



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Fish and Shrimp Hatchery

*A hatchery that follows every batch to the farm, because its own defects only appear
ninety days later on somebody else's pond*

FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

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 **Fish / Shrimp Hatchery** in India — vannamei nauplii and post-larvae, freshwater carp and pangasius fingerlings, seabass and brackish finfish seed, broodstock maturation and a batch-outcome data service, producing about 640 batches and 180 million post-larvae a year by Year 3.

This plan closes vertical 54 at its source. **Anchor rule (d) — seed PCR-tested at stocking with the hatchery named — was written about this business from the outside, by the farms that buy from it. This is the same obligation seen from the inside, and it turns out to rest on a problem the hatchery has too.**

□ **THIS IS THE ONE BUSINESS IN THE CHAIN THAT CANNOT FIND OUT WHETHER IT IS GOOD.** A hatchery ships a batch of post-larvae and the consequence appears NINETY DAYS LATER, ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S FARM, CONFOUNDED WITH STOCKING DENSITY, WATER QUALITY, FEED, DISEASE PRESSURE AND WEATHER. By harvest a weak seed batch and a badly managed pond are indistinguishable — and the farmer, who has every reason to work it out, cannot either. **SO THE INFORMATION DOES NOT EXIST ANYWHERE.** Every other plan in this library described a party who knew something and did not say it; **HERE NOBODY IN THE TRANSACTION HOLDS THE FACT AT ALL —** a hatchery operator of twenty years' standing genuinely does not know whether his seed is better or worse than the hatchery down the creek, and has never had a way to find out. **THAT IS NOT CONCEALMENT. IT IS AN ABSENCE, AND IT IS WHY QUALITY IN THIS SECTOR HAS NEVER IMPROVED THE WAY QUALITY IMPROVES IN INDUSTRIES WHERE FAILURE COMES BACK TO THE MAKER.** So this hatchery **FOLLOWS EVERY BATCH TO THE FARM AND RECORDS SURVIVAL AT HARVEST**, reaching 88% of farms by Year 3 and publishing survival by batch and by broodstock line — 79%. **WHERE YOUR DEFECT APPEARS NINETY DAYS LATER ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S FARM, YOU ARE NOT WITHHOLDING THE TRUTH — YOU DO NOT HAVE IT — SO GO AND GET IT, BATCH BY BATCH.**

□ **AND THE COUNT AT THE SOURCE IS WHY HIS NUMBERS NEVER ADD UP.** A farmer buys "one million post-larvae" and the million is a **VOLUMETRIC ESTIMATE** made by the seller — scoop a sample, count it, multiply. That completes an arc this vertical has traced from the pond bund to the peeling hall to the kitchen scale, **AND IT IS WORST HERE, BECAUSE THE ERROR DOES NOT MERELY COST HIM MONEY — IT CORRUPTS EVERY NUMBER HE WILL CALCULATE FOR THE NEXT FOUR MONTHS.** A farmer who receives 6.8% fewer larvae than he paid for is stocking at a density he does not know, so **HIS SURVIVAL RATE, HIS FCR AND HIS YIELD PER HECTARE ARE ALL COMPUTED ON A WRONG DENOMINATOR.** So counts are **VERIFIED INDEPENDENTLY BY GRAVIMETRIC AND IMAGING METHOD, WITNESSED BY THE BUYER**, and the shortfall against our own estimate fell from 6.8% to 0.9%.

□ **AND THE BROODSTOCK IS THE REAL PRODUCT, AND NOBODY DECLARES IT.** SPF status, generation number, source and inbreeding history determine everything the seed will do, are invisible in the larva, and are disclosed by almost no Indian hatchery. So **PROVENANCE, SPF STATUS AND GENERATION ARE PUBLISHED PER BATCH at 100%, with NIL broodstock of undisclosed origin and NIL batches beyond the published generation limit.**

This plan models an operator requiring **₹11.00 crore** (₹4.40 crore term loan + ₹3.20 crore investor + ₹2.20 crore promoter + ₹1.20 crore working capital), moving from **₹6.20 crore revenue and a ₹0.32 crore loss** to **₹18.00 crore revenue and ₹2.16 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 12.0% net margin and 29.5% return on capital. (Hatchery — figures illustrative.)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A hatchery that goes and finds out what happened to its seed.

Vision: To create the feedback loop this industry has never had.

Mission: Follow every batch to harvest and publish what it did; declare broodstock provenance, SPF status and generation; let the buyer witness the count; destroy on PCR rather than selling; and give the farmer his own batch data free.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended. CAA registration, broodstock import, institutional supply and outside capital all assume it.
- **Batch destruction on PCR detection as an automatic consequence — the structural precondition, since a positive batch is three weeks of rearing cost and a customer already waiting.**
- **The follow-up programme reporting outside sales — because the batches whose outcomes are worst are the ones sold to the largest customers.**

Regulatory anchor: the Coastal Aquaculture Authority Act and CAA hatchery registration, with siting; the Wild Life (Protection) Act and quarantine rules for broodstock import, **under which imported SPF broodstock must pass quarantine — while nothing requires a hatchery to disclose to its buyers what stock it used, at what generation, or whether it bred from its own harvest;** MPEDA and NaCSA registration and the aquaculture certification schemes; the banned-antimicrobial list, which applies in hatchery tanks as in ponds; the Biological Diversity Act where indigenous broodstock is used; the Legal Metrology Act, **which governs trade measurement and is not applied to volumetric larval counting at all, because the transaction is by count rather than weight and no verified instrument exists for it;** environmental consents for seawater intake and effluent; and EPF, ESI and the Factories Act for hatchery staff. **The decisive structural fact is that NOTHING REQUIRES A HATCHERY TO KNOW, RECORD OR DISCLOSE WHAT HAPPENED TO ANY BATCH IT HAS EVER SOLD.**

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with hatchery, marine biology or aquaculture-technical background, with a broodstock head and a follow-up lead. Three competences decide outcomes. *Broodstock and larval-rearing biology*, because everything the seed will do is determined in the first twenty days and by stock decisions taken months earlier. *Seasonal capital management*, since demand is violently concentrated into two stocking windows and the tanks stand idle between them. And *the willingness to destroy a PCR-positive batch with a customer waiting*, which happened 104 times in Year 3 and costs ₹1.34 crore. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **destruction on PCR detection is automatic, and the follow-up programme reports outside sales.**

4. Market Analysis — India

The input that decides every crop, sold on reputation because nothing else exists.

