded volume is recorded. Residue testing is run on bulk and on individual samples, with **FAILURES REPORTED** — 6 in Year 1, 2 in Year 2, none in Year 3 — because a testing regime that has never found anything is not testing, it is reassuring. The six were real: a band that came off, a mis-keyed date, a locum milker who did not know.

□ **AND THE TWO FACTS THE TRADE NEVER PRINTS.** A dairy herd necessarily produces male calves that will never give milk, and every cow eventually reaches a lactation where her yield no longer covers her feed — and every dairy business in India has a policy on both which it does not publish, because both are uncomfortable and neither is visible to a customer. This plan states them: male calves are reared, recorded and disposed through lawful channels appropriate to the state, never neglected, starved or abandoned, with the number reared and their destination reported; and culling is decided on welfare and productivity together, with the **AVERAGE LACTATION AT CULLING** published (3.1 rising to 4.6, against a sector norm nearer 3) since a longer productive life is the clearest single indicator that a herd is being kept well. An unstated policy is a policy nobody has had to defend.

□ **AND THE FARM'S REAL ECONOMICS ARE NOT THE MILK PRICE.** Feed is around two-thirds of the cost of a litre, so **MARGIN OVER FEED COST** — milk revenue less feed cost, per litre — is the number this business is run on, and it rises from ₹16.40 to ₹24.80 through ration formulation, fodder cultivation and yield rather than through anything the operator can negotiate. Herd depreciation and replacement cost are the invisible line: a cow is a depreciating asset with a residual value, and a farm that ignores replacement cost is reporting a profit it has borrowed from its own herd.

8. Operations Plan (breed, feed, milk, monitor, treat, deliver)

Herd and breeding

- **Animal-level identification and records from arrival** — parentage, calvings, treatments, yields, scores — because everything in this plan depends on the individual animal being identifiable.
- **Artificial insemination on a monitored heat-detection programme**, with calving interval as the headline reproductive metric (458 days falling to 396).
- **Replacement heifers reared in-house** where herd health permits, since bought-in animals import disease.
- **Dry-period management**, including dry-cow therapy decisions taken by the veterinarian rather than by default.

Feed and fodder

- **Ration formulated to stage of lactation and body condition**, reviewed monthly against milk yield and constituents.
- **Green and dry fodder cultivated on owned or contracted land**, which is the single largest lever on feed cost per litre.
- **Silage and fodder conservation** to carry the herd through the lean season without buying at peak prices.
- **Feed cost per litre and margin over feed cost tracked weekly**, not monthly, because ration drift is invisible over a month.

Milking and hygiene

- **Parlour routine with pre- and post-dipping, individual cloths and correct unit attachment**, which is what actually determines the cell count.
- **NO OXYTOCIN** — the drug is not held outside the veterinarian's locked stock, so the option does not exist at the point of temptation.
- **Treated animals banded and system-locked**, milked last or into a separate line, with discarded volume recorded.
- **Immediate chilling to 4°C** and cold-chain integrity through to collection, since bacterial count is decided in the first hour.

Health, welfare and delivery

- **Monthly lameness and body condition scoring of every animal**, with intervention triggered by score rather than by observation.
- **Cooling infrastructure operated on a temperature-humidity trigger**, not on somebody's judgement of a hot day.
- **Vaccination, deworming and testing calendar** enforced by the herd system; veterinary visit schedule contracted rather than called.
- **Milk delivered with its test results and the herd's welfare summary**, monthly, to every buyer.

The operational hinge is that every control here has to survive the pre-dawn shift, when a milker is alone, cold, behind schedule and being measured on volume. That is when the band gets ignored, the dip gets skipped and the treated cow goes into the main line — not from dishonesty but from the ordinary arithmetic of a person under pressure with nobody watching. So the controls are made mechanical rather than motivational: the oxytocin is not on the premises, the parlour software refuses the banded animal's milk rather than warning about it, and the cooling runs on a sensor rather than on a decision. A dairy discipline that depends on somebody caring at 4 a.m. will hold for about a season.

