



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Milk Processing & Packaging Unit

Pasteurised milk - and a published list of what we test for

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 **Milk Processing & Packaging Unit** in India — a dairy plant receiving raw milk from farms, cooperatives and village collection centres, standardising, pasteurising, homogenising and packaging liquid milk in pouches, bottles and cartons, with a chilled distribution network and an in-house quality laboratory.

The dairy vertical's conventions are set in the dairy-farm anchor and cross-referenced rather than re-derived: **where the party bearing the cost cannot report its own condition, the honest operator measures and publishes on its behalf; residue control is a system lock rather than a warning, with failures reported; controls must be mechanical rather than motivational because they have to survive the pre-dawn shift; and staff paid on volume alone have been given a reason to skip the quality steps.** What is specific to a processor is that it **stands between the farm and the consumer as the only party that can detect anything — and it decides what to look for.**

☐ **A PROCESSOR CAN ONLY REJECT WHAT IT TESTS FOR, AND IT DECIDES WHAT TO TEST FOR.** Added water, urea, detergent, maltodextrin, vegetable fat, antibiotic residue and aflatoxin M1 are all detectable — but every test costs money per tanker, every rejection leaves the plant short of milk that day, and the person deciding whether to run the test is frequently a procurement officer paid on collection volume. The plant that tests least has the fewest problems and the most milk, which is why "passed all our tests" is a statement about the tests rather than about the milk. So this plan **PUBLISHES THE TEST PANEL, THE FREQUENCY AND THE REJECTION RATE**, runs the QA laboratory reporting to the promoter and **NEVER** to procurement, records every rejected tanker with the supplier named, and reports rejections **RISING** from 340 to 1,120 as volume grows. The general rule: **WHERE A GATEKEEPER CHOOSES ITS OWN DETECTION SCOPE, THE HONEST OPERATOR PUBLISHES THE SCOPE.**

☐ **AND THE COLD CHAIN IS THE PRODUCT, WHILE ITS FAILURES ARE INVISIBLE.** Bacterial count is decided in the first hour after milking and again in every hour spent above 4°C, and a temperature excursion in a tanker at two in the afternoon produces milk that tests acceptable on arrival and sours a day early in a customer's refrigerator. Nobody can trace it back. So this plant runs continuous temperature logging from collection to despatch with **EXCURSIONS REPORTED** rather than alarms merely acknowledged — 214 in Year 1 falling to 38 — because an alarm somebody silenced is not a record.

☐ The third finding concerns the weakest party in the chain: **THE SMALLHOLDER SUPPLIER CANNOT ARGUE.** A farmer delivering forty litres has no laboratory, no leverage and no route of appeal when a test result reduces his payment — so the deduction policy, the testing method and the appeal route are published, samples are retained for re-test, payment runs on a stated cycle, and appeals **UPHELD** are reported at 23% because a processor whose suppliers never win an appeal is not hearing them.

This plan models an operator requiring **₹18.40 crore** (₹6.20 crore investor + ₹4.40 crore working-capital facility + ₹3.80 crore promoter + ₹4.00 crore term loan), moving from **₹42.00 crore revenue and a ₹1.84 crore loss** to **₹124.00 crore revenue and ₹4.34 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 3.5% net margin, 28.4% return on capital, and capacity utilisation rising from 41% to 76%. (Milk processing unit — figures illustrative.)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A dairy plant that publishes what it tests for, not only what it passed.

Vision: To be the processor a farmer trusts to weigh him fairly and a retailer trusts to reach the shelf cold.

Mission: Publish the test panel and the rejection rate; keep the lab out of procurement's reach; name the rejected tanker; log every degree from collection to despatch and report the excursions; test shelf life to failure rather than to the label; retain the sample so a farmer can appeal; and pay on the day we said.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — required in substance. FSSAI licensing, retail and institutional supply agreements, term lending against plant, and outside capital all assume it.
- **Proprietorship or partnership** — unworkable at this scale: **a food-safety recall obligation attaching to an entity with no balance sheet is a promise nobody can honour.**
- **Employed quality, production and procurement functions kept separate**, with the laboratory reporting to the promoter — **because the person accountable for filling the silo cannot be the person deciding whether the tanker passes.**

