

### Queries

S. No.	Query	Response
1.	While we have identified 3 districts viz Patan, Gandhinagar & Aravalli in our concept note we would now like to replace 2 districts viz Gandhinagar & Aravalli with Banaskantha & Sabarkanta as these districts have larger areas under cultivation for potato while the previous two i.e Gandhinagar & Aravalli have comparatively smaller areas. We observed that there are 2 other players who have opted Aravalli and Gandhinagar as their cluster under CDP scheme, hence, we would prefer to switch to Banaskantha and Sabarkantha wherein the potato production/area is much higher compared to Gandhinagar & Aravalli.	No, the change of districts is not allowed.
2.	We have proposed a 2200 kg/hr potato flakes plant (secondary processing) which forms a significant portion of our overall investment. We wanted to understand how much subsidy support we would get against the said component under the CDP scheme from NHB.	Please refer to MOFPI cost norms.
3.	Our group companies Fanidhar Agrotech Pvt Ltd , Fanidhar Enterprises Pvt Ltd & Saptarishi Agro Industries Ltd who will now be stakeholders in FMFPPL will also procure potato for processing/exports. Please clarify if the potatoes procured by them for value addition shall be considered towards FGV. Also confirm if the potatoes utilised by us in our existing operations/infrastructure will be considered towards FGV.	Not Applicable
4.	Please clarify if the Tissue Culture plantlets G (0,1,2) potato that we will procure from Punjab or use for multiplication in Punjab will be included for support/assistance under farmer component.	No. Multiplication in Punjab is not allowed for cluster in Gujarat
5.	How is the Farmers Financial Assistance Calculated and is there any upper limit to that like how we have it for the IA Financial Assistance.	Based on the eligible farmer component mentioned in revised guidelines on Page No.22, Table 2 and MIDH/NHB norms. There is no upper limit of financial assistance for farmer

		component, but it has to be in tune with the project.
6.	Do you want us to follow the DPR Template outlined in the Revised Guidelines for CDP published on Apr, 8th, 2025.	Yes, however this is an indicative template. If the applicant has other relevant details to provide, it can add to make the DPR more comprehensive and bankable.
7.	Any Checklist for the DPR Like How you provided a Checklist for the Concept Note, if you can provide us for the DPR that will be good to have. The List of Mandatory Documents that we need to produce along with the DPR will help	Please refer to DPR template under the revised guidelines (Page No. 101)
8.	There are four firms in Aterna Agro Alliance and all four firms have their own processing units. Among them 2 FPOs have their own building and want to install new machinery in them. Does your NHB-CDP scheme allow the partnership firm to install new machines without the construction of new buildings.	No. The assistance under the Scheme is only for greenfield projects
9.	Under the APEDA scheme, there is a subsidy of 75% for installation of Pack House in land lock state. Can the same be availed under the CDP-NHB scheme.	35%. As per MIDH/NHB guidelines
10.	A timeline of 45 days has been provided for confirmation and submission of DPR which is very less. A deadline of at least 90 days should be provided and the NHB-CDB scheme should be linked up with banks.	Kindly refer to the timeline under the revised CDP guidelines.
11.	<p>The cost norm for Integrated Post-Harvest Management (PHM) units is ₹145 lakh/project. However, it is also stated that: “Add-on components of pre-cooling, pack house, grading, packing, and cold room can be taken up as individual components.”</p> <p>Query: Does this mean that each component (e.g., a standalone packhouse or ripening chamber) can independently claim up to ₹145 lakh under the Integrated PHM head? Or is the ₹145 lakh the cumulative cap for the entire PHM project, regardless of number of components?</p>	<p>Please refer to cost norms of MIDH Annexure V. Component wise assistance can be availed.</p>
12.	Cold storage norms (₹6800–₹9500/MT) are detailed separately in the EOI, and subsidy limits are provided independently of Integrated PHM.	The cold storage norms are separately available under the scheme guidelines.

