BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Seafood Export House

Seafood export where every pond is named and tested, because the duty is levied on the country and paid by the firm

FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out a **Seafood Export House** in India — sourcing, consolidating, testing and shipping frozen shrimp, finfish and cephalopods to the US, EU, China, Japan and South-East Asia, moving about 1,280 tonnes a year at an average realisation of ₹7.50 lakh per tonne by Year 3, from a documented base of 1,840 ponds.

> This plan inherits the ten fisheries anchor rules and sits downstream of the farm and the processor. **Its problem is neither: an exporter is liable for decisions taken in ponds and on boats he does not own, cannot audit, and in most cases has never visited.**

> **THE PENALTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE IS PAID FOR BY THE FIRM. An anti-dumping duty, a countervailing duty or an import alert is imposed on INDIAN SHRIMP — not on the farm whose antibiotic decision triggered it, and not on the exporter who shipped it. So the house that tests every pond and the house that tests none PAY THE SAME TARIFF AT THE SAME BORDER ON THE SAME DAY. THE REGULATORY UNIT IS THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE UNIT IS THE FIRM, AND THE ENTIRE INCENTIVE TO COMPLY LEAKS OUT THROUGH THE GAP BETWEEN THOSE TWO. It is the shared-water problem of the pond plans transposed into a shared REPUTATION: one participant's failure arrives at everyone else's business through a medium nobody owns, and cannot be traced back to him. There is exactly one escape, and it is documentary: TRADE-REMEDY PROCEEDINGS GRANT INDIVIDUAL RATES TO FIRMS THAT CAN DOCUMENT THEIR OWN SUPPLY CHAIN, so the only defence against collective punishment is evidence that your consignments are separable from the country's. So this house NAMES, TESTS AND DOCUMENTS EVERY POND — 1,840 of them — and maintains individual-rate records CONTINUOUSLY rather than assembling them when an action is announced. WHERE THE PENALTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE IS PAID FOR BY THE FIRM, NO FIRM CAN BUY ITS WAY OUT OF ANOTHER'S FAILURE — SO BUY THE ONE THING THAT IS SEPARABLY YOURS: A NAMED, TESTED, DOCUMENTED POND.**

> **AND THE BUYER AUDIT CERTIFIES THE WRONG LINK. An importer's audit inspects the PROCESSING ESTABLISHMENT — floors, chill rooms, HACCP files, staff hygiene — which is the most visible, most capital-intensive and most easily improved part of the chain. It says almost nothing about the pond where the antibiotic decision was actually taken. SO THE AUDITED LINK IS SYSTEMATICALLY THE ONE LEAST LIKELY TO BE THE PROBLEM, PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS THE ONE BEING AUDITED — and a spotless establishment certificate is compatible with a supply base nobody has ever seen. So testing is done AT ORIGIN BEFORE CONSOLIDATION, on a panel wider than any buyer requires.**

> **AND A REJECTED CONSIGNMENT HAS TO GO SOMEWHERE. A container refused at Rotterdam can lawfully be re-routed to a market with a thinner test panel, or brought home and sold domestically — which is the processing plan's finding seen from the other end of the chain, and the ordinary way the trade recovers a failed shipment. So failed lots are DESTROYED, NIL re-routed and NIL diverted, forgoing ₹1.92 crore.**

This plan models an operator requiring **₹24.00 crore** (₹12.00 crore working capital + ₹5.60 crore term loan + ₹4.40 crore investor + ₹2.00 crore promoter), moving from **₹32.00 crore revenue and a ₹0.08 crore loss** to **₹96.00 crore revenue and ₹3.84 crore profit** by Year 3 — *a 4.0% net margin and 26.4% return on capital. (Seafood export — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: An export house whose supply base is documented pond by pond, continuously.

Vision: To make one Indian exporter separable from the country's average.

Mission: Name and test every pond; keep individual-rate records before they are needed; test at origin on a wider panel than any buyer asks for; destroy what fails rather than re-routing it; and pay for supplier testing ourselves rather than deducting it from the farmer.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended. MPEDA and EIC registration, buyer contracts, letters of credit, packing credit and outside capital all assume it.
- **Traceability records maintained continuously as a standing obligation, not a project — the structural precondition, since records assembled after an action is announced are exactly the records a reviewing authority discounts.**
- **Destruction of failed lots authorised outside the trading desk — because a failed container has a buyer in some market at some price, and the desk exists to find buyers.**

> **Regulatory anchor:** MPEDA registration and Export Inspection Council pre-shipment inspection; EU and US establishment approval and the FDA import-alert regime, **under which a detention can be applied to a country, a species or a firm, and the firm-level escape requires evidence the firm has usually not kept**; anti-dumping and countervailing-duty proceedings under the Customs Tariff Act and their foreign equivalents, **where INDIVIDUAL RATES ARE AVAILABLE ONLY TO RESPONDENTS WHO CAN DOCUMENT COSTS AND SOURCING TO A STANDARD MOST INDIAN EXPORTERS CANNOT MEET, so the compliant and the careless receive the same all-others rate by default**; FEMA and RBI rules on export realisation and packing credit; the Foreign Trade Policy and DGFT scheme obligations; FSSAI where product enters the domestic market; the CAA and banned-antimicrobial list applying upstream; and EPF, ESI and the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act for handling staff. **The decisive structural fact is that EVERY MEANINGFUL PENALTY IN THIS TRADE IS IMPOSED AT A LEVEL ABOVE THE FIRM, AND EVERY MEANINGFUL DEFENCE MUST BE ASSEMBLED BELOW IT.**

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with seafood export, international trade or supply-chain background, with a sourcing head and a compliance lead. Three competences decide outcomes. *Working-capital management*, because ₹14.86 crore of the ₹24.00 crore project cost is working capital and the cash cycle from advance to realisation runs months. *Supply-base development*, since the exporter's exposure is created entirely upstream and the only levers are which ponds you buy from and what you pay for documentation. And *the discipline to keep records nobody is asking for*, which is unglamorous, costs ₹1.68 crore a year, and is worth nothing at all until the year it is worth everything. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **traceability records are a standing obligation rather than a project, and destruction of failed lots is authorised outside the trading desk.**

4. Market Analysis — India

A major foreign-exchange earner exposed to decisions taken in thousands of ponds.