What a buyer receives with the milk, monthly

- **The tank results** — fat, SNF, bacterial count and somatic cell count, by collection rather than as a monthly average.
- **The residue testing summary** — tests run, failures found, and what was done about each.
- **The welfare summary** — lameness and body condition distribution, mastitis incidence, mortality, and average lactation at culling.
- **The withdrawal record** — animals treated, milk discarded, and confirmation that none entered the bulk line.
- **Traceability on request** — any collection resolved back to the animals that contributed to it.

Nothing on that list is difficult to produce once animal-level records exist, and almost nothing on it is produced by the Indian dairy sector — which is the observation worth sitting with. The information is absent not because it is costly but because each item converts something currently unfalsifiable into something a buyer could hold the farm to, and an industry rarely volunteers its own evidence. Sending it monthly, unrequested, is therefore a competitive position rather than an administrative one: a competitor can match the shed and the parlour within a year and cannot match the reporting without accepting the accountability that comes with it.

9. FSSAI, Animal Welfare & Operating Compliance (India)

- **Company & tax** — Private Limited, PAN/TAN, GST treatment of agricultural produce and inputs, livestock and asset insurance, land use and building approvals.
- **Food safety** — FSSAI standards for raw milk including antibiotic and pesticide residue limits and adulteration provisions; **residue in a bulk tank is a food-safety failure regardless of intent.**
- **Animal welfare & drugs** — Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and rules on housing, transport and treatment; **oxytocin administration for milk let-down is prohibited and prosecutable — not a grey area, but an offence widely committed because it is invisible.**
- **Male calves & cull animals** — state cattle-transport and slaughter laws differ sharply and directly determine what is lawful; the farm's policy is stated and operated within the law of its own state.
- **Environment** — manure, effluent and washdown management with state pollution-control consents; biogas and composting as the compliant route.

- **Veterinary** — prescription-only drugs under veterinary control, treatment register maintained, and withdrawal periods observed.
- **Workforce** — EPF/ESI, POSH, housing and safety standards for resident workers, and working-hours discipline across a seven-day operation.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / farm director	1	1	Owns the welfare programme and the published metrics
Herd manager	1	2	Holds the treatment register and the withdrawal lock
Veterinarian (retained/resident)	1	1	Sole custody of prescription drugs including oxytocin
Milkers & parlour staff	10	20	Two shifts; the pre-dawn discipline problem
Herdsmen, feeding & bedding	8	16	Scoring, observation, comfort management
Fodder cultivation & silage	6	12	The largest lever on feed cost per litre
Breeding & AI technician	1	2	Heat detection; calving interval
Maintenance, chilling & effluent	2	5	Cold chain, cooling systems, biogas
Accounts, records & admin	2	4	Herd records, buyer reporting, compliance
Total	32	63	Largely resident; housing and welfare provided

The structural rule is that the herd manager and the veterinarian hold the treatment register and the withdrawal lock, and neither reports to the person accountable for daily collection volume. It is the library's control-independence rule in its most literal form: the milk of a treated cow is worth money today and a residue failure is somebody else's problem next month, so the two decisions must sit with different people. Equally, milkers are paid on quality metrics — cell count and hygiene scores — alongside volume, because a milker paid on litres alone has been given a reason to skip exactly the steps that determine the cell count.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Land, approvals & build	Month 0–8	Incorporation, land, pollution consent, shed and parlour construction, water and power
Fodder establishment	Month 3–10	Green fodder plots, silage capability, ration formulation with a nutritionist
Herd induction	Month 6–14	Phased animal purchase with quarantine and testing; animal-level records from day one
Systems live	Month 8–13	Parlour software with withdrawal lock; scoring programme; residue testing; buyer reporting pack
Quality-linked contracts	Month 12–24	Processor agreements on fat, SNF and SCC; institutional and direct channels opened
Scale & herd maturity	Month 20–36	In-house replacements entering the herd; biogas commissioned; second shed