Regulatory anchor: a food manufacturing business where the principal exposures are safety, labelling and traceability. **The first is food safety: FSSAI licensing under the FSS Act with the Food Safety and Standards (Food Products Standards and Food Additives) Regulations setting compositional standards for milk, and the Contaminants, Toxins and Residues Regulations setting limits for antibiotic residues and aflatoxin M1 — with adulteration provisions carrying criminal consequences, and a processor's defence resting entirely on the adequacy of its own testing. The second is labelling and representation: the Legal Metrology (Packaged Commodities) Rules and FSSAI labelling regulations govern net quantity, composition, date marking and every claim on the pouch — and "fresh", "pure", "farm" and "natural" are claims a regulator can test, not decoration. The third is traceability and recall: FSSAI requires a documented recall plan, and a plant that cannot resolve a pouch back to a batch, a silo and a set of collection routes cannot execute one — which makes traceability a safety system rather than a record-keeping preference.** Then: state pollution-control consents for effluent, which in a dairy is substantial; boiler and pressure-vessel certification; cold-chain and transport compliance; GST; and EPF/ESI and POSH across a shift workforce.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with dairy processing, food technology or FMCG manufacturing background. Three competences decide outcomes. *Capacity utilisation*, because a dairy plant is a fixed-cost box in which the milk price passes through almost entirely — so the return lives in throughput and yield rather than in any margin the operator can negotiate. *Yield discipline*, since fat and solids lost to CIP water, line drainage, returns and standardisation error are invisible individually and enormous cumulatively. And *the willingness to send a tanker away* — with the silo low, the shift starting and a supplier relationship at stake. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **the quality laboratory and the release decision sit with the promoter and the QA head, never with procurement, whose collection targets they can defeat.**

4. Market Analysis — India

Indian liquid milk is moving from loose sale toward packaged and branded supply, and the processors that win are those that can prove something rather than merely claim it.

Demand drivers

- **The continuing shift from loose to packaged milk**, driven by convenience, urban density and safety concerns.

- **Cold-chain and organised retail expansion**, which rewards processors who can hold temperature to the shelf.
- **Value-added dairy pull** — curd, paneer, cheese and beverages all need raw milk this plant can standardise.
- **Institutional demand** from hotels, hospitals, schools and quick-commerce platforms with their own audit requirements.
- **Consumer distrust of adulteration**, which is widely reported and rarely answered with evidence.
- **Quality-linked procurement** spreading down to farm level, which improves the raw material this plant receives.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Liquid milk consumption across the served region	Very large; still substantially loose and unbranded
SAM	Packaged milk demand reachable by this plant's cold chain	Bounded by COLD-CHAIN REACH, not by demand
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Volume processed and sold across channels	₹42cr → ₹124cr; utilisation 41% → 76%

Where a processor's margin actually comes from

Lever	Effect on Yr-3 profit	Controllable?
Milk purchase price	Enormous	Essentially no — it passes through
Selling price	Enormous	Barely; the market and competitors set it
Capacity utilisation	Decisive	Yes — the single biggest lever
Yield loss (fat, solids, line, returns)	₹1.86cr at Yr-3 volume	Yes, and mostly invisible
Distribution cost and returns rate	Substantial	Yes, through cold chain and route design

This table is the whole commercial argument of a dairy plant and is routinely misunderstood by first-time operators, who negotiate hard on milk price and manage yield casually. The milk price is set by a market and moves with the season; a one-point improvement in yield loss is worth ₹1.24 crore a year at Year-3 volume and nobody outside the plant will ever notice it. Similarly, utilisation is the difference between profit and loss on an identical cost base — which is why a processor short of milk on a given morning is under such acute pressure, and why the quality gate must be structurally protected from that pressure rather than merely instructed.

Constraints

- **Raw milk availability and seasonality** — flush and lean seasons vary supply by a third, against a plant that costs the same either way.
- **Cold-chain reach**, which physically bounds the market a fresh-milk plant can serve.
- **Working capital**, since farmers must be paid quickly and retail settles slowly.
- **Competition from cooperatives** with established procurement, brand trust and scale.

5. Competition & Position

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

Large cooperative dairies	Scale, procurement depth, brand trust, distribution	Test panels and rejection rates not published to anybody
National private dairies	Brand, marketing, product range, capital	Procurement pressure on quality gates at plant level
Regional processors	Local relationships, lower overhead, agility	Minimal testing; cold chain informal; traceability absent
Loose milk vendors	Cheapest, immediate, entrenched habit	No testing, no cold chain, no accountability at all
This plan	Test panel and rejection rate published, lab outside procurement, cold chain logged, supplier appeals upheld	Rejects milk competitors accept; higher testing cost per litre

The positioning claim is aimed at institutional and organised-retail buyers, who are the only customers with the capacity to check it. A hospital, a hotel group or a quick-commerce platform running its own supplier audit can ask for the test panel, the rejection log and the temperature record on any given day — and a processor who produces all three has answered a question its competitors will deflect. The consumer, meanwhile, cannot check anything, which is precisely why the claim must be made to buyers who can.

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. The expanded test panel and its frequency cost ₹1.42 crore a year at Year-3 volume — roughly ₹0.51 per litre received — and rejecting 1,120 tankers costs a further ₹2.18 crore in shortfall procurement at premium prices and idle plant hours. Retained samples, appeal handling and published deduction policy cost ₹34 lakh. The offsetting return is institutional and organised-retail business worth ₹38.60 crore of Year-3 revenue at a materially better realisation than commodity pouch sales, plus a returns rate less than half the regional norm, which is where the cold-chain investment pays for itself.

6. A Processor Can Only Reject What It Tests For

Every dairy plant in India describes its milk as tested. The question nobody is asked is: tested for what, how often, and by somebody answering to whom.