Demand drivers

- **Sustained global demand** for vannamei from the US, EU, China and Japan.

- **Value-added and retail-pack demand** shifting margin toward processed formats.
- **Buyer traceability requirements** tightening every contract cycle.
- **Diversification away from single-market dependence** after tariff actions.
- **Cephalopod and finfish demand** from Japan and South-East Asia.
- **Retail and food-service consolidation** favouring documented suppliers.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian seafood export demand across all markets	Among India's largest agri-export categories
SAM	**Ponds we have named, tested and documented**	**Bounded by THE FARM BASE, not by buyer demand**
SOM (Yr 1–3)	Tonnes shipped with pond-level traceability	₹32cr → ₹96cr; 1,280 tonnes; 1,840 ponds documented

Revenue mix and share (Year 3)

Stream	Share	Gross margin — and where the collective risk sits
Frozen shrimp — US & EU	**44.0%**	**11.0% — the anti-dumping and import-alert exposure**
Frozen shrimp — China, Japan & SE Asia	20.0%	9.0% — thinner panels; where rejects get re-routed
Frozen finfish & cephalopods	16.0%	12.0% — wild-caught; traceability is to a boat
Value-added & retail-pack export	12.0%	18.0% — highest margin; heaviest audit burden
Farm-traceability & testing services to other exporters	**5.0%**	**44.0% — selling rivals the documentation we need them to have**
Domestic sale of own-standard surplus	3.0%	8.0% — surplus only; never rejects

> **The first two rows are the same product separated by the strictness of the destination panel, and the second is where the trade's rejects habitually land — which is why our own policy of destroying rather than re-routing costs money in exactly that column. The third row is the hardest to document: wild-caught finfish traces to a boat and a landing, not a pond, and a boat is a far weaker record than a farm. The fifth row is the deliberate one: we sell traceability and testing services TO COMPETING EXPORTERS at 44% margin, which looks eccentric until you remember that A DUTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY — every rival who documents his base reduces the probability of the action that would hit us, so THE SERVICE IS SOLD FOR MARGIN AND BOUGHT FOR INSURANCE AT THE SAME TIME.**

Constraints

- **Working capital**, at 62% of project cost and a cash cycle measured in months.
- **Collective trade action**, which compliance cannot individually prevent.
- **Currency**, with revenue in dollars and almost all cost in rupees.
- **The farm base**, where every exposure originates and no exporter has authority.

5. Competition & Position

Competitor type	Strength	Weakness this plan exploits

Large integrated exporters	Own processing and farms; scale; direct buyer relationships	Documented to establishment level, not pond level
Trading exporters without processing	Asset-light, flexible, low overhead, fast	Supply base entirely undocumented; agent-sourced
Processor-exporters	Control of the plant; audit-ready establishments	**The audited link is not where the risk is**
Agent-led consolidators	Cheapest sourcing; wide reach into small farms	Rejects re-routed as routine; no individual-rate defence
This plan	**1,840 ponds named and tested, continuous individual-rate records, origin testing, failed lots destroyed**	Higher cost per tonne; smaller addressable base

> **The positioning is aimed at a buyer's risk department rather than his purchasing department, and that is a deliberate and uncomfortable choice. Purchasing compares price per pound; risk compares what happens when a lot fails. We are more expensive on the first and materially better on the second, WHICH MEANS WE LOSE MOST TRANSACTIONS AND WIN THE RELATIONSHIPS THAT SURVIVE AN INCIDENT. The honest difficulty is that this is a slow way to build a book: a buyer only discovers the value of pond-level traceability in the week he needs to prove where something came from, and until that week arrives our documentation is a cost he is being asked to pay for and cannot use. The realistic route is therefore through buyers who have ALREADY had an incident — a detention, a recall, a customer complaint they could not trace — because they are the only ones for whom the argument needs no explanation.**

> **The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. Naming, testing and documenting every pond — 1,840 of them, with field officers visiting and sampling rather than collecting a form — cost ₹1.68 crore, the largest opex commitment and the one with no visible product. Pre-shipment testing at origin on a panel wider than any buyer requires cost ₹1.24 crore. Paying for supplier testing and advisory ourselves, rather than deducting it from the farmer's price as the trade does, cost ₹54 lakh. And destroying failed lots rather than re-routing them to a thinner-panel market or bringing them home forgave ₹1.92 crore of gross profit — off the P&L entirely, because it is revenue deliberately not recovered. Total ₹5.38 crore against ₹3.84 crore of profit — so a house with the same buyers and the same suppliers running trade-standard practice would earn ₹9.22 crore.**

6. The Penalty Is Levied on the Country

This is the finding, and it is a mismatch of units.

What is measured	At what level
An anti-dumping or countervailing duty	**The country**
An FDA import alert on a species	**The country**
A retailer's decision to switch origin	**The country**
The cost of testing every pond	The firm
The cost of destroying a failed lot	The firm
The benefit of having done both	**Shared, and unattributable**

> **Every meaningful penalty in this trade is imposed at a level above the firm. An anti-dumping duty falls on Indian shrimp; an import alert names a country and a species; a European retailer that has had one bad experience switches origin rather than supplier. NONE OF THESE INSTRUMENTS DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN THE HOUSE THAT TESTED EVERY POND AND THE HOUSE THAT TESTED NONE — they arrive at the same border on the same day at the same rate. Meanwhile every cost of compliance is borne individually, immediately and in full. THE REGULATORY UNIT IS THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE UNIT IS THE FIRM, AND THE ENTIRE INCENTIVE TO COMPLY LEAKS OUT THROUGH THE GAP BETWEEN THEM.**

> **This is the shared-water problem of the pond plans transposed into a shared REPUTATION. There, one farmer's discharge entered a creek and arrived at his neighbour's intake untraceably; here, one exporter's residue failure enters the trade statistics and arrives at every other exporter's tariff line — and IT IS EQUALLY UNTRACEABLE, because a duty order does not name the consignment that caused it. The structure is identical and so is the outcome: a cost imposed by one participant on all the others, through a medium nobody owns, with no mechanism of attribution and therefore no consequence. AND IT PRODUCES THE SAME PERVERSE ARITHMETIC — the exporter who spends ₹5.38 crore on compliance and the one who spends nothing face the SAME probability of a country-level action, because that probability is set by the aggregate and neither can move it alone. A RATIONAL PARTICIPANT LOOKING ONLY AT TRADE-REMEDY RISK WOULD SPEND NOTHING, AND HE WOULD BE RIGHT.**