Training and competence

- **Parlour routine and hygiene certified for every milker**, re-verified quarterly, since this single routine determines the cell count and therefore both welfare and price.
- **Lameness and body condition scoring** trained to a published scale so scores are comparable between staff and over time.
- **Withdrawal and banding discipline**, including what to do when a band is missing, which is the failure mode that actually occurs.
- **Heat-stress recognition and cooling operation**, and calf-rearing protocols for both sexes.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees. They exist to show the drivers of a commercial dairy P&L and how the welfare and residue controls move them. Every input is editable. **The defining feature of this model is that feed is around two-thirds of the cost of a litre and the milk price is not controllable — so MARGIN OVER FEED COST, not milk price or revenue, is the number the business is run on.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Land development, sheds & animal housing	248	Comfort and cooling designed in, not retrofitted
Livestock — phased herd purchase	286	The principal asset; a depreciating one
Milking parlour, chilling & cold chain	124	Includes the software carrying the withdrawal lock
Cooling infrastructure — fans, foggers, shade	46	Production infrastructure, not a kindness
Fodder land development, irrigation & machinery	92	The largest lever on feed cost per litre
Effluent, manure management & biogas	54	Compliance and an income line
Veterinary facility, testing & quarantine	36	Residue testing and isolation capability
Worker housing, utilities & pre-operative	42	Resident workforce; approvals and consents
Working capital & contingency	132	Feed inventory and the pre-revenue rearing period
Total project cost	860	₹280L investor + ₹160L WC facility + ₹220L promoter + ₹200L term loan

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Oxytocin administered for let-down / drug held outside veterinary locked stock / treated animals banded and system-locked	NIL / NIL / 100%	NIL / NIL / 100%	NIL / NIL / 100%
Residue tests run / FAILURES FOUND AND REPORTED / withdrawal-period milk discarded (litres)	1,240 / 6 / 41,000	2,180 / 2 / 58,000	3,120 / 0 / 74,000

Bulk somatic cell count / mastitis incidence per 100 cow-years / animals lame	480,000 / 38 / 22%	264,000 / 24 / 12%	168,000 / 14 / 6%
Body condition in range / average lactation at culling / annual mortality	61% / 3.1 / 4.8%	79% / 3.8 / 2.9%	92% / 4.6 / 1.6%
Welfare summary published to buyers monthly / male calves reared and destination recorded	100% / 100%	100% / 100%	100% / 100%
Milking animals / yield per animal per day / calving interval (days) / margin over feed cost per litre	220 / 11.2L / 458 / ₹16.40	340 / 13.6L / 424 / ₹21.20	480 / 15.8L / 396 / ₹24.80

Row two is the row that makes the residue claim credible, and it must be read the library's way: six failures found in Year 1, reported rather than quietly corrected. Those six were a band that came off, a mis-keyed withdrawal date and a locum milker who did not know the system — and finding them is what turned the lock from a feature into a working control. A farm reporting zero failures from its first month has not been testing. Row four's average lactation at culling — 3.1 rising to 4.6 against a sector norm nearer 3 — is the single most informative welfare number here, because a cow that stays productive for a fifth lactation has not been worn out, and no adjective can substitute for it.

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Driver
Raw milk — processor contracts (quality-linked)	268	486	772	Fat, SNF and SCC-linked pricing
Raw milk — institutional & direct	62	124	194	Hotels, hospitals, premium retail; traceability paid for
Livestock sales — surplus heifers & cull animals	48	88	146	Herd management, lawfully channelled
Manure, compost & biogas	22	44	78	Compliance obligation turned into income
Fodder & silage surplus	14	26	44	Sold when cultivation exceeds herd need
Breeding services & farm training	6	12	26	Semen, heifer sales, training programmes
Total revenue	420	780	1,260	Illustrative

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)
Revenue	420	780	1,260
Feed & fodder cost	(238)	(408)	(614)
Margin over feed cost	182	372	646
Labour — milkers, herdsman, fodder, resident staff	(96)	(148)	(226)
Veterinary, welfare programme & residue testing	(62)	(78)	(96)
Withdrawal-period milk discarded	(19)	(27)	(34)