Demand drivers

- **Vannamei stocking demand** across the coastal aquaculture belt.
- **Freshwater intensification** in carp and pangasius requiring reliable fingerlings.
- **Seabass and finfish diversification** where seed supply is the binding constraint.
- **Export-buyer traceability** pushing documentation upstream to the hatchery.

- **Disease pressure** raising the value of demonstrably clean seed.
- **PMMSY support** for hatchery and brood-bank infrastructure.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian shrimp and fish seed demand	Large; the binding input for the whole vertical
SAM	Batches that clear PCR and carry documented broodstock	Bounded by WHAT WE WILL SHIP, not by demand
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Batches sold with published outcome and provenance	₹6.2cr → ₹18cr; 640 batches; 180m post-larvae at ₹0.42 realised

Revenue mix and share (Year 3)

Stream	Share	Gross margin — and what the buyer cannot see
Vannamei post-larvae — PL10 to PL12	42.0%	46.0% — the batch whose outcome arrives in 90 days
Freshwater fingerlings — carp, pangasius	18.0%	34.0% — longer cycle; outcome even further away
Vannamei nauplii — sold to other hatcheries	16.0%	38.0% — counted volumetrically by the seller
Seabass & brackish finfish seed	12.0%	42.0% — supply-constrained; buyers accept anything
Batch-outcome data service & farm advisory	7.0%	58.0% — the feedback loop, sold to those who want it
Broodstock maturation & SPF stock supply	5.0%	50.0% — where provenance either exists or does not

The third row is where the counting problem bites hardest and is least discussed, because the buyer is another hatchery rather than a farmer: NAUPLII ARE SOLD BY THE MILLION, COUNTED BY SCOOP, AND A PROFESSIONAL BUYER ACCEPTS THE SELLER'S ESTIMATE EXACTLY AS A SMALLHOLDER DOES. The fourth row is the one where discipline costs most — seabass seed is supply-constrained to the point where buyers will take almost anything, SO EVERY BATCH WE DESTROY IN THAT SPECIES IS ONE A CUSTOMER WOULD HAVE ACCEPTED WITHOUT QUESTION. The fifth row is unusual and deliberate: we sell the batch-outcome data service to farms and to other hatcheries at 58% margin, WHICH MEANS SELLING OUR COMPETITORS THE FEEDBACK LOOP WE BUILT — and in a sector where seed-borne disease moves between farms through shared water, a competitor who learns which of his lines fail is a competitor whose failures stop arriving at our customers' ponds.

Constraints

- **Broodstock supply and cost**, largely imported and tightly held.
- **Seasonality**, with demand concentrated into two stocking windows.
- **Biosecurity**, where one breach costs a production season.
- **What we will ship**, which caps volume before demand does.

5. Competition & Position

Competitor type	Strength	Weakness this plan exploits
-----------------	----------	-----------------------------

Large integrated hatcheries	Scale, imported SPF broodstock, technical depth, brand	No batch outcome ever recorded; reputation is the only signal
Independent regional hatcheries	Local relationships, price, proximity to stocking clusters	Broodstock undisclosed; often bred from own harvest
Backyard and unregistered units	Cheapest; fill peak-season gaps nobody else can	No PCR at all; the sector's principal disease vector
Imported seed and nauplii traders	Access to established genetics; volume in shortage	Provenance stops at the border; count taken on trust
This plan	Batch outcome followed to harvest and published, provenance declared, counts witnessed, PCR destruction	Ships less; destroys saleable batches; higher price per larva

The positioning is easier to sell here than anywhere else in this vertical, for one reason: **THE FARMER ALREADY SUSPECTS THE SEED AND HAS NEVER BEEN ABLE TO PROVE IT.** Every farmer who has lost a crop has wondered whether it was the batch, and every hatchery has told him it was his water — and **NEITHER OF THEM HAS EVER HAD A SINGLE FIGURE TO SETTLE IT WITH.** Publishing farm-reported survival by batch does not merely differentiate us; **IT INTRODUCES THE FIRST PIECE OF EVIDENCE EITHER PARTY HAS EVER HAD IN THAT ARGUMENT.** The honest difficulty is that the evidence cuts both ways and we publish it anyway: our own farm-reported survival is 79%, **WHICH IS A NUMBER A COMPETITOR CAN CRITICISE AND WE CANNOT REBUT WITH ANYTHING EXCEPT THE OBSERVATION THAT HE HAS NO NUMBER AT ALL.**

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. Destroying batches on PCR detection rather than shipping them forgave ₹1.34 crore of gross profit — 104 batches in Year 3, each representing three weeks of rearing cost already spent and a customer already waiting — off the P&L entirely because it is seed never sold. Following every batch to the farm and recording survival at harvest cost ₹1.04 crore, and it is the largest opex line in the plan. Publishing broodstock provenance, SPF status and generation cost ₹68 lakh. Independent counting, witnessed by the buyer, cost ₹46 lakh. Total ₹3.52 crore against ₹2.16 crore of profit — so a hatchery with the same tanks and the same broodstock running trade-standard practice would earn ₹5.68 crore.

6. The One Business That Cannot Find Out Whether It Is Good

This is the finding, and it closes the vertical on an absence rather than a concealment.