	<p>Query: Are Cold Storage Units (Type 1 &amp; 2) to be included within the ₹145 lakh limit under Post-Harvest &amp; Value Addition in Section (f)? Or can they be shown as separate standalone components under a different subsidy head — and if so, how should they be reflected in Section (f) and Section (h.a) of the DPR?</p>	
<b>13.</b>	<p>Section (f) of Annexure 3 asks for proposed components and interventions under NHB's three verticals (Pre-production, Post-Harvest, Logistics &amp; Branding), whereas Section (h.a) asks for a cost breakup under financial heads (e.g., Civil Work, P&amp;M, Utilities).</p> <p>Query: How should we reconcile and align broad vertical-based interventions in Section (f) with the financial / accounting heads in Section (h.a)? Is there a mapping framework or illustrative example available for reference?</p>	<p>The component wise cost under the various verticals should get totalled in the Project Cost and reconciled.</p>
<b>14.</b>	<p>Section (h.a) of the DPR template requires disclosure of the Total Project Cost, broken down by cost heads. However, in Section (f), interventions span across all three NHB verticals — including several non-capex and non-subsidizable components (e.g., services, branding, soft infra, working capital).</p> <p>Query: How is “Total Project Cost” defined for the purpose of DPR preparation? Does it mean: a) Only the eligible components that are covered under NHB/MIDH cost norms (and qualify for subsidy)? Or b) The entire project outlay, including both eligible and non-eligible components, across all three verticals — such as: • Farmer mobilization and capacity building</p>	<p>Total Project Cost is sum of all Components that are being proposed under the project based on quotations and CE certificates. The entire project outlay, including both eligible and non-eligible components, across all three verticals. This is sum of component wise cost under both IA and Farmers Component.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working capital margin for procurement / operations</li> <li>• Traceability systems, QR code generation, e-commerce portals</li> <li>• Branding, marketing collateral, packaging design</li> <li>• Market linkage facilitation and trade fair participation</li> <li>• Civil structures like admin blocks or display centers</li> </ul> <p>If (b), should the ineligible components still be included in the total cost and means of finance (e.g., shown as equity), while the grant/subsidy calculation is applied only on the eligible portion?</p>	Yes
15.	<p>Annexure 1 of the EOI lists "Site Development" as a non-eligible component for grant / subsidy support under the scheme.</p> <p>At the same time, Technical Civil Work (e.g., for packhouses, cold storage, ripening chamber, etc.) appears to be an essential part of infrastructure creation.</p> <p>Query: We seek clarification on the following:</p> <p>a) Does "Site Development" (as ineligible) refer only to activities such as land levelling, fencing, boundary walls, internal roads, etc.?</p> <p>b) Is the construction or expansion of packhouses, processing sheds, ripening chambers, or cold rooms (i.e., civil structures directly required for functional infrastructure) considered eligible under the Technical Civil Work head?</p>	Please refer the revised guidelines

	<p>c) What is the difference between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Development (ineligible)</li> <li>• Technical Civil Work (eligible)</li> </ul> <p>Other Civil Work (ambiguous — is it eligible or not?)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>This is typically considered under non-technical civil works</p> <p>These are civil works like administrative building, creche for workers etc. (Falls under ineligible list)</p>
<b>16.</b>	<p>The DPR format and cost norms refer to “basic cost as per quotation” for infrastructure and machinery.</p> <p>Query:</p> <p>Are applicants required to provide actual vendor quotations and Chartered Engineer-certified BOQs for each proposed component in the DPR?</p> <p>Or is it permissible to use reasonable internal estimates, provided cost norms are adhered to, and detailed costing is available?</p> <p>Please confirm what level of documentation is expected at the DPR stage (vs. post-approval).</p>	<p>Yes. Actual Vendor Quotations and Chartered Engineer certificate for each proposed component in the DPR</p>
<b>17.</b>	<p>How and when farmer will get reimbursement for input purchase (Example Seedling, Machinery, etc) among the following options and what are the documents needed to be submitted</p> <p>a. Case 1 - Farmer pay 100% to nursery and request reimbursement</p> <p>b. Case 2 - Nursery give credit and nursery will claim reimbursement</p>	<p>The funds for the Farmer's Component are disbursed directly to the vendor on the lines of Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) through the CDP Suraksha Portal, which ensures efficient and timely financial transfers, thereby minimizing delays and enhancing transparency</p> <p>Approval for Release of Assistance: The release of assistance to farmer &amp; farmer's suppliers will be done in two equal tranches. The first shall require the approval of farmer and IA and the</p>