Breeding, AI & semen	(14)	(20)	(28)
Power, water, cooling & chilling	(34)	(48)	(68)
Effluent management, bedding & consumables	(22)	(32)	(46)
Repairs, transport, insurance & admin	(38)	(54)	(78)
EBITDA	(103)	(35)	70
Herd depreciation & replacement provision	(46)	(62)	(78)
Asset depreciation	(58)	(64)	(70)
Finance cost	(32)	(38)	(42)
Other income — scheme support, calf rearing, custom fodder work	153	247	321
PBT	(86)	48	201
Tax	18	(6)	(50)
PAT	(68)	42	151
Net margin	(16.2%)	5.4%	12.0%
ROCE	(9.4%)	13.8%	24.6%

Two lines require the vertical's discipline rather than a footnote. **HERD DEPRECIATION AND REPLACEMENT** at ₹78 lakh is the line most Indian dairy accounts omit entirely — a cow is a depreciating asset with a finite productive life, and a farm that does not provide for replacement is reporting a profit borrowed from its own herd and will discover the shortfall as a capital call in year five. Scheme support and other income at ₹3.21 crore is larger than PAT and is shown separately per the library's rule, because a business whose profit depends on a scheme is a business whose profit a scheme can withdraw. The withdrawal-discard line at ₹34 lakh is the price of the residue control and RISES with volume, which is what it should do — a farm whose discarded volume is nil is either treating no animals or is not discarding.

12.5 Per-animal profitability by decile

Herd decile (Yr 3)	Animals	Yield/day	Margin over feed, ₹/animal/yr
Top decile	48	22.4L	₹1,86,000
Deciles 2–4	144	18.1L	₹1,41,000
Deciles 5–8	192	14.2L	₹98,000
Bottom two deciles	96	9.6L	₹31,000
Herd average	480	15.8L	₹1,05,000

Reported by decile per the rule established in the it-peripherals and stock-photography plans, and for the same reason: the herd average conceals the fact that a fifth of the animals return less than a third of what the median animal returns, and some of them do not cover their own feed at all. A farm managed to the average will carry those animals indefinitely because nobody can see them. The decile view is also a welfare instrument rather than only a commercial one — a persistently low-yielding cow is usually a cow with a problem, so the bottom decile is the first place to look for lameness, subclinical mastitis or a reproductive

failure that nobody has investigated.

12.6 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹12.60cr	₹1.51cr	As modelled
Feed cost up 12%	₹12.60cr	₹77L	Two-thirds of cost per litre; the dominant sensitivity
Milk price down 8%	₹11.83cr	₹74L	Not controllable; hence margin over feed cost
Scheme and other income down 30%	₹12.60cr	₹55L	Why it is disclosed separately
Yield 15.8L → 13.5L per animal	₹11.14cr	₹48L	Heat stress or a bad fodder year
Calving interval 396 → 440 days	₹11.96cr	₹96L	Reproductive management is a P&L line

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Investor equity	280	Growth capital; herd-health and yield covenants
Working-capital facility	160	Feed inventory and the pre-revenue rearing cycle
Promoter contribution	220	Cash and land
Term loan	200	Sheds, parlour and livestock; 7-9 years with moratorium
Total	860	Illustrative structure

The bankability case rests on a long-dated asset base and on records, and the second point is where this plan differs from most dairy propositions a lender sees. Livestock is difficult security — it can sicken, die or lose productive value invisibly — so a lender's real protection is the herd's measured health, and a farm that produces monthly cell counts, lameness scores, mortality and average lactation at culling is offering something a conventional dairy proposal cannot. The same records that demonstrate welfare demonstrate asset quality: that is the library's durability test satisfied in its most direct form, since the control protects the animal AND the security, and therefore survives a bad year. A long moratorium matched to herd build-up is essential, because a dairy farm's cash flow lags its capital deployment by two full years.

- **Use of funds** — 33% livestock, 29% sheds and housing, 14% parlour and chilling, 11% fodder land and machinery, 6% effluent and biogas, 5% cooling, balance veterinary facility, housing and working capital.
- **Repayment** — term loan from Year 3 cash flow with moratorium through herd build-up; working-capital facility revolving against feed cycle and milk receivables.
- **Investor exit** — strategic sale to a dairy processor seeking captive supply, an integrated dairy group, or a promoter buyback from a matured herd.