> **But there is exactly one escape, and it is documentary rather than behavioural. TRADE-REMEDY PROCEEDINGS DO NOT ONLY PRODUCE COUNTRY-WIDE RATES: they grant INDIVIDUAL RATES to respondents who can document their costs and their sourcing to the investigating authority's standard. THAT STANDARD IS THE ONE PLACE IN THIS ENTIRE STRUCTURE WHERE A FIRM'S OWN CONDUCT IS SEPARABLE FROM THE COUNTRY'S — and most Indian exporters cannot meet it, so they receive the all-others rate by default, not because they were found wanting but because they had nothing to file. So this house maintains INDIVIDUAL-RATE DOCUMENTATION CONTINUOUSLY rather than assembling it when an action is announced, at 100%, with the POND-TO-CONTAINER CHAIN RECONSTRUCTABLE FOR ANY PAST SHIPMENT and three years of records retrievable within thirty days. THE TIMING IS THE WHOLE POINT: records assembled after an initiation notice are exactly the records a reviewing authority discounts, and by then the period under investigation is already history. 1,840 PONDS ARE NAMED, TESTED AND DOCUMENTED, with field officers visiting and sampling rather than collecting a signed form — at ₹1.68 crore a year, which buys nothing whatever until the year it buys everything. WHERE THE PENALTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE IS PAID FOR BY THE FIRM, NO FIRM CAN BUY ITS WAY OUT OF ANOTHER'S FAILURE — SO BUY THE ONE THING THAT IS SEPARABLY YOURS: A NAMED, TESTED, DOCUMENTED POND.**

7. The Audit Certifies the Wrong Link

Two further findings, and the anchors carried down the chain.

> **AN IMPORTER'S AUDIT INSPECTS THE PROCESSING ESTABLISHMENT, WHICH IS NOT WHERE THE RISK IS. The auditor walks the floors, reads the HACCP file, checks chill-room temperatures, watches hand-washing and reviews the pest-control log — all of it competent, all of it necessary, and ALL OF IT CONCERNING THE MOST VISIBLE, MOST CAPITAL-INTENSIVE AND MOST EASILY IMPROVED LINK IN THE CHAIN. He does not visit the pond where an antibiotic decision was taken eleven weeks earlier by a farmer he will never meet, because the pond is not the auditee. SO THE AUDITED LINK IS SYSTEMATICALLY THE ONE LEAST LIKELY TO BE THE PROBLEM, PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS THE ONE BEING AUDITED — attention improves what it lands on, and it has landed on establishments for thirty years. A SPOTLESS ESTABLISHMENT CERTIFICATE IS THEREFORE FULLY**

> **COMPATIBLE WITH A SUPPLY BASE NOBODY HAS EVER SEEN, and both the auditor and the exporter know it. So TESTING IS DONE AT ORIGIN BEFORE CONSOLIDATION, at 100%, on a PANEL WIDER THAN ANY BUYER REQUIRES, with NIL consignments shipped on the buyer's minimum panel alone — and consignments rejected at destination fell from 4 to nil. Testing after consolidation is close to useless for attribution: once forty farms are in one container, a positive result condemns the container and identifies nobody.**

> **AND A REJECTED CONSIGNMENT HAS TO GO SOMEWHERE. A container refused at Rotterdam does not cease to exist: it can lawfully be re-routed to a market whose panel does not test for whatever it failed on, or brought home and sold domestically. THIS IS THE PROCESSING PLAN'S FINDING SEEN FROM THE OTHER END OF THE CHAIN — the same sorting, performed at sea rather than at a sorting table, with a bill of lading instead of a conveyor. And it is the ordinary way the trade recovers a failed shipment; nobody regards it as concealment, because the second market's standard is genuinely met. So FAILED LOTS ARE DESTROYED, at 100%, with NIL re-routed to a thinner-panel market and NIL diverted domestically — forgoing ₹1.92 crore, and DESTRUCTION IS AUTHORISED OUTSIDE THE TRADING DESK, because a failed container always has a buyer in some market at some price and the desk exists to find buyers.**

> **AND THE COST OF PROVING A FARM IS CLEAN IS NORMALLY DEDUCTED FROM THE FARMER. The trade tests, and recovers the cost in the price it offers — so the farmer pays to demonstrate his own innocence, and a farmer close to the margin declines the test and sells to someone who does not ask. THE TESTING REGIME THEREFORE SELECTS AGAINST EXACTLY THE FARMS MOST WORTH TESTING. So SUPPLIER TESTING AND ADVISORY ARE PAID FOR BY US, at 100%, with NIL cost recovered from the farmer's price, free seed PCR and residue testing extended to 620 FARMS, and a PREMIUM OF ₹7 PER KILO PAID FOR A DOCUMENTED CLEAN POND — which is the mechanism, since a premium reaches the farmer and an exhortation does not.**

What an importer can check in sixty seconds

The first question separates almost every Indian exporter from almost every other.

- **Can you name the pond this container came from?** Not the plant, not the region — the pond, with a test date.
- **Show me the same for a shipment from two years ago.** Continuous records look different from assembled ones.
- **Was the testing done at origin or after consolidation?** After consolidation, a positive identifies nobody.
- **What happened to your last rejected container?** "Re-routed" is lawful and tells you exactly what you need to know.
- **Who paid for the farm's residue test — you or the farmer?** If the farmer paid, the marginal farms went untested.
- **What is your panel, against the one my contract requires?** If they are the same, nothing is being caught early.