Contaminant or adulterant	Detectable?	Why it often is not tested
Added water	Yes, routinely	Usually is tested — it costs the plant money directly
Urea, starch, salt	Yes, cheaply	Sometimes tested; a rejection empties a silo
Detergent and neutralisers	Yes	Costs per sample; no commercial loss if missed
Vegetable fat and maltodextrin	Yes, with proper equipment	Requires instrumentation many plants do not own
Antibiotic residue	Yes, per tanker	Real cost per test; harm lands on the consumer
Aflatoxin M1	Yes	Expensive; feed-borne; nobody's fault locally

Read the third column, because it is the diagnosis. The adulterants a processor reliably tests for are the ones that cost the processor money — added water dilutes what it paid for. The contaminants that harm the consumer and cost the plant nothing to miss are precisely the ones whose testing is discretionary, expensive, and decided by somebody under pressure to fill a silo. No conspiracy is required: **THE PLANT THAT TESTS**

LEAST HAS THE FEWEST PROBLEMS AND THE MOST MILK, and it can say with complete honesty that everything it received passed. **WHERE A GATEKEEPER CHOOSES ITS OWN DETECTION SCOPE, THE HONEST OPERATOR PUBLISHES THE SCOPE** — otherwise "passed all tests" is a statement about the tests, not about the milk.

So the panel and its frequency are published to buyers and to suppliers: which tests are run on every tanker, which on a sampling basis and at what rate, which instruments are used, and what the acceptance limits are. **ANTIBIOTIC RESIDUE IS TESTED ON EVERY TANKER WITHOUT EXCEPTION**, because it is the one contaminant whose harm is both real and untraceable. The QA laboratory reports to the promoter and never to procurement; laboratory staff are salaried with no volume-linked component; and a rejected tanker is recorded with the supplier named, the reason stated and the disposition documented — because a rejection quietly re-routed to another line is not a rejection. Rejections rise from 340 to 1,120 as volume grows: the working-gate pattern this library applies everywhere, and a plant whose rejection count falls as it scales is not tightening, it is tiring.

7. The Cold Chain, the Shelf Life, and the Supplier Who Cannot Argue

Three further problems define this business, and all three are invisible to the person who eventually drinks the milk.

☐ **THE COLD CHAIN IS THE PRODUCT AND ITS FAILURES LEAVE NO EVIDENCE.** Bacterial count is decided in the first hour after milking and again in every hour above 4°C — so a tanker that sat for ninety minutes in the afternoon sun, or a delivery vehicle whose compressor was switched off to save fuel, produces milk that tests acceptable on arrival and sours a day early in somebody's kitchen. The customer blames the brand, the retailer blames the customer, and nobody can trace it to the hour it happened. So temperature is logged continuously from collection through chilling, storage, processing and despatch, and **EXCURSIONS ARE REPORTED** rather than alarms acknowledged — 214 in Year 1 falling to 38 in Year 3 — because an alarm somebody silenced at 3 a.m. is not a record, and a cold chain with no logged excursions is a cold chain with no logger.

☐ **SHELF LIFE IS A PREDICTION, NOT A PROPERTY** — the photo-lab plan's rule arriving in food. A date on a pouch assumes a storage temperature the pouch will probably not experience, and the trade prints the number without the assumption. This plant states the storage conditions the date assumes on the pack itself, tests shelf life **TO FAILURE** at realistic Indian conditions rather than to the label at laboratory conditions, and sets the printed date from the realistic result — which is shorter, costs distribution flexibility and is the reason the returns rate is less than half the regional norm.

☐ **AND THE SMALLHOLDER SUPPLIER CANNOT ARGUE.** A farmer delivering forty litres has no laboratory, no second opinion and no leverage; when a test result reduces his payment he can accept it or stop supplying, and both parties know which he will choose. The deduction is opaque, the method is unexplained, and the dispute is unwinnable — which is a real transfer of value from the weakest party in the chain to the strongest. So the deduction policy and the testing method are **PUBLISHED** at every collection centre in the local language, samples are **RETAINED** for a stated period so a disputed result can be re-tested, payment runs on a stated cycle that does not move, and **APPEALS UPHELD ARE REPORTED** at 23% — because a processor whose suppliers never win an appeal is not hearing them, exactly as the refurbished-electronics plan found for consumer disputes.

□ **AND "FRESH", "PURE" AND "FARM" ARE CLAIMS, NOT DECORATION.** Where milk is reconstituted from powder in the lean season — a normal and lawful practice — it is declared on the pack rather than concealed behind a pastoral illustration, and the plant does not use the word "farm-fresh" on a product that has been reconstituted. The commercial-photography rule applies unchanged: a supplier paid to produce the instrument of a misrepresentation has not transferred the responsibility by pointing at a marketing brief.

8. Operations Plan (procure, test, chill, process, pack, distribute)

Procurement and reception

- **Every tanker sampled and tested against the published panel before unloading**, with antibiotic residue on every load without exception.
- **Reception decision taken by the laboratory, not by the shift or by procurement**, and recorded with the supplier named.
- **Rejected loads documented with disposition** — returned, condemned or diverted to non-food use — because an undocumented rejection is a re-routing.
- **Retained samples held for a stated period** so a supplier dispute can be re-tested rather than argued.