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
------	--------	------------

Animal suffering that leaves no trace in the product	Chronic lameness, subclinical mastitis, heat stress and poor condition are invisible to every buyer, so welfare spending is a pure competitive disadvantage and the market rewards the operator who spends least	Measure and publish what the animal cannot say: monthly lameness scoring on every animal with hoof trimming triggered by score (22% → 6%); body condition scoring against stage of lactation (61% → 92%); mastitis incidence and somatic cell count at bulk and individual level (480,000 → 168,000); calving interval, average lactation at culling and mortality; and cooling operated on a temperature-humidity sensor rather than on somebody's judgement of a hot day — with the welfare summary sent to every buyer monthly whether or not anybody asks
Oxytocin use for milk let-down	Illegal, acutely painful, causes long-term reproductive damage, raises apparent yield, and is completely undetectable in a bulk tank — which is exactly why it is widespread	Absolute prohibition, and enforced as a SUPPLY CHAIN rather than a rule: the drug is not held on the farm outside the veterinarian's locked stock, so a herdsman under pressure at four in the morning does not have the option. Veterinary use restricted to genuine obstetric indications, recorded in the treatment register and countersigned. Remove the decision from the moment rather than relying on resolve at the moment
Antibiotic residue entering the bulk tank	Residue in the food chain and a contribution to antimicrobial resistance, with the harm landing on a consumer who will never trace it — and the temptation arriving on precisely the mornings when collection is short	Treated animal banded at the moment of treatment; her identity entered in the parlour software which LOCKS her milk out of the bulk line until the withdrawal calendar clears her — a lock, not a warning; milked last or into a separate line; discarded volume recorded (₹34 lakh a year, rising with volume as it should); and residue testing on bulk and individual samples with FAILURES REPORTED — 6, 2, 0 — because a testing regime that has never found anything is reassuring rather than testing
Feed cost and fodder failure	Roughly two-thirds of cost per litre; a 12% rise halves Year-3 profit	Green and dry fodder cultivated on owned and contracted land as the primary lever; silage and conservation to carry the lean season without buying at peak; ration formulated to lactation stage and reviewed monthly against yield and constituents; feed cost per litre and margin over feed cost tracked WEEKLY because ration drift is invisible over a month; and forward contracting of bought-in concentrate
Disease outbreak in the herd	Catastrophic and fast; can remove a year's production and a decade's breeding	Closed-herd policy with in-house replacement rearing where health permits; quarantine and testing on every bought-in animal; vaccination and testing calendar enforced by the herd system rather than called; biosecurity at the gate; livestock insurance; and physical separation of the sick pen from the milking group
Heat stress across the summer	Yield, conception and welfare all fall together across whole seasons in most of India	Cooling designed into the shed rather than retrofitted — orientation, ridge ventilation, fans, foggers and shade — operated on a temperature-humidity trigger; feeding and milking rescheduled to cooler hours in summer; heat-tolerant genetics in the breeding programme; and the cost carried as production infrastructure rather than debated as a kindness
Milk price volatility and buyer concentration	Price is not controllable and a single processor can be most of the offtake	Margin over feed cost managed as the operating metric rather than price; quality-linked contracts that pay for what this farm is good at; institutional and direct channels at 15% of revenue; and livestock, manure, biogas and fodder lines diversifying the income base

Pre-dawn control decay	Every control here fails in the same place — a milker alone, cold, behind schedule, measured on volume, with nobody watching	Controls made mechanical rather than motivational: oxytocin not on the premises; parlour software REFUSES the banded animal's milk rather than warning about it; cooling on a sensor rather than a decision; scoring on a scheduled cycle rather than on observation; and milkers paid on cell count and hygiene scores ALONGSIDE volume, because a milker paid on litres alone has been given a reason to skip exactly the steps that determine the cell count
-------------------------------	--	--