Who could establish whether a seed batch was good	Can they?
The hatchery — it made the batch	No. It never sees the outcome
The farmer — he stocked it	No. Five variables, one crop
The regulator — it registers hatcheries	No. It records nothing about outcomes
Anybody at all	No

A hatchery ships a batch of post-larvae and the consequence appears **NINETY DAYS LATER, ON A FARM IT DOES NOT OWN, CONFOUNDED WITH STOCKING DENSITY, WATER QUALITY, FEED, DISEASE PRESSURE AND WEATHER.** By harvest a weak batch and a badly managed pond look exactly alike, and the farmer — who has every incentive in the world to work it out — cannot separate them either, for the reasons the feed plan set

out at length: five variables, one observation, no control. SO THE INFORMATION DOES NOT EXIST ANYWHERE IN THE SYSTEM. It is not held by a party who declines to share it. It is not buried in a record nobody reads. IT WAS NEVER CREATED, BY ANYONE, ABOUT ANY BATCH.

That makes this the odd one out in a library of asymmetries. HERE THE SELLER IS AS BLIND AS THE BUYER. A hatchery operator of twenty years' standing genuinely does not know whether his seed is better or worse than the hatchery down the creek, AND HAS NEVER HAD A WAY OF FINDING OUT. He forms a view, and his view is sincere, and there is nothing behind it. THAT IS WHY QUALITY IN THIS SECTOR HAS NEVER IMPROVED THE WAY IT IMPROVES IN INDUSTRIES WHERE FAILURE COMES BACK TO THE MAKER: there is no mechanism by which a hatchery that is quietly getting worse would ever discover it, and none by which one getting better could prove it. The market therefore clears on price, availability and reputation — AND REPUTATION HERE IS AN AGGREGATE OF ANECDOTES ABOUT A PRODUCT NOBODY HAS EVER MEASURED.

So the loop is built rather than the disclosure improved. EVERY BATCH IS FOLLOWED TO THE FARM AND SURVIVAL RECORDED AT HARVEST, at 100% dispatched and 88% OF FARMS ACTUALLY REPORTING BACK by Year 3 — up from 46%, which is the genuinely hard part, because it requires a field team visiting ponds three months after the money has cleared to ask a question nobody has ever asked. SURVIVAL IS PUBLISHED BY BATCH AND BY BROODSTOCK LINE, at 79%, and the broodstock-line breakdown is the part that changes behaviour internally: it is the first time anyone in this business has been able to say that one maturation line is producing measurably weaker seed than another, AND WE RETIRED TWO LINES ON THAT EVIDENCE. THE DATA IS RETURNED TO THE FARMER FREE — his own batch's survival, alongside the average — and 312 FARMS CHANGED THEIR STOCKING DENSITY AFTER RECEIVING IT, which is a larger effect on the industry than anything we did to our own tanks. It costs ₹1.04 crore, it is the largest opex line here, and it produces no product. WHERE YOUR DEFECT APPEARS NINETY DAYS LATER ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S FARM, YOU ARE NOT WITHHOLDING THE TRUTH — YOU DO NOT HAVE IT — SO GO AND GET IT, BATCH BY BATCH.

7. The Count at the Source Is Why His Numbers Never Add Up

Two further findings, and the batch that arrives with a customer waiting.

□ A FARMER BUYS "ONE MILLION POST-LARVAE" AND THE MILLION IS AN ESTIMATE MADE BY THE SELLER. The method is volumetric: scoop a sample, count what is in it, multiply by the volume — performed by us, in our tank, with our beaker, and accepted because there is no alternative and no verified instrument exists for counting larvae in trade. This completes an arc this vertical has traced from the pond bund to the peeling hall to the household kitchen scale, AND IT IS WORST AT THE SOURCE, BECAUSE THE ERROR DOES NOT MERELY COST HIM MONEY ONCE — IT CORRUPTS EVERY NUMBER HE WILL CALCULATE FOR THE NEXT FOUR MONTHS. A farmer who receives 6.8% fewer larvae than he paid for is stocking at a density he does not know, so HIS SURVIVAL RATE IS WRONG, HIS FEED CONVERSION RATIO IS WRONG AND HIS YIELD PER HECTARE IS WRONG — all computed on a denominator supplied by the party selling to him. AND THOSE ARE PRECISELY THE FIGURES HE WOULD USE TO JUDGE OUR SEED, so the counting error does not merely enrich the hatchery, IT DEGRADES THE ONLY EVIDENCE THE FARMER COULD EVER BRING AGAINST IT. So counts are VERIFIED BY GRAVIMETRIC AND IMAGING METHOD AND WITNESSED BY THE BUYER at 100%, with NIL counted volumetrically by us alone — and the shortfall against our own estimate fell from 6.8% to 0.9%.

□ AND THE BROODSTOCK IS THE REAL PRODUCT. Specific-pathogen-free status, generation number, source and inbreeding history determine growth rate, disease resistance and survival more than anything that happens in the larval tanks — and NONE OF IT IS VISIBLE IN THE LARVA, WHICH LOOKS IDENTICAL WHATEVER

IT CAME FROM. The temptations are ordinary and undisclosed: breeding from your own harvested stock rather than buying fresh SPF broodstock, running lines past the generation at which performance degrades, or buying cheap unpapared stock in a shortage. Imported SPF broodstock must pass quarantine — but **NOTHING WHATEVER REQUIRES A HATCHERY TO TELL ITS BUYERS WHAT STOCK IT USED, AT WHAT GENERATION, OR WHETHER IT BRED FROM ITS OWN POND.** So **PROVENANCE, SPF STATUS AND GENERATION NUMBER ARE PUBLISHED PER BATCH at 100%, with NIL broodstock of undisclosed origin and NIL batches produced beyond the published generation limit.**

☐ **AND THE HATCHERY IS THE MOST EFFICIENT DISEASE VECTOR IN THE INDUSTRY.** One infected batch does not damage one pond — **IT SEEDS EVERY POND IT IS SPLIT ACROSS, simultaneously, in a single week, across an entire cluster that shares water.** White spot and EHP travelling through seed reach further in seven days than a discharged pond does in a season. So **BATCHES ARE DESTROYED ON PCR DETECTION at 100%, with NIL PCR-positive batch sold to any buyer at any price — 104 batches in Year 3, forgoing ₹1.34 crore, each one three weeks of rearing already spent.**

What a farmer can check in sixty seconds, before stocking

The first question has never been answerable by any Indian hatchery.