> **The asymmetry here runs in an unusual direction: THE EXPORTER IS THE PARTY WITHOUT INFORMATION, AND HE IS ALSO THE PARTY HELD LIABLE. The farmer knows what he put in the pond. The agent knows which farms he aggregated. The processor knows what arrived at his dock. THE EXPORTER KNOWS NONE OF IT AND SIGNS FOR ALL OF IT — his name is on the health certificate, the bill of lading and the buyer's contract, and his is the establishment number a detention will cite. He is, in the strictest sense, GUARANTEEING FACTS HE HAS NO MEANS OF ESTABLISHING, which is a position no other participant in this vertical occupies. And it explains why the industry's standard response is not diligence but DILUTION — spread across many suppliers, keep no records that could be used against you, and treat rejection as a cost of doing business rather than as information. THAT RESPONSE IS ENTIRELY RATIONAL FOR A FIRM THAT EXPECTS TO BE JUDGED COLLECTIVELY, AND IT IS THE PRECISE BEHAVIOUR THAT MAKES THE COLLECTIVE JUDGEMENT CORRECT. The only way out is to become individually documentable — which costs ₹5.38 crore, protects nobody else, and works only for the firm that pays for it.**

8. Operations Plan (source, test, ship, prove)

The base

- **Every pond named and documented** — 1,840, with the farmer and the hatchery recorded.
- **Field officers visit and sample** — 38 ponds each per year, not a collected form.
- **Seed PCR and residue testing paid for by us** — nil recovered from the farmer.
- **₹7 per kilo premium for a documented clean pond**, paid to the farmer.

The test

- **At origin, before consolidation** — after consolidation a positive identifies nobody.
- **Panel wider than any buyer requires**; nil shipped on the contract minimum alone.
- **Anchor (c) carried up the chain** — pond-level residue, not border testing.
- **Results held against the pond**, not only against the lot.

The failure

- **Failed lots destroyed** — nil re-routed, nil diverted domestically.
- **Destruction authorised outside the trading desk.**
- **Supplier informed and shown the result**, with the pond suspended pending re-test.
- **Forgone gross profit published** — ₹1.92 crore in Year 3.

The record

- **Individual-rate documentation maintained continuously**, not on demand.
- **Pond-to-container chain reconstructable** for any past shipment.
- **Three years retrievable within thirty days**, in the form an authority expects.
- **Traceability sold as a service** to other exporters at 44% margin.

> **The operational hinge is a 26-tonne container held at destination on a residue detention, traced within two days to a single pond among the 47 that fed it — worth ₹1.95 crore, in a quarter where two other buyers are running audits. Because the origin testing was pond-level, we can identify the source, prove the other 46 were clean, and offer the buyer a documented replacement from named ponds within a fortnight. THE COMMERCIAL TEMPTATION IS NOT TO CONCEAL BUT TO UNDER-DISCLOSE: report the detention, replace the container, and say nothing about the fact that the pond in question had a marginal result three months earlier that we accepted. Nobody would ever know, the buyer is satisfied, and volunteering it converts a resolved incident into a documented pattern. BUT A PATTERN IS PRECISELY WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL-RATE FILE IS MADE OF — a record that shows only clean results is worth less to a reviewing authority than one that shows failures found, acted on and followed up, BECAUSE THE FIRST LOOKS LIKE A SYSTEM THAT DOES NOT DETECT ANYTHING. So the earlier marginal result was disclosed, the acceptance decision recorded as an error with the reason, the pond suspended and the supplier retained on a re-test protocol. Nil pay is linked to shipped volume or to detention count.**

9. Export, Trade-Remedy & Food-Safety Compliance (India)

- **MPEDA registration and EIC pre-shipment inspection**; EU and US establishment approval and listing.

- **FDA import-alert regime — a detention may be applied to a country, a species or a firm, and the firm-level escape requires evidence the firm has usually not kept.**
- **Anti-dumping and countervailing-duty proceedings — individual rates are available only to respondents who can document costs and sourcing to the authority's standard, so the compliant and the careless receive the same all-others rate by default.**
- **FEMA and RBI rules** on export realisation, packing credit and forward cover.
- **Foreign Trade Policy and DGFT scheme obligations**, including duty-drawback and RoDTEP documentation.
- **FSSAI** where any product enters the domestic market, including surplus.
- **CAA registration and the banned-antimicrobial list** applying upstream at the farm (anchor c).
- **EPF, ESI and the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act** for handling and consolidation staff. **Every meaningful penalty is imposed at a level above the firm, and every meaningful defence must be assembled below it.**

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / managing director	1	1	Cannot authorise a re-route or a destruction
Farm traceability & supplier field team	22	48	**38 ponds per officer per year; visits and samples**
Cold store, consolidation & logistics	18	42	Consolidation happens after testing, never before
Documentation, trade compliance, admin & finance	18	39	**Individual-rate file maintained continuously**
Pre-shipment testing laboratory	7	14	**Panel wider than any buyer's contract**
Marketing, buyer relations & certification	5	11	**Nil pay linked to shipped volume or detentions**
Total	**71**	**155**	**1,280 tonnes; 1,840 ponds; nil re-routed**

The field headcount is derived rather than assumed, and it reconciles three ways. By volume: 1,840 documented ponds at 38 ponds per field officer per year is 48 officers — a caseload set so that each pond is physically visited and sampled at least twice in a cycle rather than telephoned, because a traceability record built from forms the farmer filled in himself is the kind of record a reviewing authority reads and discounts. By cost per tonne: the ₹3.46 crore of traceability, origin testing and supplier development across 1,280 tonnes is ₹27,031 per tonne — 3.6 per cent of a ₹7.50 lakh per tonne realisation, down from ₹47,307 in Year 1, and it is high for a trading business precisely because the risk it addresses is not a trading risk. By cost per head: the ₹2.36 crore field and laboratory salary line across 62 people is ₹3.81 lakh cost-to-company each, with the remaining ₹56 lakh of those two lines being reagents, sampling consumables and field travel. The compliance function maintains the individual-rate file continuously, and nobody's pay is linked to shipped volume.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Formation, registrations & first buyers	Month 0–8	Incorporation, MPEDA, EIC, cold store, first contracts
Farm base named and first ponds documented	Month 3–12	**640 ponds; field team of 22; free testing offered**
Origin testing before consolidation	Month 6–14	**Wider panel than contract; detentions 4 → 1**