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths • Animal-level records with welfare metrics published monthly • No oxytocin, enforced by not holding the drug • Withdrawal enforced by a system lock, with failures reported • Cell count 168,000 — welfare and quality in one number • Margin over feed cost ₹24.80 and average lactation at culling 4.6	Weaknesses • Higher cost per litre than smallholder supply • Capital-intensive with a two-year cash-flow lag • Feed cost dominates and is only partly controllable • Result depends materially on scheme and other income
Opportunities • Quality-linked pricing rewarding low cell count • Processor demand for consistent, testable supply • Institutional and premium direct channels paying for traceability • Biogas and manure converting a compliance cost into income • Breeding stock and training as secondary revenue	Threats • Disease outbreak in the herd • Feed and fodder cost shocks • Milk price cycles and processor concentration • Heat and water stress worsening across seasons

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Herd register & animal record system** — parentage, calvings, yields, scores and treatments at animal level.
- **Treatment & withdrawal lock** — banding, withdrawal calendar, and a system that refuses locked milk rather than warning about it.
- **Welfare scoring tracker** — lameness, body condition, mastitis, mortality and average lactation at culling, with the monthly buyer summary generated from it.
- **Feed & ration planner** — feed cost per litre and margin over feed cost tracked weekly.
- **Breeding & calving-interval scheduler** — heat detection, AI records, expected calvings.
- **Per-animal profitability dashboard** — margin over feed cost by decile, with bottom-decile animals flagged for investigation.
- **Compliance calendar** — FSSAI, pollution consent, vaccination, residue testing and veterinary schedules.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, herd size, yields, feed cost and headcount are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on region, climate, fodder availability, genetics and buyer mix. Figures are in Indian rupees.
- **This plan is the anchor of the dairy vertical.** The conventions established here — measuring on behalf of a party that cannot report its own condition, the withdrawal lock, residue failures reported rather than corrected quietly, margin over feed cost as the operating metric, per-animal profitability by decile, and stating the uncomfortable policies plainly — are inherited and cross-referenced by the nine plans that follow rather than re-derived in each.
- **The central integrity finding is that the animal cannot complain, cannot leave, and her suffering is invisible in the product.** Milk from a cow in chronic pain looks, tastes and tests identical to milk from a healthy one, so welfare is a pure cost with no product signal — the same structure the drone plan found in aviation compliance, producing the same market outcome in which the operator who spends least has the best-looking numbers. **The general rule the vertical inherits: WHERE THE PARTY BEARING THE COST CANNOT REPORT ITS OWN CONDITION, THE ONLY HONEST OPERATOR IS ONE WHO MEASURES AND PUBLISHES ON ITS BEHALF — lameness, body condition, mastitis, cell count, calving interval, average lactation at culling and mortality, sent to every buyer monthly whether or not anybody asks, because "we treat our animals well" is an adjective and 168,000 is a number.**
- **Somatic cell count deserves separate emphasis as the rare metric where the honest measure and the commercial measure are identical.** It is a direct indicator of udder inflammation — of pain — and simultaneously the most informative quality number in dairy, determining shelf life, cheese yield and processor price. **A farm driving its cell count down is relieving suffering and earning more for the same litre with no trade-off to manage. Where such a metric exists it should be the axis the business is run on, and every plan in this vertical inherits the instruction to look for one.**
- **Oxytocin is illegal, painful and undetectable, which is precisely why it is widespread** — and it raises apparent yield, so the operator who refuses it looks less productive. **The prohibition is enforced as a supply chain rather than as a rule: the drug is not held on the farm outside the veterinarian's locked stock, so a herdsman under pressure at four in the morning does not have the option. Remove the decision from the moment rather than relying on resolve at the moment — the drone plan's principle, applied where the temptation recurs twice a day.**
- **The withdrawal period is where residue enters the food chain, and the temptation is precise and recurring.** A treated cow's milk is worth money on a morning when collection is short, and the harm lands on a consumer who will never trace it and on antimicrobial resistance, which lands on everybody. **So the treated animal is banded at the moment of treatment and the parlour software LOCKS her milk out of the bulk line — a lock, not a warning — until the withdrawal calendar clears her, with the discarded volume recorded at ₹34 lakh a year and RISING with herd size, as it should. Residue failures are reported: 6 in Year 1, 2 in Year 2, none in Year 3. The six were a band that came off, a mis-keyed date and a locum milker who did not know — and finding them is what turned the lock from a feature into a control. A farm reporting zero failures from its first month has not been testing.**
- **Two facts the trade never prints are stated here.** A dairy herd necessarily produces male calves that will never give milk, and every cow eventually reaches a lactation where her yield no longer covers her feed. **Male calves are reared, recorded and disposed through channels lawful in the farm's own state — never neglected, starved or abandoned — with numbers and destinations reported; and culling is decided on welfare and productivity together, with average lactation at culling published (3.1 rising to 4.6 against a sector norm nearer 3), since a longer productive life is the clearest single indicator that a herd is kept well. An unstated policy is a policy nobody has had to defend.**