- **What survival did your last ten batches achieve on farms?** If the answer is a feeling rather than a figure, nobody measured.
- **Which broodstock line is this batch from, and what generation?** The larva looks the same whatever it came from.
- **Is the stock SPF, and can you show the quarantine paper?** Nothing obliges them to tell you.
- **Who counted the larvae, and how?** A scoop and a multiplication, done by the seller, is the industry standard.
- **What happens to a PCR-positive batch here?** Three weeks of cost is already sunk when that result arrives.
- **Will anyone ask you at harvest how it went?** If not, your crop teaches them nothing.

The asymmetry in this plan is the one the whole vertical has been building toward, and it is not an asymmetry at all: **IT IS A SHARED BLINDNESS.** The buyer cannot assess the seed, and neither can the seller — so the usual remedy of this library, **MOVING INFORMATION FROM THE PARTY WHO HAS IT TO THE PARTY WHO DOES NOT,** has nothing to move. What is required first is to **CREATE the fact,** which is why the largest commitment here is a field team that visits ponds ninety days after payment to ask what happened, and why it costs ₹1.04 crore and produces nothing saleable. **AND IT HAS AN UNUSUAL PROPERTY: THE INFORMATION WE MANUFACTURE IS WORTH MORE TO THE FARMER AND TO THE CLUSTER THAN IT IS TO US.** 312 farms changed their stocking density on receiving their own batch data — a larger effect on regional disease pressure than anything we changed in our own tanks, and one we captured no revenue from. **THAT IS THE CLOSING NOTE OF THIS VERTICAL: FROM THE POND TO THE PLATE, THE BINDING CONSTRAINT WAS NEVER SOMEBODY'S HONESTY. IT WAS THAT NOBODY HAD BUILT THE INSTRUMENT, AND THE PARTY WHO COULD BUILD IT WAS NEVER THE PARTY WHO WOULD PROFIT MOST FROM IT.**

8. Operations Plan (mature, spawn, rear, follow)

The broodstock

- **Provenance, SPF status and generation published per batch — 100%.**
- **Nil undisclosed origin;** nil breeding from our own harvested stock.
- **Nil batches beyond the published generation limit.**
- **Lines retired on published outcome evidence — two in Year 3.**

The batch

- **PCR tested before dispatch**; destroyed on detection, no exception.
- **Nil PCR-positive batch sold to any buyer at any price.**
- **Destruction recorded and the count published** — 104 batches.
- **Banned antimicrobials nil in hatchery tanks**, as in ponds (anchor c).

The count

- **Verified gravimetrically and by imaging**, not by scoop and multiplication.
- **Witnessed by the buyer** at dispatch, every time.
- **Shortfall against our own estimate published** — 6.8% to 0.9%.
- **Nauplii sold to other hatcheries counted the same way** as farm sales.

The follow-up

- **Every batch followed to the farm**; survival recorded at harvest.
- **88% of farms reporting back**, from 46%.
- **Survival published by batch and by broodstock line** — 79%.
- **Data returned to the farmer free** — 312 farms changed density on it.

The operational hinge is a PCR-positive result on a 4.2 million post-larvae batch at day nineteen, three weeks of rearing already spent, worth ₹17.6 lakh, in the second week of a stocking window when every hatchery on the coast is sold out and the customer has a pond prepared and filled. The detection is low-level EHP — not white spot, not lethal, and a batch that many operators would ship without hesitation because it will very probably produce an acceptable crop. THE CUSTOMER, TOLD THE TRUTH, WOULD ALMOST CERTAINLY ASK US TO SHIP IT ANYWAY, BECAUSE AN EMPTY POND IN A STOCKING WINDOW IS A LOST SEASON AND A MARGINAL BATCH IS NOT. AND THAT CONSENT WOULD BE GENUINE AND WORTHLESS — given by a man with a prepared pond, a loan drawn and no alternative supplier, which is the same worthless consent the carpentry plan found in week five of a fit-out. So DESTRUCTION ON PCR DETECTION IS AUTOMATIC WITH NO COMMERCIAL AND NO CUSTOMER OVERRIDE (anchor j): the batch was destroyed, the customer was told why and given his deposit back the same day, and the result was published in the batch register. He stocked eleven days late with another hatchery's seed and lost part of the window — AND THAT IS A REAL COST BORNE BY HIM RATHER THAN BY US, which is the least comfortable sentence in this plan and is stated because it is true. Nil pay is linked to batches dispatched.

9. Hatchery, Broodstock & Biosecurity Compliance (India)

- **CAA hatchery registration under the Coastal Aquaculture Authority Act** — siting, seawater intake and effluent conditions.
- **Quarantine rules for imported broodstock** — imported SPF stock must pass quarantine, while nothing requires a hatchery to disclose to buyers what stock it used or at what generation.
- **MPEDA and NaCSA registration** and voluntary aquaculture certification schemes.
- **The banned-antimicrobial list**, which applies in hatchery tanks exactly as in grow-out ponds (anchor c).
- **Biological Diversity Act** where indigenous broodstock or genetic material is used.
- **Legal Metrology Act** — which governs trade measurement and is not applied to volumetric larval counting at all, because the sale is by count and no verified instrument exists for it.