		second shall require the approval of SHM/NHB in addition to farmer and IA. This ensures that the disbursement is properly vetted and aligned with the project objectives
18.	What evidence is valid for showing experience in Pre-production and production relevant experience of > 1 crore.	Documents pertaining to financial transactions for purchases from farmers. Certificate from respective SHMs.
19.	For seed production unit is there any subsidy under CDP	As per applicable MIDH norms
20.	On salaries for Hr and other staff recruited for this project is there any subsidy or financial assistance from NHB.	No
21.	For value addition Infrastructure (Secondary Processing Unit mentioned in page 72 of revised MIDH guidelines) only 1 crore per unit is permitted. Is there any better scheme for the same.	The cost norms of the extant schemes including but not limited to MIDH, NHB, MoFPI and MoA&FW.
22.	Please suggest any relevant scheme is there for Drones	Central sector component IA: 40% of cost maximum upto 4 lacs as per SMAM guidelines.
23.	For Demonstration machinery there is subsidy mentioned for public sector. Please clarify for FPO is there any subsidy for demonstration machinery.	Only applicable for public sector.
24.	There are lot of schemes for different components of farmer. Is there any limit of subsidy amount under different schemes for a single farmer or per acre or per	The cost norms of the extant schemes including but not limited to MIDH, NHB, MoFPI and MoA&FW.
25.	The current marking linking turnover requirements to project cost are limiting opportunities for small-sized enterprises like us. We respectfully request that this turnover marking criterion be relaxed. This adjustment would allow smaller companies with innovative ideas and solid business cases to contribute significantly to the project's success Additionally, we believe that by allowing more flexible criteria, the project could benefit from a diverse range of participants, bringing fresh perspectives and creative solutions. This would not only enhance the overall quality of the project	No change

	but also promote inclusivity and equal opportunity for all enterprises, regardless of their size. We are confident that such changes will foster a more competitive and dynamic environment, ultimately leading to better outcomes for everyone involved.	
26.	<p>We approach this project with a strategic vision to develop and expand the export of the focus crop, pepper, over the next five years. Therefore, we respectfully request that the marking criteria be relaxed, as we share this forward-looking vision and may not have significant export experience in previous years.</p> <p>Allowing more flexible criteria would reflect a commitment to equitable opportunities, ensuring that all enterprises, irrespective of their size, have a fair chance to participate and succeed. We firmly believe that such changes will ultimately lead to better outcomes for everyone involved, driving innovation and excellence in the project's execution.</p>	No change
27.	<p>What documentation is required to substantiate the costs associated with the farmer's component?</p> <p>We seek your guidance on the documentation necessary to substantiate the costs associated with the farmer's component. It is essential for us to have a clear understanding of the required paperwork to ensure a thorough and streamlined submission process.</p>	MOUs/ letter of association (to be converted to MOUs) with the Farmers/ FPOs/ Farmer collectives/ Cooperatives etc.
28.	<p>We referred the relevant clause no.7.2 at Page no. 15 of Operational Guidelines of Cluster development Programme published in October 2021 states that –</p> <p><i>“A maximum of 40% of the total financial assistance can be utilized within a single vertical based on the requirement of the Cluster as indicated in the Cluster Gap Assessment. This limit may be relaxed in case of an integrated project by a single Implementing Agency.”</i></p> <p>We understand that the said clause to be considered at the stage where vertical-wise implementing agency is selected.</p>	<p>The farmer components shall be minimum 40% of the total project cost.</p> <p>Applicable to both Part A and Part B.</p>

	<p>Hence, may please clarify the applicability of clause of minimum 40% of project cost for the farmer component shall also be applicable to part A (Multi Commodity high value clusters) of the guidelines.</p> <p>Further, in our case/ business model which has been designed as an integrated farm-to-market ecosystem without segmenting the verticals. Our model deliberately avoids financial, infrastructural, or land-based contribution from farmers. Instead, we provide holistic support to over 11,400 farmers (covering 80% of the cluster), including access to inputs, technology, training, post-harvest infrastructure, and assured market linkage—without expecting any investment or asset transfer from them. This allows us to integrate small and marginal farmers as core beneficiaries without placing financial burden on them.</p> <p>In light of the above, we humbly request that our interpretation be considered and the absence of a conventionally defined “farmer component” be accepted as compliant with the spirit and intent of the CDP, given the inclusive and farmer-centric nature of our model.</p>	<p>There should be formal linkage with the farmers in the form of signed MOUs/ Letter of intent (to be converted to MOU)</p>
29.	<p>While Trident Agrocom has a strong track record of exports across multiple countries over the past five years, we are bound by confidentiality agreements with our international buyers, which restrict us from disclosing their names.</p> <p>However, to ensure transparency and credibility, we are willing to furnish invoices, shipping bills, and other consignment-related documents as authentic proof of our export activities.</p> <p>We sincerely request that our submission be considered adequate in view of the confidentiality sensitivities involved in international trade, and that will be permitted to maintain the privacy of our clients while still substantiating our export credentials.</p>	<p>Please provide us summary of the exported amount and countries supported by invoices, shipping bills, copies of relevant agreement,</p>