EU/US establishment listing	Month 10–20	Buyer audits passed; value-added lines opened
Individual-rate file established	Month 14–26	**Continuous records; two years retrievable in 30 days**
Scale & traceability services	Month 28–36	1,840 ponds; 1,280 tonnes; nil detentions; services sold

Training and competence

- **Sampling a pond properly** so the result would survive a reviewing authority's scrutiny.
- **Maintaining a file nobody has asked for**, consistently, for years.
- **Refusing a re-route** that is lawful, profitable and invisible.
- **Explaining a premium** to a farmer who has never been paid for documentation.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

> **All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees.** They exist to show the drivers of a seafood-export P&L under a pond-level traceability rule. Every input is editable. **The defining economics are that this is a thin-margin, working-capital-heavy business: ₹14.86 crore of the ₹24.00 crore project cost is working capital, finance cost is ₹2.18 crore against ₹3.84 crore of profit, and a 4.0% net margin means a six per cent currency move erases the year.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Working capital — advances, inventory and receivables	**1,486**	**62% of project cost; cash cycle in months**
Cold store, consolidation & pre-shipment facility	324	Consolidation after testing, never before
Farm traceability system & testing laboratory	**268**	**Origin testing; records built to authority standard**
Office, documentation & trade-compliance systems	148	Individual-rate file, retrievable within 30 days
Supplier development fund — testing and advisory for the base	**96**	**Paid by us; nil recovered from the farmer**
Licences, MPEDA/EIC registrations & certifications	48	Establishment listing, BAP/ASC where required
Pre-operative & contingency	30	Insurance, legal, launch
Total project cost	**2,400**	₹1,200L WC + ₹560L term loan + ₹440L investor + ₹200L promoter

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
EVERY POND NAMED, TESTED AND DOCUMENTED / **consignments assembled from unnamed or agent-aggregated sources** / ponds in the documented base / **consignments traceable to an individual pond within 24 hours**	100% / NIL / 640 / 88%	100% / NIL / 1,240 / 96%	**100% / NIL / 1,840 / 100%**

TESTING AT ORIGIN, BEFORE CONSOLIDATION, ON A WIDER PANEL THAN ANY BUYER REQUIRES / **consignments shipped on the buyer's minimum panel alone** / lots tested at origin rather than after consolidation / **consignments detained or rejected at destination**	100% / NIL / 100% / 4	100% / NIL / 100% / 1	**100% / NIL / 100% / NIL**
FAILED LOTS DESTROYED — NEVER RE-ROUTED OR DIVERTED / **failed lots re-routed to a market with a thinner panel** / **failed lots brought home and sold domestically** / gross profit forgone on destruction (₹ lakh)	100% / NIL / NIL / 78	100% / NIL / NIL / 134	**100% / NIL / NIL / 192**
SUPPLIER TESTING PAID FOR BY US, NOT DEDUCTED FROM THE FARMER / **testing cost recovered through the price offered** / farms receiving free seed PCR and residue testing / **premium paid for a documented clean pond (₹/kg)**	100% / NIL / 240 / ₹3	100% / NIL / 460 / ₹5	**100% / NIL / 620 / ₹7**
INDIVIDUAL-RATE DOCUMENTATION MAINTAINED CONTINUOUSLY, NOT ON DEMAND / **records assembled only once an action is announced** / pond-to-container chain reconstructable for any past shipment / **years of records retrievable within 30 days**	100% / NIL / 88% / 1	100% / NIL / 96% / 2	**100% / NIL / 100% / 3**
Tonnes exported / average realisation per tonne / **ponds per field officer per year** / **traceability, testing and supplier-development cost per tonne** / consignments detained	427 / ₹7.49L / 29 / ₹47,307 / 4	853 / ₹7.50L / 34 / ₹32,825 / 1	**1,280 / ₹7.50L / 38 / ₹27,031 / NIL**

> **Row three's second column is the one a competitor would find hardest to match, because re-routing a failed container is lawful, invisible and profitable, and refusing it costs ₹1.92 crore with no observable benefit. Row four's last column is the mechanism rather than the gesture: ₹7 a kilo reaches the farmer and an exhortation does not, and paying for the test ourselves is what stops the regime selecting against the marginal farms it most needs to reach. Row five's last column reaching three years is the only number here that cannot be created quickly — a continuous record is definitionally something you either started three years ago or did not, WHICH IS WHY IT IS THE ONE COMMITMENT A COMPETITOR CANNOT ADOPT IN RESPONSE TO LOSING A CONTRACT. Row six's detentions falling to nil should be read cautiously: at 1,280 tonnes it is a small sample, and the honest claim is that origin testing moved the detection upstream, not that it made the supply base perfect.**

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Gross margin
Frozen shrimp — US & EU	1,408	2,816	4,224	**11.0%**
Frozen shrimp — China, Japan & SE Asia	640	1,280	1,920	9.0%
Frozen finfish & cephalopods	512	1,024	1,536	12.0%
Value-added & retail-pack export	384	768	1,152	18.0%
Farm-traceability & testing services to other exporters	160	320	480	**44.0%**
Domestic sale of own-standard surplus	96	192	288	8.0%
Total revenue	**3,200**	**6,400**	**9,600**	**13.2% blended**

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)

Revenue	3,200	6,400	9,600
Cost of goods — purchased material, processing charges & packing	(2,779)	(5,558)	(8,337)
Gross profit	**421**	**842**	**1,263**
Farm traceability register — every pond named, tested, documented	**(98)**	**(136)**	**(168)**
Pre-shipment residue and histamine testing beyond buyer requirement	**(72)**	**(100)**	**(124)**
Logistics, freight, documentation & port handling	(52)	(74)	(96)
Admin, finance, legal & trade compliance	(54)	(66)	(78)
Supplier development — testing, advisory & premium administration	**(32)**	**(44)**	**(54)**
Marketing, buyer relations & certification	(28)	(35)	(41)
EBITDA	**85**	**387**	**702**
Depreciation & amortisation	(38)	(54)	(68)
Finance cost — packing credit and working capital	**(92)**	**(156)**	**(218)**
Other income — drawback, RoDTEP & forward-cover gains *(disclosed)*	34	62	96
PBT	**(11)**	**239**	**512**
Tax	3	(60)	(128)
PAT	**(8)**	**179**	**384**
Net margin	**(0.3%)**	**2.8%**	**4.0%**
ROCE	**2.0%**	**13.9%**	**26.4%**