- **Environmental consents** for seawater intake, effluent and hatchery discharge (anchor a).
- **EPF, ESI and the Factories Act** for hatchery and field staff. **Nothing requires a hatchery to know, record or disclose what happened to any batch it has ever sold.**

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / managing director	1	1	Cannot override a PCR destruction
Hatchery technicians — maturation, spawning, larval rearing	34	80	8.0 batches per technician per year
Algae culture, feed & water management	14	32	Live feed is the binding daily constraint
Batch follow-up field team	12	28	Visits ponds 90 days after payment; reports outside sales
Sales, distribution & farmer relations	8	18	Nil pay linked to batches dispatched
Admin, finance, legal & business development	7	15	CAA, quarantine and certification compliance
Laboratory — PCR, water quality, count verification	3	6	Destruction authority; no commercial override
Total	79	180	640 batches; 180m post-larvae; 104 destroyed

The technician headcount is derived rather than assumed, and it reconciles three ways. By volume: 640 batches at 8.0 batches per hatchery technician per year is 80 technicians — a ratio that barely improves across the three years, because larval rearing is attention-bound rather than volume-bound and a technician covering more tanks notices a mortality event later, which in a twenty-day cycle is most of the difference between a good batch and a destroyed one. By cost per batch: the ₹2.18 crore of follow-up, provenance publication and independent counting across 640 batches is ₹34,063 per batch — 12.1 per cent of a ₹2.81 lakh average batch value, down from ₹52,308 in Year 1, and unusually high because the largest component buys information rather than product. By cost per head: the ₹1.30 crore follow-up and laboratory salary line across 34 people is ₹3.82 lakh cost-to-company each, with the remaining ₹42 lakh of those two lines being field travel, PCR consumables and the batch register. The laboratory holds destruction authority and the follow-up team reports outside sales, because the batches whose outcomes are worst are the ones sold to the largest customers.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Formation, hatchery build & broodstock	Month 0-10	Incorporation, CAA registration, tanks, quarantine, SPF broodstock
PCR laboratory and destruction rule live	Month 6-12	Destruction automatic on detection; 62 batches in Year 1
Independent counting witnessed by the buyer	Month 8-14	Gravimetric and imaging; shortfall 6.8% exposed and closed

Provenance publication per batch	Month 10-16	SPF status, source and generation on every dispatch note
Batch follow-up field team operating	Month 14-26	46% → 71% of farms reporting; first line retired on evidence
Scale & data service	Month 28-36	640 batches, 88% reporting, 79% survival, data sold on

Training and competence

- **Asking a farmer what his harvest did** ninety days after he paid, and recording a bad answer.
- **Destroying a batch at day nineteen** with a customer's pond already filled.
- **Counting gravimetrically** in front of the buyer rather than behind him.
- **Reading survival by broodstock line** and retiring a line the sales team likes.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees. They exist to show the drivers of a hatchery P&L under a follow-the-batch rule. Every input is editable. **The defining economics are that margin per larva is high and the business is nonetheless fragile: demand arrives in two stocking windows, biosecurity capital is 20% of project cost, and a single broodstock disease event takes a production season and ₹2.04 crore of profit with it.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Hatchery tanks, maturation, larval rearing & algae culture	386	Idle between two stocking windows by nature
Biosecurity — filtration, UV, quarantine, effluent	218	20% of project cost; one breach costs a season
Broodstock acquisition — SPF, documented generation	148	The real product; provenance recorded at purchase
Laboratory — PCR, water quality, counting verification	124	Holds destruction authority
Working capital — feed, algae, energy, seasonal build	108	Live feed cannot be stockpiled
Land, building & utilities	82	Seawater intake and discharge routing
Licences, CAA registration, consents & pre-operative	34	CAA, quarantine, MPEDA, insurance
Total project cost	1,100	₹440L term loan + ₹320L investor + ₹220L promoter + ₹120L WC

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
--------	------	------	------

EVERY BATCH FOLLOWED TO THE FARM AND SURVIVAL RECORDED AT HARVEST / batches sold with no outcome ever recorded / farms actually reporting harvest survival back / published survival by batch and broodstock line	100% / NIL / 46% / 68%	100% / NIL / 71% / 74%	100% / NIL / 88% / 79%
BROODSTOCK PROVENANCE, SPF STATUS AND GENERATION PUBLISHED PER BATCH / broodstock of undisclosed origin used / generation number stated on every dispatch note / batches produced beyond the published generation limit	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL
NAUPLII AND PL COUNTED INDEPENDENTLY, WITNESSED BY THE BUYER / count estimated volumetrically by us alone / counts verified gravimetrically and by imaging / shortfall found against our own volumetric estimate	100% / NIL / 100% / 6.8%	100% / NIL / 100% / 3.1%	100% / NIL / 100% / 0.9%
BATCHES DESTROYED ON PCR DETECTION / PCR-positive batch sold to any buyer at any price / batches destroyed at PCR / gross profit forgone on destruction (₹ lakh)	100% / NIL / 62 / 58	100% / NIL / 88 / 96	100% / NIL / 104 / 134
BATCH OUTCOME DATA RETURNED TO THE FARMER FREE / outcome data withheld or sold back to the farm that generated it / farms receiving their own batch survival report / farms changing stocking density after receiving it	100% / NIL / 46% / 74	100% / NIL / 71% / 186	100% / NIL / 88% / 312
Batches produced / post-larvae sold (million) / batches per technician per year / follow-up, provenance and counting cost per batch / farm-reported survival	260 / 68 / 7.6 / ₹52,308 / 68%	480 / 128 / 7.6 / ₹37,083 / 74%	640 / 180 / 8.0 / ₹34,063 / 79%

Row one's third column rising from 46% to 88% is the hardest-won number in this plan and the least glamorous: it is a field team persuading farmers to answer a question three months after the transaction closed, and it took two years to get most of them to. Row three's last column is the most uncomfortable number we publish — a 6.8% shortfall in Year 1 means **WE WERE OVERSTATING OUR OWN COUNTS BY 6.8% BEFORE ANYBODY VERIFIED THEM**, not through dishonesty but because a volumetric estimate drifts in the direction that favours the estimator and nobody had ever checked. Row five's last column at 312 farms is the effect this business had on the industry rather than on itself: those farms changed stocking density on data we produced and gave away, and the reduction in regional disease pressure benefits every hatchery on the coast including our competitors. Row six's survival rising from 68% to 79% is the result the whole apparatus exists to produce, and it moved because the broodstock-line breakdown let us retire two lines that were quietly underperforming.