	<p>Copies of relevant agreements and proof of ongoing operations may be shared.</p> <p>Request you to kindly suggest on submission of relevant documentary evidence in this matter.</p>	
<b>30.</b>	<p>Trident Agrocom currently operates through an asset-light model wherein critical infrastructures such as packhouses, cold chain systems, and logistics is accessed through rental and lease agreements. As these assets are not owned by the company, they are not reflected in the equity component of the Implementing Agency.</p> <p>This strategic approach allows for rapid scalability while minimizing upfront capital investments. We request that this model be considered as a viable and cost-efficient operational framework, and our approach may kindly be accepted while evaluating the infrastructure contribution under the CDP.</p>	Not applicable
<b>31.</b>	Land tie-up and land acquisition documents cut of date? Which one & possible extensions and circumstances under which they are allowed.	As per the scheme guidelines, land should be on the name of the applicant. In case of leased land, period of lease should be not less than 15 years on the name of the applicant only. It should be submitted with the DPR/business case. In case there is a requirement of Change of land use (CLU) that also needs to be provided with the DPR/business case.
<b>32.</b>	Bank funding tie-up letter of sanction cutoff date if any and potential upper limits for extension to submit as we will need some more time to execute ( Bank processing time, other parties and approvals etc )	Letter of sanction should be submitted along with the DPR/business case.
<b>33.</b>	Which are the components to get highest Grant as % of spending by applicant IA	Please refer to the guidelines.
<b>34.</b>	How do we get more time lines and extension for next set of activities and submissions etc to make things ready in a much better ways AND To ensure we have full & proper blueprint?	Please refer the timelines given in the scheme guidelines.
<b>35.</b>	How do we get 100 cr [ upper limit of Grant ]or maximum possible grant based on merits of the project, right plans and right allocations of projects components etc?	Please refer to the guidelines and extant schemes of MIDH/NHB/APEDA/MoFPI etc.

	What we should do means Focus more on were government wants IA to execute?	
36.	Income tax implications, interest costs subvention/GST modvat etc understanding is required as what procedures and Guidelines?!	Not Applicable
37.	Electricity costs related subsidy understanding required for different components	Not Applicable
38.	Equity Capital as % of project execution and Debt as % of execution vs Grant funds flow of execution and priorities etc requirements/process/modus operandi. What precautions and rules ?	Minimum 20% of IA component each for equity and term loan.
39.	When are the next sessions or set of meetings to educate stakeholders on draft schemes guidelines etc and we request you for considering us for some more sessions on understanding guidelines as we had missed earlier meetings etc	Will be informed from time to time.
40.	If there are 6-7 different locations , land parcels and connecting related activities are outside the particular district to complete the project and to integrate the solution, how much time is provided for submissions of Documents etc?	Please submit all the documents along with the DPR / business case
41.	Can we get one Single POC for interactions on queries	Please contact: 1. Pawan Kumar, (Deputy Director) 2. Ravindra Dangi, (Deputy Director) Email - clusters.nhb@gov.in
42.	As per the trail mail, farmer components shall be minimum 40% of the total project cost.-- So for our selected project i.e. Gujcomasol - Multicommodity Cluster Development Project with Mango as focus crop; with total project cost of Rs. 236.53; please clarify that the farmer component shall be more than Rs. 95 Lacs and that also for Pre Production component only?	The farmer components shall be minimum 40% of the total project cost.
43.	Also request you to clarify who will incur the cost for farmer component? To whom the grant for same will be disbursed?	NHB will disburse the subsidy directly to the farmers/ farmer vendors on DBT mode.
44.	If the cost will be incurred by IA; how project stands viable from angel of IA?	Not Applicable.
45.	We seek clarity on whether the total project cost (including both eligible and non-eligible components under CDP) — covering both Farmer and IA portions — can exceed the IA's revenue from the previous financial year, especially when	No.