> **Cost of goods at 86.8% of revenue is the shape of a trading business: the house buys almost everything it sells and adds a thin layer of consolidation, testing and documentation on top. Finance cost at ₹2.18 crore is 57% of profit, which is what ₹14.86 crore of working capital costs when the cycle runs from an advance to a farmer through a container on the water to a realisation ninety days later. The three commitment lines total ₹3.46 crore, 3.6% of revenue — a very large number against a 13.2% gross margin, and the plan does not pretend it is comfortable. Other income of ₹96 lakh is duty drawback, RoDTEP and forward-cover gains, disclosed as a line and 1.0% of revenue. Commitments of ₹5.38 crore against ₹3.84 crore of profit — ₹3.46 crore of opex above plus ₹1.92 crore of gross profit forgone on destroyed lots, which never reaches the P&L — mean a trade-standard house would earn ₹9.22 crore.**

12.5 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹96.0cr	₹3.84cr	As modelled, pond-level traceability, nil re-routing
Trade-standard — agent sourcing, buyer-minimum panel, rejects re-routed	₹111.4cr	₹9.37cr	**The trade's model, computed rather than dismissed**

Rupee appreciates 6%	₹90.7cr	(₹0.13cr)	**Dollar revenue, rupee cost; 4% margin absorbs little**
Raw-material prices rise 10%	₹96.0cr	₹0.09cr	86.8% of revenue; only partly passed through
Anti-dumping duty of 5% on Indian shrimp	₹96.0cr	₹1.54cr	**Levied on the country; compliance does not exempt us**
A US import alert halts one quarter of US/EU volume	₹85.4cr	₹2.42cr	Establishment listing is a single point of failure

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Working capital / packing credit	1,200	Against confirmed orders and LCs; revolving per shipment
Term loan	560	Cold store, laboratory, systems; 6 years
Investor equity	440	Traceability build and supplier fund; records covenant
Promoter contribution	200	Cash and export-trade leadership
Total	**2,400**	Illustrative structure

> **A lender should read ponds documented, detentions, years of retrievable records and the destruction figure, and should note one unusual feature of this credit: THE LARGEST SINGLE RISK IS ONE THE BORROWER CANNOT REDUCE BY BEHAVING WELL. A 5% anti-dumping duty takes profit to ₹1.54 crore and would fall identically on a house that tested nothing — so diligence here buys individual-rate eligibility and buyer retention, not exemption, and a lender who models it as exemption will be disappointed. The starkest figure is that agent sourcing, a buyer-minimum panel and routine re-routing of rejects would take profit from ₹3.84 crore to ₹9.37 crore on the same buyers and the same suppliers, with every step lawful. The sharpest exposure is currency: a 6% rupee appreciation produces a ₹0.13 crore loss, because revenue is in dollars, cost is in rupees and a 4.0% net margin absorbs almost nothing — forward cover is a survival tool here rather than a treasury preference. Finance cost at 57% of profit means working-capital pricing is the second lever, ahead of almost any commercial negotiation.**

- **Use of funds** — 62% working capital, 14% cold store and consolidation, 11% traceability system and laboratory, 6% documentation systems, 4% supplier development fund, 2% registrations, 1% pre-operative.
- **Repayment** — packing credit revolving per shipment against LCs; term loan from Year 2 cash flow.
- **Investor exit** — sale to an integrated seafood group, a global trading house or a processor integrating forward; or promoter buyback. **The traceability, origin-testing and no-re-routing commitments survive change of control.**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation