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Gross margin
Vannamei post-larvae — PL10 to PL12	260	521	756	46.0%
Freshwater fingerlings — carp, pangasius	112	223	324	34.0%
Vannamei nauplii — sold to other hatcheries	99	198	288	38.0%
Seabass & brackish finfish seed	75	149	216	42.0%
Batch-outcome data service & farm advisory	43	87	126	58.0%
Broodstock maturation & SPF stock supply	31	62	90	50.0%

Total revenue	620	1,240	1,800	43.1% blended
---------------	-----	-------	-------	---------------

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)
Revenue	620	1,240	1,800
Cost of production — broodstock, live feed, energy, rearing labour	(353)	(705)	(1,024)
Gross profit	267	535	776
Batch follow-up to the farm — survival recorded at harvest	(62)	(84)	(104)
Broodstock provenance, SPF status & generation published	(44)	(56)	(68)
Sales, distribution & farmer relations	(34)	(46)	(58)
Independent nauplii and PL counting, witnessed by the buyer	(30)	(38)	(46)
Hatchery overhead, water, energy & biosecurity	(28)	(36)	(44)
Admin, finance, legal & business development	(30)	(33)	(36)
EBITDA	39	242	420
Depreciation & amortisation	(58)	(76)	(96)
Finance cost	(34)	(46)	(58)
Other income — data service to other hatcheries & scheme support <i>(disclosed)</i>	10	16	22
PBT	(43)	136	288
Tax	11	(34)	(72)
PAT	(32)	102	216
Net margin	(5.2%)	8.2%	12.0%
ROCE	(1.7%)	15.1%	29.5%

A 43.1% gross margin and a 12.0% net margin make this the most profitable business in the vertical, and the reason is worth stating plainly: seed is a tiny fraction of a farmer's cost and an enormous fraction of his outcome, SO THE PRICING POWER IS REAL AND HAS NEVER BEEN DISCIPLINED BY EVIDENCE. The three commitment lines total ₹2.18 crore, 12.1% of revenue — by far the highest proportion in this vertical — and the largest of them buys information rather than product. Other income of ₹22 lakh is the data service sold to other hatcheries and scheme support, disclosed as a line and 1.2% of revenue. Commitments of ₹3.52 crore against ₹2.16 crore of profit — ₹2.18 crore of opex above plus ₹1.34 crore of gross profit forgone on 104 destroyed batches — mean a trade-standard hatchery would earn ₹5.68 crore.

12.5 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹18.0cr	₹2.16cr	As modelled, batches followed and outcomes published

Trade-standard — no follow-up, undisclosed broodstock, seller's count, ship on PCR	₹22.3cr	₹5.78cr	The sector's model, computed rather than dismissed
A broodstock disease event costs one production season	₹11.7cr	₹0.12cr	Biosecurity is 20% of capital for this reason
Stocking demand falls 25% after a regional crash	₹13.5cr	₹0.71cr	Demand is downstream of last season's survival
PCR rejection rate doubles	₹18.0cr	₹0.90cr	The cost of the rule in a bad broodstock year
Energy and live-feed costs rise 25%	₹18.0cr	₹1.10cr	Algae culture runs continuously and cannot be paused

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Term loan	440	Tanks, biosecurity, laboratory, building; 7 years
Investor equity	320	Broodstock and the follow-up programme; publication covenant
Promoter contribution	220	Cash and hatchery-technical leadership
Working capital facility	120	Live feed, algae and seasonal build
Total	1,100	Illustrative structure

A lender should read farm-reported survival, the reporting rate, batches destroyed and the counting shortfall, and should understand one feature peculiar to this credit: THE BORROWER IS SPENDING ₹1.04 CRORE A YEAR TO MANUFACTURE INFORMATION THAT DID NOT PREVIOUSLY EXIST, AND MOST OF ITS VALUE ACCRUES TO PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT ITS CUSTOMERS. 312 farms changed stocking density on data we gave away, and the resulting reduction in regional disease pressure benefits every hatchery on the coast. The starkest figure is that abandoning the follow-up, leaving broodstock undisclosed, counting by scoop and shipping PCR-positive batches would take profit from ₹2.16 crore to ₹5.78 crore on the same tanks and the same broodstock — and only the last of those four is unambiguously wrong. The sharpest exposure is biological: a broodstock disease event costing one production season leaves ₹0.12 crore, which is why biosecurity is 20% of project cost rather than a line item. A lender should treat the farm reporting rate as the covenant, since every other commitment can be documented internally and that one requires somebody to keep going back.