	<p>ineligible costs (such as land, site development, admin buildings, etc.) are fully funded by the IA through equity or loans without claiming subsidy and we confirm that the total eligible cost (i.e., the portion on which subsidy is eligible) does not exceed the company's topline for the previous financial year.</p> <p>Also, please confirm if such ineligible costs can still be included in the DPR for submission to banks for loan appraisal, even though they are not eligible for subsidy under the scheme.</p>	Yes.
46.	<p>We seek clarification on whether we can submit an in-principle approval for the IA's debt component by 31st July 2025, with the option to submit the final bank sanction letter subsequently within a specified timeline from the same bank given that the amounts need to be approved by higher (ED/ CMD) authority.</p>	The applicant needs to submit the final sanction letter for the term loan from the bank along with the DPR /business case.
47.	<p>In certain components under MIDH guidelines, subsidies are capped for specific quantities or units—for example, in the case of air circulation fans in polyhouses, the subsidy is limited to ₹5,000 per fan for a maximum of 6 fans per 2,500 sq.m. per beneficiary. While we understand and accept the subsidy limits, we wish to clarify whether we can still include a higher quantity of such components (with the additional cost fully funded through equity or bank loans without subsidy) in the DPR/project cost submitted to NHB and banks.</p> <p>This query is not limited to circulation fans but applies broadly to other components as well where we may need to go beyond the subsidy-capped limits for operational or technical reasons.</p>	As per the cost norms of the extant scheme under MIDH/NHB/APEDA/MoFPI etc.
48.	<p>The cost of Ghost pepper seeds is very costly, about Rs. 40,000/Kg for King Chili. Can we consider this for the 632.81 hectares covering all the four proposed FPCs</p>	Please refer the cost norms of the extant schemes including but not limited to MIDH, NHB, MoFPI and MoA&FW.
49.	<p>Inputs for INM and IPM and those of GAP seems are similar e.g. quality seeds, fertilizers, pesticides.</p>	Please refer the scheme guidelines.
50.	<p>Cost of farm machinery at the farmers/collective level should be</p>	Please refer the cost norms of the extant schemes including but not limited to MIDH, NHB, MoFPI and MoA&FW.

	considered as per market price or those indicated under the SMAM norms.	
51.	If we consider fertilizer/pesticide, etc. under INM and IPM, what components cost can we consider under GAP.	Please refer the scheme guidelines. Also, chemical fertilizers are not eligible under the scheme guidelines.
52.	As per revised guideline the farmer component will be atleast 40% of the total project cost, whether this will be applicable for this DPR also.	Yes.
53.	The cost of establishment of a Primary Processing Centre for Ghost Peppers is costly as looking at the quantity of harvest, we have to dry about 8-9 tons of this produce per day and demands continuous chili dryers. But MIDH guidelines estimate for such a unit is Rs. 35 lakh out of which 50% subsidy is mentioned for the NER. Can we go for higher cost for establishment of a Primary processing Centre for each FPC? Will the subsidy be confined to Rs. 17.5 lakh/unit?	Please refer the cost norms of the extant schemes including but not limited to MIDH, NHB, MoFPI and MoA&FW.
54.	TRIBAC is in collaboration with APEDA and recognizes the importance of export markets but lacks direct export experience due to grassroots-level limitations. They request flexibility in eligibility to build capacity gradually without disqualification. They also seek guidance on required documentation.	All the supporting documents should be provided along with the DPR / business case.
55.	Same as above – flexibility requested due to limited infrastructure and external trade access. Clarification needed on acceptable evidence for evaluation.	All the supporting documents should be provided along with the DPR / business case.
56.	Clarification sought on whether only projects with formal contracts/work orders are eligible, or if internally funded initiatives with clear outcomes can also qualify, especially in areas like Manipur where formal contracting is often unfeasible.	All the supporting documents should be provided along with the DPR / business case.
57.	TRIBAC implies the same concern—seeking recognition for internally documented efforts due to challenges in formalizing large-scale external projects.	All the supporting documents should be provided along with the DPR / business case.
58.	Clarification requested on including internally supported branding, logistics, or marketing initiatives as valid experience. TRIBAC stresses that such	Please refer the scheme guidelines.

	activities are vital to promoting horticulture and enhancing market access in remote tribal areas.	
--	--	--