Chilling and storage

- **Continuous temperature logging from collection centre to silo**, with excursions recorded and investigated rather than silenced.
- **Silo segregation by quality band** so a marginal load cannot contaminate a premium stream.
- **Silo residence time tracked**, since time and temperature act together and the trade watches only one of them.
- **CIP validated by swab and rinse testing** rather than by cycle completion, because a completed cycle is not a clean line.

Processing and packaging

- **Standardisation controlled to declared composition**, with fat and SNF verified against the label rather than to a target.
- **Pasteurisation validated continuously** — time, temperature and flow-diversion tested, not assumed from a chart.
- **Yield loss measured at each stage** — separation, standardisation, line drainage, CIP and returns — because it is invisible individually and worth ₹1.86 crore a year cumulatively.
- **Batch coding that resolves a pouch to a silo, a shift and a set of collection routes**, which is what makes a recall executable.

Distribution and the shelf

- **Chilled vehicles with logged temperature** and route design built around cold-chain integrity rather than around distance alone.
- **Retailer cold-storage assessed before appointment**, since a perfect plant delivering into a warm cabinet has achieved nothing.
- **Returns analysed by route, retailer and date** rather than credited and forgotten.
- **Recall drill run twice a year against a real batch code**, with the time-to-trace recorded, because a recall plan nobody has exercised is a document.

The operational hinge is the morning the silo is low. A shift is starting, retail orders are committed, a tanker has arrived with a marginal result, and every commercial pressure in the business points one way — which is precisely the moment the entire quality system exists for. So the decision is removed from the moment, per the drone plan: the laboratory's release is required by the plant control system before a silo can be filled, the QA head cannot be overruled by the plant manager, and shortfall procurement at premium prices is budgeted in advance so nobody is negotiating quality against cost at six in the morning.

9. FSSAI, Labelling & Operating Compliance (India)

- **Company & tax** — Private Limited, PAN/TAN, GST, FSSAI manufacturing licence, product and public-liability insurance.
- **Food safety** — FSS Act with compositional standards for milk and the Contaminants, Toxins and Residues Regulations governing antibiotic residues and aflatoxin M1; **adulteration provisions carry criminal consequences and a processor's defence rests entirely on the adequacy of its own testing.**
- **Labelling & metrology** — FSSAI labelling regulations and Legal Metrology (Packaged Commodities) Rules over net quantity, composition, date marking and claims; **"fresh", "pure" and "farm" are testable claims, not decoration, and reconstitution is declared.**
- **Traceability & recall** — documented recall plan required; **a plant that cannot resolve a pouch to a batch, a silo and a set of routes cannot execute one, which makes traceability a safety system rather than a filing preference.**
- **Environment & utilities** — state pollution-control consents for a substantial effluent load; boiler and pressure-vessel certification; refrigerant handling.
- **Supplier fairness** — published deduction policy, retained samples and a stated payment cycle, which is a contractual and reputational obligation rather than a statutory one.
- **Workforce** — EPF/ESI, POSH, shift-working rules, food-handler health checks and training.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / managing director	1	1	Owns the published test panel and the rejection log
Quality assurance & laboratory	8	18	Reports to the promoter; salaried, no volume-linked pay
Production & process operators	24	52	Three shifts; pasteurisation and packaging lines
Procurement & collection network	12	28	Cannot overrule a laboratory decision
Cold chain, despatch & logistics	14	34	Temperature logging, route integrity, returns analysis
Engineering, utilities & effluent	8	16	Boiler, refrigeration, CIP, ETP
Sales, distribution & institutional	10	24	Retail, institutional and quick-commerce channels
Finance, records & admin	6	13	Farmer payments on a stated cycle; traceability records
Total	83	186	Employed; food-handler certified

Eighteen people in quality at Year 3, costing ₹1.42 crore including the test panel, is the structural claim of this business expressed as headcount — and the reporting line matters more than the number. A laboratory

reporting to a plant manager will, within two seasons, discover that marginal loads are acceptable; a laboratory reporting to the promoter and paid without a volume component will not. It is the library's control-independence rule applied at the exact point where a consumer's safety and a day's production compete, and it is the reason procurement headcount is deliberately separated from quality headcount in this table rather than combined into "operations".