- **Use of funds** — 35% hatchery tanks and rearing, 20% biosecurity, 13% broodstock, 11% laboratory, 10% working capital, 7% land and building, 3% registrations.
- **Repayment** — term loan from Year 2 cash flow, with instalments set against stocking-window receipts rather than monthly.
- **Investor exit** — sale to an integrated aqua group, a feed manufacturer integrating backward or a genetics company; or promoter buyback. **Follow-up publication, provenance disclosure and PCR destruction survive change of control.**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
The one business that cannot find out whether it is good	A hatchery ships a batch and the consequence appears NINETY DAYS LATER, ON A FARM IT DOES NOT OWN, CONFOUNDED WITH STOCKING DENSITY, WATER QUALITY, FEED, DISEASE PRESSURE AND WEATHER. By harvest a weak batch and a badly managed pond LOOK EXACTLY ALIKE, and the farmer — WHO HAS EVERY INCENTIVE IN THE WORLD TO WORK IT OUT — cannot separate them either: five variables, one observation, no control. SO THE INFORMATION DOES NOT EXIST ANYWHERE IN THE SYSTEM. That makes this the odd one out in a library of asymmetries: every other plan described someone who KNEW AND DID NOT SAY, and HERE THE SELLER IS AS BLIND AS THE BUYER.	BUILD THE LOOP RATHER THAN IMPROVE THE DISCLOSURE. EVERY BATCH FOLLOWED TO THE FARM AND SURVIVAL RECORDED AT HARVEST (100% dispatched), with 88% OF FARMS ACTUALLY REPORTING BACK from 46%. SURVIVAL PUBLISHED BY BATCH AND BY BROODSTOCK LINE (79%), and the line breakdown is what changes behaviour internally — THE FIRST TIME ANYONE HERE COULD SAY ONE MATURATION LINE PRODUCES MEASURABLY WEAKER SEED THAN ANOTHER, AND WE RETIRED TWO ON THAT EVIDENCE. DATA RETURNED TO THE FARMER FREE and 312 FARMS CHANGED STOCKING DENSITY ON IT. GENERAL RULE: WHERE YOUR DEFECT APPEARS NINETY DAYS LATER ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S FARM, YOU ARE NOT WITHHOLDING THE TRUTH — YOU DO NOT HAVE IT — SO GO AND GET IT, BATCH BY BATCH
The count at the source corrupts every number downstream	A farmer buys "ONE MILLION POST-LARVAE" AND THE MILLION IS AN ESTIMATE MADE BY THE SELLER — scoop a sample, count it, multiply — PERFORMED BY US, IN OUR TANK, WITH OUR BEAKER, and accepted because there is no alternative and NO VERIFIED INSTRUMENT EXISTS FOR COUNTING LARVAE IN TRADE. A farmer receiving 6.8% fewer larvae than he paid for is STOCKING AT A DENSITY HE DOES NOT KNOW, so HIS SURVIVAL RATE, HIS FCR AND HIS YIELD PER HECTARE ARE ALL COMPUTED ON A DENOMINATOR SUPPLIED BY THE PARTY SELLING TO HIM — AND THOSE ARE PRECISELY THE FIGURES HE WOULD USE TO JUDGE OUR SEED. THE COUNTING ERROR DOES NOT MERELY ENRICH THE HATCHERY, IT DEGRADES THE ONLY EVIDENCE THE FARMER COULD EVER BRING AGAINST IT	COUNTS VERIFIED GRAVIMETRICALLY AND BY IMAGING, WITNESSED BY THE BUYER (100%), NIL counted volumetrically by us alone, and the SHORTFALL AGAINST OUR OWN ESTIMATE PUBLISHED: 6.8% → 0.9%. THAT FIRST FIGURE MEANS WE WERE OVERSTATING OUR OWN COUNTS BY 6.8% BEFORE ANYBODY VERIFIED THEM — NOT THROUGH DISHONESTY, BUT BECAUSE A VOLUMETRIC ESTIMATE DRIFTS IN THE DIRECTION THAT FAVOURS THE ESTIMATOR AND NOBODY HAD EVER CHECKED. Nauplii sold to other hatcheries counted the same way as farm sales (₹46L)

The broodstock is the real product and nobody declares it	SPF status, generation number, source and inbreeding history determine growth rate, disease resistance and survival MORE THAN ANYTHING THAT HAPPENS IN THE LARVAL TANKS — and NONE OF IT IS VISIBLE IN THE LARVA, WHICH LOOKS IDENTICAL WHATEVER IT CAME FROM. The temptations are ordinary and undisclosed: breeding from your own harvested stock instead of buying fresh SPF, running lines past the generation at which performance degrades, buying cheap unpapered stock in a shortage. IMPORTED SPF BROODSTOCK MUST PASS QUARANTINE — BUT NOTHING WHATEVER REQUIRES A HATCHERY TO TELL ITS BUYERS WHAT STOCK IT USED, AT WHAT GENERATION, OR WHETHER IT BRED FROM ITS OWN POND	PROVENANCE, SPF STATUS AND GENERATION NUMBER PUBLISHED PER BATCH (100%), NIL broodstock of undisclosed origin, NIL batches beyond the published generation limit, and provenance recorded AT PURCHASE rather than reconstructed. Two maturation lines retired on published outcome evidence (₹68L)
The hatchery is the most efficient disease vector in the industry	One infected batch does not damage one pond — IT SEEDS EVERY POND IT IS SPLIT ACROSS, SIMULTANEOUSLY, IN A SINGLE WEEK, ACROSS AN ENTIRE CLUSTER THAT SHARES WATER. White spot and EHP travelling through seed REACH FURTHER IN SEVEN DAYS THAN A DISCHARGED POND DOES IN A SEASON	BATCHES DESTROYED ON PCR DETECTION (100%), NIL PCR-positive batch sold to any buyer at any price — 104 batches in Yr 3 forgoing ₹1.34cr, EACH ONE THREE WEEKS OF REARING ALREADY SPENT. Destruction authority held by the laboratory; banned antimicrobials nil in hatchery tanks as in ponds (anchor c)
The positive result with a pond already filled	A PCR-positive on a 4.2 million PL batch at DAY NINETEEN, three weeks of rearing spent, worth ₹17.6 LAKH, IN THE SECOND WEEK OF A STOCKING WINDOW when every hatchery on the coast is sold out and the customer has a pond PREPARED AND FILLED. The detection is LOW-LEVEL EHP — not lethal, and a batch many operators would ship without hesitation because IT WILL VERY PROBABLY PRODUCE AN ACCEPTABLE CROP. THE CUSTOMER, TOLD THE TRUTH, WOULD ALMOST CERTAINLY ASK US TO SHIP IT ANYWAY, BECAUSE AN EMPTY POND IN A STOCKING WINDOW IS A LOST SEASON AND A MARGINAL BATCH IS NOT — AND THAT CONSENT WOULD BE GENUINE AND WORTHLESS, GIVEN BY A MAN WITH A PREPARED POND, A LOAN DRAWN AND NO ALTERNATIVE SUPPLIER	DESTRUCTION AUTOMATIC WITH NO COMMERCIAL AND NO CUSTOMER OVERRIDE (anchor j). Batch destroyed, customer told why and given his deposit back the same day, result published in the batch register. HE STOCKED ELEVEN DAYS LATE WITH ANOTHER HATCHERY'S SEED AND LOST PART OF THE WINDOW — A REAL COST BORNE BY HIM RATHER THAN BY US, WHICH IS THE LEAST COMFORTABLE SENTENCE IN THIS PLAN AND IS STATED BECAUSE IT IS TRUE. Nil pay linked to batches dispatched
The evidence cuts both ways	Our own farm-reported survival is 79%, a number a competitor can criticise and we cannot rebut with anything except the observation that he has no number at all	Published as a trend rather than a level, with the broodstock-line breakdown showing where improvement came from; the data service sold to competing hatcheries at 58% margin so the comparison becomes measured-against-measured; and the reporting rate published alongside, since a survival figure from 46% of farms means something different from one at 88%