- **The real economics are feed, not price.** Feed is around two-thirds of the cost of a litre and the milk price is not controllable, so MARGIN OVER FEED COST is the number the business is run on — ₹16.40 rising to ₹24.80 — achieved through ration formulation, fodder cultivation and yield rather than through anything the operator can negotiate, and tracked weekly because ration drift is invisible over a month. **Herd depreciation and replacement at ₹78 lakh is the line most Indian dairy accounts omit entirely: a cow is a depreciating asset with a finite productive life, and a farm that does not provide for replacement is reporting a profit borrowed from its own herd and will meet the shortfall as a capital call in year five.** Per-animal profitability is reported BY DECILE, since the herd average conceals a bottom fifth returning less than a third of the median — and the decile view is a welfare instrument too, because a persistently low yielder is usually a cow with an uninvestigated problem.
- **Every control here has to survive the pre-dawn shift, so all of them are mechanical rather than motivational.** A milker alone, cold, behind schedule and measured on volume is where the band gets ignored, the teat dip gets skipped and the treated cow enters the main line — not from dishonesty but from the ordinary arithmetic of a person under pressure with nobody watching. **Hence: the oxytocin is not on the premises, the software refuses rather than warns, cooling runs on a sensor, scoring runs on a schedule, and milkers are paid on cell count and hygiene alongside volume — because a milker paid on litres alone has been given a reason to skip exactly the steps that determine the cell count. A dairy discipline depending on somebody caring at 4 a.m. will hold for about a season.**
- **The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees, and so is its return.** Withheld withdrawal milk costs ₹34 lakh a year; refusing oxytocin costs an estimated ₹58 lakh of forgone measured yield against farms that use it; the welfare and testing programme costs ₹96 lakh. **Against that, quality-linked and institutional contracts worth ₹1.94 crore of Year-3 revenue are unavailable to a farm without records, the cull rate falls and productive life lengthens, and a lender's real security in a livestock business is the herd's measured health — so the same records that demonstrate welfare demonstrate asset quality. That is the durability test in its most direct form, and it is why these controls survive a bad year.**
- **Compliance runs through food safety, animal law and the environment at once.** FSSAI standards for raw milk including antibiotic and pesticide residue limits, where residue is a failure regardless of intent; the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act and rules on housing, transport and treatment, with oxytocin administration for let-down prohibited and prosecutable; state cattle-transport and slaughter laws that differ sharply and directly determine what is lawful for male calves and cull cows; state pollution-control consents for manure, effluent and washdown; prescription-drug control under veterinary custody with a maintained treatment register; land use and building approvals; GST treatment of agricultural produce; and EPF/ESI, POSH and housing standards for a resident workforce. Professional advice should be taken on the specific state, herd policy and buyer contracts.

► **Use these tools now — free on AiSevak**

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on aisevak.in. Open the [Dairy toolkit](https://aisevak.in/verticals/dairy) to browse and use them all at <https://aisevak.in/verticals/dairy> — or go straight to any specific tool at <https://aisevak.in/service/<tool-name>>. No signup needed to explore; each tool guides you step by step.

Prepared by AiSevak.in — a product of ABL Digital Technologies. AI-powered business services for India. This is AI-assisted guidance; figures are illustrative and not a guarantee of results. Verify all numbers, licences and regulatory requirements with a qualified professional before relying on this plan for binding decisions. © 2026 ABL Digital Technologies Private Limited.