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Land, approvals & build	Month 0-10	Incorporation, FSSAI licence, pollution consent, plant construction, boiler and utilities
Plant commissioning	Month 8-14	Pasteuriser, homogeniser, silos, packaging lines, CIP validated by swab testing
Laboratory & systems	Month 9-14	Test panel defined and published; instrumentation for vegetable fat and aflatoxin; temperature logging end to end
Procurement network	Month 10-20	Collection centres, chilling units, published deduction policy and appeal route in local language
Market ramp	Month 14-28	Retail distribution, institutional contracts won on the audit pack, quick-commerce integration
Utilisation & scale	Month 24-36	Utilisation to 76%, second shift on packaging, value-added lines assessed

Training and competence

- **Laboratory method certification** for every analyst, with inter-analyst comparison so a result does not depend on who ran it.
- **Cold-chain discipline for drivers and despatch**, including why switching off a compressor to save fuel destroys a day of shelf life.
- **Collection-centre operator training** on sampling, retained samples and explaining a deduction to a farmer in his own language.
- **Recall drill participation** across production, despatch and sales, twice a year against a real batch code.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees. They exist to show the drivers of a dairy processing P&L and how the testing and cold-chain controls move them. Every input is editable. **The defining feature of this model is that milk cost is 76% of revenue and passes through almost entirely — so utilisation and yield loss, not price, determine whether the plant makes money.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Land, civil works & plant building	420	Food-grade construction, drainage, segregation

Processing plant — pasteuriser, homogeniser, separator, silos	560	The capacity; utilisation decides the return
Packaging lines — pouch, bottle, carton	280	Format flexibility for channel mix
Quality laboratory & instrumentation	96	Includes vegetable-fat and aflatoxin capability most plants lack
Cold chain — chillers, cold rooms, logged vehicles	180	Collection centres through to despatch
Utilities — boiler, refrigeration, power, water	160	Certified pressure vessels
Effluent treatment plant	88	Dairy effluent load is substantial; consent-critical
Collection centres & village chilling units	120	Where cold-chain integrity actually begins
Working capital & contingency	336	Farmers paid weekly; retail settles at 30-45 days
Total project cost	1,840	₹620L investor + ₹440L WC facility + ₹380L promoter + ₹400L term loan

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Test panel, frequency and acceptance limits PUBLISHED / antibiotic residue tested on every tanker / lab reporting outside procurement	100% / 100% / 100%	100% / 100% / 100%	100% / 100% / 100%
Tankers REJECTED / rejection rate / rejected loads with named supplier and documented disposition	340 / 1.9% / 100%	720 / 2.7% / 100%	1,120 / 3.4% / 100%
Cold-chain excursions LOGGED AND REPORTED / continuous logging collection-to-despatch	214 / 100%	96 / 100%	38 / 100%
Deduction policy published in local language / retained samples held / supplier appeals UPHELD / payment cycle met	100% / 100% / 19% / 100%	100% / 100% / 21% / 100%	100% / 100% / 23% / 100%
Shelf life tested to failure at realistic conditions / storage conditions stated on pack / recall drills with time-to-trace recorded	100% / 100% / 2	100% / 100% / 2	100% / 100% / 2
Capacity utilisation / yield loss / market returns / contribution per litre	41% / 2.9% / 3.4% / ₹3.10	62% / 2.0% / 2.1% / ₹4.10	76% / 1.4% / 1.2% / ₹4.85

Row two is the row that makes the gatekeeping claim credible: rejections **RISING** from 340 to 1,120 and the rejection rate rising from 1.9% to 3.4% as volume grows. A plant whose rejection rate falls as it scales is not tightening its supply base, it is tiring — and the rate rising here reflects an expanding test panel catching things the first year's panel could not. Row four's 23% of supplier appeals upheld is the uncomfortable number and is reported deliberately: a processor whose farmers never win an appeal is not hearing them, and 23% means roughly one disputed deduction in four was wrong — which is what a real appeal route looks like. Row six carries the economics: yield loss from 2.9% to 1.4% is worth ₹1.86 crore a year, more than the entire quality function costs.

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Driver
--------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------

Packaged liquid milk — retail pouch	2,480	4,420	6,820	Volume core; thin margin, high turnover
Standardised & toned variants	720	1,380	2,240	Composition-controlled; label accuracy critical
Institutional & organised retail	560	1,240	2,180	Won on the audit pack; better realisation
Bulk sales to value-added processors	280	480	760	Surplus balancing; utilisation filler
Cream, skim powder & by-products	120	240	340	Season balancing; fat management
Contract processing for other brands	40	40	60	Fills capacity in lean periods
Total revenue	4,200	7,800	12,400	Illustrative

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)
Revenue	4,200	7,800	12,400
Raw milk purchase	(3,318)	(6,006)	(9,424)
Packaging material	(294)	(530)	(818)
Gross profit	588	1,264	2,158
Production & engineering employee cost	(164)	(248)	(372)
Quality assurance, laboratory & test panel	(88)	(116)	(142)
Rejection cost — shortfall procurement & idle hours	(96)	(162)	(218)
Cold chain, distribution & freight	(186)	(312)	(468)
Power, fuel, water & effluent	(148)	(232)	(346)
Sales, marketing & trade	(112)	(178)	(268)
Supplier fairness — retained samples, appeals, published policy	(22)	(28)	(34)
Admin, insurance, professional & other	(104)	(158)	(232)
EBITDA	(332)	(170)	78
Depreciation & amortisation	(146)	(158)	(172)
Finance cost	(118)	(142)	(164)
Other income — contract chilling, by-product recovery, scheme support, effluent-derived energy	366	598	837
PBT	(230)	128	579
Tax	46	(32)	(145)
PAT	(184)	96	434
Net margin	(4.4%)	1.2%	3.5%
ROCE	(9.8%)	12.4%	28.4%

Three lines require the vertical's disclosure discipline. Raw milk at ₹94.24 crore is 76% of revenue and passes through almost entirely, which is why net margin is 3.5% and why ROCE rather than margin is the measure this business should be judged on. REJECTION COST at ₹2.18 crore is the price of the gate being real — shortfall procurement at premium prices plus idle plant hours — and it RISES with volume, which is correct; a plant whose rejection cost is nil has a gate that never closes. Other income at ₹8.37 crore is larger than PAT and is shown separately per the library's rule, because contract chilling, by-product recovery and scheme support are not the milk business, and an investor is entitled to see how much of the return depends on them.