Biology, seasonality and demand	A broodstock disease event costing a season leaves ₹0.12cr; demand falling 25% after a regional crash is ₹0.71cr; a doubled PCR rejection rate is ₹0.90cr	Biosecurity at 20% of project cost with quarantine physically separated; species diversified across vannamei, carp, pangasius and seabass with different disease profiles and stocking calendars; the data service as non-biological revenue; and loan instalments set against stocking-window receipts rather than monthly
---------------------------------	---	---

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths • Every batch followed to harvest; 88% of farms reporting • Survival published by batch and broodstock line — 79% • Provenance, SPF status and generation published per batch • Counts witnessed by the buyer; shortfall 6.8% → 0.9% • 104 batches destroyed on PCR; nil positive batch shipped	Weaknesses • ₹3.52cr forgone against ₹2.16cr of profit • Publishes a survival figure competitors need not match • Largest opex line produces no saleable product • Seasonal and biologically fragile
Opportunities • Farmers who have long suspected the seed and could never prove it • Data service sold to farms and competing hatcheries • Any seed-outcome disclosure rule would favour us • Export buyers pushing traceability to the hatchery • Broodstock supply as a second business	Threats • Backyard units filling peak demand with untested seed • Broodstock import cost and availability • Regional crop failure collapsing stocking demand • Price competition where quality is unmeasured

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Batch follow-up scheduler** — prompts a farm visit 90 days after dispatch; records survival either way.
- **Broodstock provenance register** — SPF status, source and generation, recorded at purchase.
- **Independent count log** — gravimetric and imaging verification, countersigned by the buyer.
- **PCR destruction trigger** — positive result delists the batch; no commercial or customer override.
- **Survival-by-line dashboard** — farm outcomes grouped by maturation line, for retirement decisions.
- **Farmer data-return pack** — his own batch survival against the average, issued free.
- **Stocking-window planner** — seasonal capacity and cash against two concentrated demand peaks.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, batch counts, post-larvae volumes, survival, PCR rejection rates and broodstock costs are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on disease pressure, stocking demand, broodstock supply and seasonality. Figures are in Indian rupees. **This plan closes vertical 54 and inherits its ten anchor rules (a)-(j).**
- **The central finding is that this is the one business in the chain that cannot find out whether it is good. So the information does not exist anywhere in the system. It is not withheld and not buried: it was never created, by anyone, about any batch.**

- **That makes this the odd one out in a library of asymmetries. Here the seller is as blind as the buyer — an operator of twenty years genuinely does not know whether his seed is better or worse than the hatchery down the creek.** Which is why quality here has never improved the way it improves where failure comes back to the maker.
- **So the loop is built rather than the disclosure improved.** Every batch is followed to the farm and survival recorded at harvest, with 88% of farms reporting back. **Survival is published by batch and by broodstock line, which let us retire two lines that were quietly underperforming. WHERE YOUR DEFECT APPEARS NINETY DAYS LATER ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S FARM, YOU ARE NOT WITHHOLDING THE TRUTH — YOU DO NOT HAVE IT — SO GO AND GET IT, BATCH BY BATCH.**
- **The count at the source corrupts every number downstream.** "One million post-larvae" is a volumetric estimate made by the seller, and a farmer receiving 6.8% fewer than he paid for is stocking at a density he does not know. **So his survival rate, his FCR and his yield per hectare are all computed on a denominator supplied by the party selling to him. The counting error does not merely enrich the hatchery; it degrades the only evidence the farmer could ever bring against it.** Verified counts took the shortfall from 6.8% to 0.9%.
- **The broodstock is the real product, and the hatchery is the industry's most efficient disease vector.** SPF status, generation and source decide almost everything and are invisible in the larva, and nothing requires disclosure. **And one infected batch does not damage one pond — it seeds every pond it is split across, simultaneously, in a single week, across a cluster that shares water.** Hence published provenance, and destruction on PCR at 104 batches and ₹1.34 crore.
- **The asymmetry here is not an asymmetry at all — it is a shared blindness.** The usual remedy of this library, moving information from the party who has it to the party who does not, has nothing to move; the fact must first be created. **And the information we manufacture is worth more to the farmer and the cluster than to us: 312 farms changed stocking density on data we gave away, a larger effect on regional disease pressure than anything we changed in our own tanks.** That is the closing note of this vertical: **from the pond to the plate, the binding constraint was never somebody's honesty. It was that nobody had built the instrument, and the party who could build it was never the party who would profit most from it.**
- **Compliance and professional advice.** CAA hatchery registration under the Coastal Aquaculture Authority Act; quarantine rules for imported broodstock, **under which imported SPF stock must pass quarantine while nothing requires disclosure to buyers of what stock was used or at what generation;** MPEDA and NaCSA registration and certification schemes; the banned-antimicrobial list, applying in hatchery tanks as in ponds; the Biological Diversity Act for indigenous broodstock; **the Legal Metrology Act, which is not applied to larval counting at all;** environmental consents for seawater intake and effluent; and EPF, ESI and the Factories Act for hatchery and field staff. **Nothing requires a hatchery to know, record or disclose what happened to any batch it has ever sold.** Professional advice should be taken on broodstock import, count-verification methodology, liability for seed-borne disease claims, and CAA siting and effluent conditions.

► Use these tools now — free on AiSevak

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on aisevak.in. Open the [Fisheries and Aquaculture toolkit](#) to browse and use them all at <https://aisevak.in/verticals/fisheries> — 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.