The penalty is levied on the country and the compliance is paid for by the firm	EVERY MEANINGFUL PENALTY IN THIS TRADE IS IMPOSED AT A LEVEL ABOVE THE FIRM: an anti-dumping duty falls on INDIAN SHRIMP; an import alert names a COUNTRY AND A SPECIES; a European retailer that has had one bad experience SWITCHES ORIGIN RATHER THAN SUPPLIER. NONE OF THESE INSTRUMENTS DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN THE HOUSE THAT TESTED EVERY POND AND THE HOUSE THAT TESTED NONE — THEY ARRIVE AT THE SAME BORDER ON THE SAME DAY AT THE SAME RATE. Meanwhile every cost of compliance is borne INDIVIDUALLY, IMMEDIATELY AND IN FULL. THE REGULATORY UNIT IS THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE UNIT IS THE FIRM, AND THE ENTIRE INCENTIVE TO COMPLY LEAKS OUT THROUGH THE GAP BETWEEN THEM. This is the SHARED-WATER PROBLEM OF THE POND PLANS TRANSPOSED INTO A SHARED REPUTATION: there, one farmer's discharge entered a creek and arrived at his neighbour's intake untraceably; here, one exporter's residue failure enters the trade statistics and arrives at every other exporter's tariff line — EQUALLY UNTRACEABLE, BECAUSE A DUTY ORDER DOES NOT NAME THE CONSIGNMENT THAT CAUSED IT. And it produces the same perverse arithmetic: the exporter who spends ₹5.38cr and the one who spends nothing FACE THE SAME PROBABILITY OF A COUNTRY-LEVEL ACTION, because that probability is set by the aggregate and NEITHER CAN MOVE IT ALONE. A RATIONAL PARTICIPANT LOOKING ONLY AT TRADE-REMEDY RISK WOULD SPEND NOTHING, AND HE WOULD BE RIGHT	**THERE IS EXACTLY ONE ESCAPE AND IT IS DOCUMENTARY RATHER THAN BEHAVIOURAL. TRADE-REMEDY PROCEEDINGS GRANT INDIVIDUAL RATES to respondents who can document costs and sourcing to the authority's standard — THE ONE PLACE IN THIS STRUCTURE WHERE A FIRM'S CONDUCT IS SEPARABLE FROM THE COUNTRY'S. Most Indian exporters cannot meet it and receive the all-others rate BY DEFAULT, NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE FOUND WANTING BUT BECAUSE THEY HAD NOTHING TO FILE → INDIVIDUAL-RATE DOCUMENTATION MAINTAINED CONTINUOUSLY (100%), pond-to-container chain reconstructable for ANY PAST SHIPMENT, three years retrievable within 30 days. THE TIMING IS THE WHOLE POINT: RECORDS ASSEMBLED AFTER AN INITIATION NOTICE ARE EXACTLY THE RECORDS A REVIEWING AUTHORITY DISCOUNTS, AND BY THEN THE PERIOD UNDER INVESTIGATION IS ALREADY HISTORY. 1,840 PONDS NAMED, TESTED AND DOCUMENTED, field officers VISITING AND SAMPLING rather than collecting a form, at ₹1.68cr a year — WHICH BUYS NOTHING WHATEVER UNTIL THE YEAR IT BUYS EVERYTHING. GENERAL RULE: WHERE THE PENALTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE IS PAID FOR BY THE FIRM, NO FIRM CAN BUY ITS WAY OUT OF ANOTHER'S FAILURE — SO BUY THE ONE THING THAT IS SEPARABLY YOURS: A NAMED, TESTED, DOCUMENTED POND**
The audit certifies the wrong link	An importer's audit walks the floors, reads the HACCP file, checks chill-room temperatures and reviews the pest-control log — ALL COMPETENT, ALL NECESSARY, AND ALL CONCERNING THE MOST VISIBLE, MOST CAPITAL-INTENSIVE AND MOST EASILY IMPROVED LINK IN THE CHAIN. He does not visit the pond where an antibiotic decision was taken eleven weeks earlier by a farmer he will never meet, BECAUSE THE POND IS NOT THE AUDITEE. SO THE AUDITED LINK IS SYSTEMATICALLY THE ONE LEAST LIKELY TO BE THE PROBLEM, PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS THE ONE BEING AUDITED — ATTENTION IMPROVES WHAT IT LANDS ON, AND IT HAS LANDED ON ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THIRTY YEARS. A SPOTLESS ESTABLISHMENT CERTIFICATE IS FULLY COMPATIBLE WITH A SUPPLY BASE NOBODY HAS EVER SEEN, AND BOTH THE AUDITOR AND THE EXPORTER KNOW IT	**TESTING AT ORIGIN BEFORE CONSOLIDATION (100%) on a PANEL WIDER THAN ANY BUYER REQUIRES, NIL shipped on the contract minimum alone, detentions 4 → NIL. TESTING AFTER CONSOLIDATION IS CLOSE TO USELESS FOR ATTRIBUTION: ONCE FORTY FARMS ARE IN ONE CONTAINER, A POSITIVE RESULT CONDEMNS THE CONTAINER AND IDENTIFIES NOBODY. Results held against the POND, not only against the lot (₹1.24cr)**

A rejected consignment has to go somewhere	A container refused at Rotterdam DOES NOT CEASE TO EXIST: it can lawfully be RE-ROUTED TO A MARKET WHOSE PANEL DOES NOT TEST FOR WHATEVER IT FAILED ON, or brought home and sold domestically. THIS IS THE PROCESSING PLAN'S FINDING SEEN FROM THE OTHER END OF THE CHAIN — THE SAME SORTING, PERFORMED AT SEA RATHER THAN AT A SORTING TABLE, WITH A BILL OF LADING INSTEAD OF A CONVEYOR. And it is the ordinary way the trade recovers a failed shipment; NOBODY REGARDS IT AS CONCEALMENT, BECAUSE THE SECOND MARKET'S STANDARD IS GENUINELY MET	**FAILED LOTS DESTROYED (100%), NIL re-routed to a thinner-panel market and NIL diverted domestically, forgoing ₹1.92cr — and DESTRUCTION AUTHORISED OUTSIDE THE TRADING DESK, BECAUSE A FAILED CONTAINER ALWAYS HAS A BUYER IN SOME MARKET AT SOME PRICE AND THE DESK EXISTS TO FIND BUYERS. Supplier informed, shown the result, pond suspended pending re-test**
The cost of proving a farm is clean is deducted from the farmer	The trade tests and RECOVERS THE COST IN THE PRICE IT OFFERS, so the farmer pays to demonstrate his own innocence — and A FARMER CLOSE TO THE MARGIN DECLINES THE TEST AND SELLS TO SOMEONE WHO DOES NOT ASK. THE TESTING REGIME THEREFORE SELECTS AGAINST EXACTLY THE FARMS MOST WORTH TESTING	**SUPPLIER TESTING AND ADVISORY PAID FOR BY US (100%), NIL recovered from the farmer's price, free seed PCR and residue testing extended to 620 FARMS, and a PREMIUM OF ₹7 PER KILO FOR A DOCUMENTED CLEAN POND — WHICH IS THE MECHANISM, SINCE A PREMIUM REACHES THE FARMER AND AN EXHORTATION DOES NOT (₹54L)**
The hinge — under-disclosure rather than concealment	A 26-tonne container detained on residue, traced in two days to ONE POND AMONG THE 47 THAT FED IT, worth ₹1.95cr, in a quarter with two buyer audits running. The temptation IS NOT TO CONCEAL BUT TO UNDER-DISCLOSE: report the detention, replace the container, and SAY NOTHING ABOUT THE MARGINAL RESULT THAT POND RETURNED THREE MONTHS EARLIER AND THAT WE ACCEPTED. NOBODY WOULD EVER KNOW, THE BUYER IS SATISFIED, AND VOLUNTEERING IT CONVERTS A RESOLVED INCIDENT INTO A DOCUMENTED PATTERN	**BUT A PATTERN IS PRECISELY WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL-RATE FILE IS MADE OF: A RECORD SHOWING ONLY CLEAN RESULTS IS WORTH LESS TO A REVIEWING AUTHORITY THAN ONE SHOWING FAILURES FOUND, ACTED ON AND FOLLOWED UP, BECAUSE THE FIRST LOOKS LIKE A SYSTEM THAT DOES NOT DETECT ANYTHING. The earlier marginal result disclosed, the acceptance recorded as an error with its reason, the pond suspended, the supplier retained on a re-test protocol. Nil pay linked to shipped volume or detention count**
The exporter is the party without information	The farmer knows what he put in the pond, the agent knows which farms he aggregated, the processor knows what reached his dock — the exporter knows none of it AND SIGNS FOR ALL OF IT, guaranteeing facts he has no means of establishing	Which is why the industry's standard response is dilution rather than diligence — spread across many suppliers, keep no usable records, treat rejection as a cost; and why becoming individually documentable is the only exit, at ₹5.38cr, protecting nobody else and working only for the firm that pays
Currency, working capital and raw material	A 6% rupee appreciation is a ₹0.13cr loss on a 4.0% margin; raw material is 86.8% of revenue so a 10% rise leaves ₹0.09cr; finance cost is 57% of profit	Forward cover treated as survival rather than treasury preference; buyer mix across five markets so one tariff action is not the year; traceability services at 44% margin as non-trading income; and packing-credit pricing negotiated as a primary commercial lever rather than a banking detail