12.5 Where the money is actually lost — yield

Loss point	Yr 1	Yr 3	How it improves
Separation & standardisation error	0.9%	0.4%	Inline measurement and control loops
Line drainage & changeover	0.8%	0.4%	Pigging, batch sequencing, fewer changeovers
CIP water and flush losses	0.6%	0.3%	Recovery of first and last product; validated shorter cycles
Packaging rejects & overfill	0.4%	0.2%	Filler calibration; overfill is a silent giveaway
Market returns	3.4%	1.2%	Cold chain, realistic shelf life, route redesign
Total yield loss (excl. returns)	2.9%	1.4%	Worth ₹1.86 crore a year at Yr-3 volume

Overfill deserves a sentence of its own because it is the most common invisible loss in Indian dairy packaging: a filler running 2% over the declared quantity is giving away product on every pouch, in a business whose entire net margin is 3.5%. It is not generosity, it is uncalibrated equipment — and it is legally required to be corrected upward, not downward, since underfilling is a Legal Metrology offence. The honest and profitable position is the same one: fill accurately, verify continuously, and declare what is in the pouch.

12.6 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹124.0cr	₹4.34cr	As modelled
Utilisation 76% → 62%	₹101.1cr	₹1.12cr	Fixed-cost box; the dominant sensitivity
Yield loss 1.4% → 2.4%	₹124.0cr	₹3.41cr	Invisible individually, decisive cumulatively
Other income down 30%	₹124.0cr	₹2.46cr	Why it is disclosed separately
Milk purchase price up 4% unrecovered	₹124.0cr	₹1.52cr	Pass-through lag is the seasonal risk
Returns 1.2% → 2.6%	₹122.3cr	₹3.12cr	Cold chain and realistic dating

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Investor equity	620	Growth capital; utilisation and quality covenants
Working-capital facility	440	Farmers paid weekly; retail settles at 30-45 days
Promoter contribution	380	Cash and land

Term loan	400	Plant, packaging lines and cold chain; 8–10 years
Total	1,840	Illustrative structure

The bankability case rests on utilisation and on the absence of a catastrophic tail, and a lender should weigh the second more heavily than dairy lending usually does. A food-safety incident traced to this plant — a residue finding, an adulteration prosecution, a recall — ends the brand regardless of the P&L, and the security is a specialised plant worth a fraction of its cost to anybody else. The published test panel, the rejection log, the temperature record and the exercised recall drill are therefore not overhead but the reason this cash flow can be lent against, and they are auditable monthly. The working-capital line is structural rather than temporary: farmers must be paid weekly and cannot finance retail's terms, so the gap is permanent and must be sized honestly at the outset.

- **Use of funds** — 30% processing plant, 23% land and building, 15% packaging lines, 18% working capital, 10% cold chain, balance laboratory, effluent treatment and collection infrastructure.
- **Repayment** — term loan from Year 3 cash flow with a moratorium through commissioning and ramp; working-capital facility revolving against milk cycle and retail receivables.
- **Investor exit** — strategic sale to a national dairy group or FMCG company seeking regional capacity and procurement, or a promoter buyback once utilisation matures.

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
A contaminant the plant chose not to test for	Antibiotic residue, aflatoxin M1, detergent or vegetable fat reaching consumers — detectable, undetected, and defensible only as "it passed our tests", which is a statement about the tests	Test panel, frequency, instruments and acceptance limits PUBLISHED to buyers and suppliers; antibiotic residue on EVERY tanker without exception because its harm is real and untraceable; vegetable-fat and aflatoxin instrumentation held rather than outsourced; QA laboratory reporting to the promoter and never to procurement, salaried with no volume-linked component; every rejected load recorded with the supplier named and the disposition documented, because a rejection quietly re-routed is not a rejection; rejections RISING 340 → 1,120
Quality gate collapsing on the morning the silo is low	Every commercial pressure in the business points one way at exactly the moment the system exists for	Remove the decision from the moment: laboratory release required by the plant control system before a silo can be filled; the QA head cannot be overruled by the plant manager; shortfall procurement at premium prices BUDGETED IN ADVANCE at ₹2.18 crore so nobody is negotiating quality against cost at six in the morning; and rejection cost carried as a reported line that rises with volume
Cold-chain failure that leaves no evidence	Milk that tests fine on arrival and sours a day early in a customer's kitchen; the brand is blamed and nobody can trace the hour	Continuous temperature logging from collection centre through chilling, silo, processing and despatch, with EXCURSIONS REPORTED rather than alarms acknowledged (214 → 38) — an alarm somebody silenced at 3 a.m. is not a record, and a cold chain with no logged excursions is one with no logger; silo residence time tracked alongside temperature; retailer cold storage assessed before appointment, since a perfect plant delivering into a warm cabinet has achieved nothing

The supplier who cannot argue	A farmer with forty litres has no laboratory, no second opinion and no leverage; an opaque deduction is a transfer of value from the weakest party in the chain to the strongest	Deduction policy and testing method PUBLISHED at every collection centre in the local language; samples RETAINED for a stated period so a disputed result can be re-tested rather than argued; payment on a stated cycle that does not move; and appeals UPHELD reported at 23%, because a processor whose suppliers never win an appeal is not hearing them
Utilisation and seasonality	The dominant sensitivity — 14 points of utilisation is ₹3.2 crore of PAT, and flush and lean vary supply by a third against an identical cost base	Contract processing and bulk sales to value-added processors filling lean-season capacity; by-product and powder conversion balancing flush; institutional contracts with committed volumes; procurement catchment deliberately spread across agro-climatic zones; and utilisation reported monthly rather than annually
Yield loss and overfill	Invisible individually, worth ₹1.86 crore a year cumulatively in a business with a 3.5% net margin	Loss measured at every stage — separation, standardisation, line drainage, CIP, packaging rejects and overfill — rather than as a plant total; pigging and batch sequencing to cut changeover loss; first and last product recovery on CIP; filler calibration verified continuously, since overfill is a silent giveaway and underfill is a Legal Metrology offence
Recall execution failure	A recall plan that cannot resolve a pouch to a batch, a silo and a set of routes is a document rather than a capability	Batch coding designed for traceability from commissioning; recall drills run twice a year against a REAL batch code with time-to-trace recorded; distribution records retained; and the drill treated as a tested process rather than a written one, per the anchor's rule that a process nobody tests is a belief
Working-capital squeeze	Structural and permanent — farmers must be paid weekly and cannot finance retail's 30–45 day terms	Facility sized to the permanent gap at the outset rather than treated as temporary; farmer payment cycle held as a fixed commitment because a processor who pays late loses its procurement base within a season; institutional receivables managed by finance rather than by sales; and growth throttled to facility headroom

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths • Test panel, frequency and rejection rate published • Antibiotic residue on every tanker; lab outside procurement • Cold chain logged end to end with excursions reported • Supplier deduction policy published and 23% of appeals upheld • Yield loss 1.4% and returns 1.2%	Weaknesses • Rejects milk competitors accept; higher testing cost per litre • Thin net margin with milk cost passing through • Capital-intensive and utilisation-dependent • Result depends materially on other income
Opportunities • Continuing shift from loose to packaged milk • Institutional and organised-retail buyers who audit suppliers • Value-added processors needing standardised bulk supply • Contract processing filling lean-season capacity • Effluent-derived energy and by-product recovery	Threats • A food-safety incident traced to this plant • Milk price spikes with pass-through lag • Cooperative scale and brand trust • Seasonal supply shortfall against fixed costs

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Tanker reception & test register** — panel run, results, release decision, rejection with named supplier and disposition.
- **Cold-chain temperature log** — continuous records from collection to despatch, with excursions raised and closed.
- **Batch traceability & recall tracker** — pouch to batch to silo to routes, with drill results and time-to-trace.
- **Yield-loss dashboard** — separation, drainage, CIP, packaging rejects, overfill and returns by line and shift.
- **Supplier payment & deduction register** — published policy, retained samples, appeals raised and upheld, payment cycle adherence.
- **Capacity utilisation planner** — shift loading, lean-season contract processing, seasonal balancing.
- **Compliance calendar** — FSSAI, pollution consent, boiler certification, food-handler health checks and recall drills.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, utilisation, yield loss, milk price and headcount are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on procurement catchment, seasonality, channel mix and cold-chain reach. Figures are in Indian rupees.
- **The central integrity finding is that a processor can only reject what it tests for, and it decides what to test for.** Added water, urea, detergent, maltodextrin, vegetable fat, antibiotic residue and aflatoxin M1 are all detectable — but each test costs money per tanker, each rejection leaves the plant short of milk that day, and the person deciding is often a procurement officer paid on collection volume. **Note which adulterants get tested reliably: the ones that cost the PROCESSOR money, like added water. The contaminants that harm the CONSUMER and cost the plant nothing to miss are precisely the ones whose testing is discretionary. No conspiracy is required — THE PLANT THAT TESTS LEAST HAS THE FEWEST PROBLEMS AND THE MOST MILK, and can say with complete honesty that everything it received passed. The general rule: WHERE A GATEKEEPER CHOOSES ITS OWN DETECTION SCOPE, THE HONEST OPERATOR PUBLISHES THE SCOPE — otherwise "passed all tests" is a statement about the tests, not about the milk.**
- **So the panel is published and the gate is structurally protected.** Which tests run on every tanker, which on sampling and at what rate, on what instruments, to what limits — published to buyers and suppliers alike; antibiotic residue on EVERY load without exception because its harm is real and untraceable; the QA laboratory reporting to the promoter and never to procurement, salaried with no volume-linked pay; and every rejection recorded with the supplier named and the disposition documented, **because a rejection quietly re-routed to another line is not a rejection. Rejections rise from 340 to 1,120 and the rate from 1.9% to 3.4% — a plant whose rejection rate falls as it scales is not tightening, it is tiring.**
- **The quality system exists for the morning the silo is low,** when a shift is starting, retail orders are committed, a tanker has arrived with a marginal result and every commercial pressure points one way. **So the decision is removed from the moment, per the drone plan: laboratory release is required by the plant control system before a silo can be filled, the QA head cannot be overruled by the plant manager, and shortfall procurement at premium prices is BUDGETED IN ADVANCE at ₹2.18 crore so nobody is negotiating quality against cost at six in the morning. That cost is carried as a reported line and rises with volume, which is correct — a plant whose rejection cost is nil has a gate that never closes.**
- **The cold chain is the product and its failures leave no evidence.** Bacterial count is decided in the first hour and again in every hour above 4°C, so a tanker that sat ninety minutes in the sun or a vehicle whose compressor was switched off to save fuel produces milk that tests fine on arrival and sours early in somebody's kitchen — the customer blames the brand and nobody can trace the hour. **Continuous logging from collection to despatch with**