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
• 1,840 ponds named, tested and documented • Individual-rate file maintained continuously, three years deep • Origin testing on a wider panel than any contract • Failed lots destroyed — nil re-routed, nil diverted • Supplier testing paid by us; ₹7/kg clean-pond premium	• ₹5.38cr forgone against ₹3.84cr of profit • Largest risk cannot be reduced by behaving well • 4.0% margin; 6% currency move erases the year • Finance cost 57% of profit; ₹14.86cr working capital
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Buyers who have already had a traceability incident • Individual-rate eligibility in any future action • Traceability sold to competing exporters at margin • Value-added and retail-pack margin expansion • Any mandatory pond-level rule would favour us	• Country-level duties and import alerts • Rupee appreciation against a thin margin • Agent-sourced rivals underpricing on documentation • Establishment listing as a single point of failure

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Pond register** — farmer, hatchery, stocking date, test results, visit log, per pond.
- **Origin test scheduler** — sampling before consolidation, results held against the pond.
- **Individual-rate file builder** — cost and sourcing records kept to authority standard, continuously.
- **Pond-to-container tracer** — reconstructs any past shipment within 24 hours.
- **Destruction authorisation** — routed outside the trading desk; re-routing blocked.
- **Clean-pond premium ledger** — ₹/kg paid, per farm, per cycle.
- **Detention and follow-up register** — failures found, acted on and closed, kept as evidence.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, tonnage, realisation, testing cost, destruction volumes, currency and finance cost are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on global demand, tariff actions, raw-material prices and exchange rates. Figures are in Indian rupees. **This plan inherits the ten fisheries anchor rules (a)–(j).**
- **The central finding is that the penalty is levied on the country and the compliance is paid for by the firm.** An anti-dumping duty falls on Indian shrimp; an import alert names a country and a species; a retailer switches origin rather than supplier. **None of these instruments distinguishes between the house that tested every pond and the house that tested none — they arrive at the same border on the same day at the same rate, while every cost of compliance is borne individually and in full.**
- **It is the shared-water problem of the pond plans transposed into a shared reputation.** One exporter's residue failure enters the trade statistics and arrives at every other exporter's tariff line, equally untraceably, because a duty order does not name the consignment that caused it. **So the exporter who spends ₹5.38 crore and the one who spends nothing face the same probability of a country-level action. A rational participant looking only at trade-remedy risk would spend nothing, and he would be right.**

- **There is exactly one escape and it is documentary rather than behavioural.** Trade-remedy proceedings grant individual rates to respondents who can document costs and sourcing to the authority's standard — the one place where a firm's conduct is separable from the country's. **Most Indian exporters receive the all-others rate by default, not because they were found wanting but because they had nothing to file.** Hence continuous records rather than assembled ones: **records produced after an initiation notice are exactly the records a reviewing authority discounts. WHERE THE PENALTY IS LEVIED ON THE COUNTRY AND THE COMPLIANCE IS PAID FOR BY THE FIRM, NO FIRM CAN BUY ITS WAY OUT OF ANOTHER'S FAILURE — SO BUY THE ONE THING THAT IS SEPARABLY YOURS: A NAMED, TESTED, DOCUMENTED POND.**
- **The buyer audit certifies the wrong link.** It inspects the processing establishment — the most visible, most capital-intensive and most easily improved part of the chain — and not the pond where the decision was taken. **So the audited link is systematically the one least likely to be the problem, precisely because it is the one being audited: attention improves what it lands on, and it has landed on establishments for thirty years.** Hence origin testing before consolidation, since once forty farms are in one container a positive result condemns the container and identifies nobody.
- **A rejected consignment has to go somewhere, and the cost of proving a farm is clean is normally deducted from the farmer.** Re-routing to a thinner-panel market is lawful and ordinary — the processing plan's finding seen from the other end of the chain. **And where the farmer pays for his own residue test, the marginal farmer declines it and sells to someone who does not ask, so the testing regime selects against exactly the farms most worth testing.** Hence destruction rather than re-routing, and a ₹7/kg premium that reaches the farmer where an exhortation would not.
- **The asymmetry runs in an unusual direction: the exporter is the party without information and also the party held liable.** The farmer knows what went into the pond, the agent knows what he aggregated, the processor knows what arrived — **the exporter knows none of it and signs for all of it, guaranteeing facts he has no means of establishing.** Which explains why the industry's standard response is dilution rather than diligence: spread wide, keep no usable records, treat rejection as a cost. **That response is entirely rational for a firm expecting to be judged collectively, and it is the precise behaviour that makes the collective judgement correct.**
- **Compliance and professional advice.** MPEDA registration and EIC pre-shipment inspection; EU and US establishment approval and the FDA import-alert regime, **under which a detention may be applied to a country, a species or a firm, and the firm-level escape requires evidence the firm has usually not kept**; anti-dumping and countervailing-duty proceedings, **where individual rates are available only to respondents who can document costs and sourcing to the authority's standard**; FEMA and RBI rules on export realisation and packing credit; Foreign Trade Policy and DGFT obligations including drawback and RoDTEP; FSSAI where product enters the domestic market; the CAA and banned-antimicrobial list applying upstream; and EPF, ESI and the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act for handling staff. **Every meaningful penalty is imposed at a level above the firm, and every meaningful defence must be assembled below it.** Professional advice should be taken on individual-rate documentation standards, destruction and duty-drawback interaction, forward-cover policy, and liability allocation between exporter, processor and supplier.

▶ 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.