EXCURSIONS REPORTED rather than alarms acknowledged: 214 falling to 38, because an alarm somebody silenced at 3 a.m. is not a record and a cold chain with no logged excursions is one with no logger.

- **Shelf life is a prediction, not a property** — the photo-lab plan's rule arriving in food. A date on a pouch assumes a storage temperature the pouch will probably not experience, and the trade prints the number without the assumption. This plant states the assumed conditions on the pack, tests to failure at realistic Indian conditions rather than to the label at laboratory conditions, and sets the printed date from the realistic result — shorter, less flexible for distribution, and the reason the returns rate is less than half the regional norm.
- **The smallholder supplier cannot argue, and that asymmetry is a transfer of value.** A farmer delivering forty litres has no laboratory, no second opinion and no leverage; when a test reduces his payment he can accept it or stop supplying, and both parties know which he will choose. **So the deduction policy and testing method are published at every collection centre IN THE LOCAL LANGUAGE, samples are retained so a disputed result can be re-tested rather than argued, payment runs on a stated cycle that does not move, and APPEALS UPHELD are reported at 23% — roughly one disputed deduction in four was wrong, which is what a real appeal route looks like. A processor whose suppliers never win an appeal is not hearing them.**
- **The money is in utilisation and yield, not in price.** Raw milk is 76% of revenue and passes through almost entirely, so net margin is 3.5% and ROCE rather than margin is the right measure. Fourteen points of utilisation is ₹3.2 crore of profit; yield loss falling from 2.9% to 1.4% is worth ₹1.86 crore a year — more than the entire quality function costs — and it is invisible individually and enormous cumulatively. **Overfill deserves particular attention as the most common silent loss in Indian dairy packaging: a filler running 2% over gives away product on every pouch in a business whose whole net margin is 3.5%, and it is uncalibrated equipment rather than generosity. The honest and the profitable position coincide — fill accurately, verify continuously, declare what is in the pouch.**
- **The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees, and so is its return.** The expanded test panel costs ₹1.42 crore a year, about ₹0.51 per litre received; rejecting 1,120 tankers costs ₹2.18 crore in shortfall procurement and idle hours; retained samples, appeals and published policy cost ₹34 lakh. **Against that, institutional and organised-retail business worth ₹38.60 crore of Year-3 revenue is won on an audit pack competitors cannot produce, returns run at less than half the regional norm, and a lender's real protection in a food business is the absence of a catastrophic tail — so the same records that protect the consumer make the cash flow lendable. Other income of ₹8.37 crore exceeds PAT and is disclosed separately, because contract chilling, by-product recovery and scheme support are not the milk business.**
- **Compliance runs through safety, labelling, traceability and effluent at once.** FSS Act licensing with compositional standards for milk and the Contaminants, Toxins and Residues Regulations on antibiotic residues and aflatoxin M1, where adulteration provisions carry criminal consequences and the defence rests on the adequacy of the plant's own testing; FSSAI labelling and Legal Metrology (Packaged Commodities) Rules over net quantity, composition, date marking and claims, where "fresh", "pure" and "farm" are testable claims and reconstitution is declared; a documented and EXERCISED recall plan, since a plant that cannot resolve a pouch to a batch, a silo and a set of routes cannot execute one; state pollution-control consents for a substantial dairy effluent load; boiler and pressure-vessel certification; cold-chain and transport compliance; GST; and EPF/ESI, POSH and food-handler health checks across a shift workforce. Professional advice should be taken on the specific licences, label claims and supplier 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.