

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE. The supplier, the buyer and every finding below are invented to show the structure of a Velkor assessment. No company named here exists. Nothing in it is a statement about any real business.

SUPPLIER ASSESSMENT

Ponvelan Knitwear Private Limited

Prepared for	Aldergate Apparel BV, Rotterdam — Sourcing Manager
Assessment reference	VLK-SAMPLE-02
Supplier as quoted	Ponvelan Knitwear Private Limited
Registered entity	Ponvelan Knitwear Private Limited
Report issued	19 September 2026
Carried out by	Tanmay Mene, Velkor Ventures

SCOPE OF THIS ASSESSMENT

This assessment covered:

A desk review only. The public registers were searched, the documents the supplier provided were read and checked, structured questions were put to the supplier by email and on two calls, and one document was obtained from the supplier at the buyer's request. The requirement assessed was 12,000 cotton jersey t-shirts to the buyer's specification, described by the supplier as certified organic cotton, for delivery into the Netherlands.

This assessment did not cover:

A site visit. No premises were seen, so nothing in this report establishes what is at the address, what equipment exists, or who works there. Laboratory testing of fabric or finished goods. Financial standing, solvency and credit history. The stitching units referred to at checkpoint 02, which were neither named nor visited. Working conditions at any site.

How to read this report

Every checkpoint below is recorded the same way: what the supplier claimed, where that claim came from, what was done to test it, what was found, and what it means for your decision. A finding never appears without the evidence it rests on.

Nothing here is scored. There is no overall rating, no grade and no recommendation, because a single number would hide exactly the detail you are paying to see. Each checkpoint carries one of four states:

VERIFIED	The evidence supports the claim.
PARTIALLY VERIFIED	Some evidence supports it, and relevant gaps remain.
NOT VERIFIED	The available evidence does not establish the claim.
OPEN QUESTION	There is not enough evidence to reach a conclusion. This is not a negative finding.

An open question is not a warning. It means the evidence available did not settle the point, and it is written down rather than quietly resolved in either direction.

What this report is not

It is an assessment of what could be established at the dates shown, from the sources shown. It is not a guarantee of performance, not a certification, and not a substitute for inspection of goods before shipment. A supplier that assesses well can still miss a delivery.

Summary

The position on each checkpoint. Detail follows.

	CHECKPOINT	STATUS	IN ONE LINE
01	Identity	VERIFIED	Company, GST, IEC and council registration all return the same name at the same address.
02	Capability	OPEN QUESTION	Not established either way. No premises were seen, and the photographs carry no date or location.
03	Documentation	NOT VERIFIED	The scope certificate expires before the shipment window, and its licence number is not in the public database.
04	Commercial Fit	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	Terms fit. The price is FOB not CIF, and the schedule leaves no room for a re-make.
05	Export Capability	VERIFIED	Registered as a manufacturer exporter, and a shipping bill naming them as exporter was provided.
06	Risk	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	One claim failed, two questions went unanswered, and capability was outside the scope of this review.

OPEN QUESTIONS CARRIED FORWARD

1. Which stitching units will make this order, where are they, and are they part of the same company? The supplier describes stitching as being done by “associate units” and has not named them.
2. Is the organic cotton claim supported by a valid certificate covering this shipment? The certificate supplied does not (checkpoint 03), and the buyer's own retailer is likely to ask for one that does.
3. Does the quoted lead time survive the retailer's delivery window once sea transit and clearance are added? On the supplier's own numbers it is close.

Findings

01 Identity

Who is this company, legally and commercially?

Supplier's claim	"We are a private limited company in Tiruppur, manufacturing knitted garments for export."
Source of the claim	The supplier's profile document and quotation, 2 September.
What was checked	MCA/CIN search for the company, its incorporation date, directors and whether annual filings are current. GST taxpayer search and the declared nature of business. IEC. Export promotion council registration and the class registered under. The name and address on each compared against the quotation.
What was found	The company is registered with the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, is active, and its annual filings are current to the last financial year. The GST registration matches the company name and the address on the quotation, and its declared nature of business is manufacturing. An IEC exists against the same name. The firm is registered with the apparel export promotion council in the manufacturer exporter class, not as a merchant exporter. Every identifier checked returned the same name at the same address.
Status	VERIFIED
What this means for you	The buyer is dealing with a real, currently-filing company that is registered to manufacture and to export under its own name, at the address it gave. This is the cleanest checkpoint in this file. It says who they are. It says nothing yet about what they can make.

02 Capability

Can they actually produce what is being bought?

Supplier's claim	"Knitting, dyeing, cutting, stitching, printing and packing are handled by us and our associate units. Capacity 40,000 pieces per month."
Source of the claim	The supplier's profile document, and the call of 11 September.
What was checked	What could be established about premises, equipment and process without a site visit: the photographs and video the supplier provided, what the registers show about the scale of the unit, and what the supplier said when asked directly which stages happen under their own roof.

What was found	The supplier provided eleven photographs and a short video of a knitting and stitching floor. None of them can be dated, located or attributed from the files themselves. Asked which stages are carried out at the registered address, the supplier said knitting and finishing are in-house and that stitching is done by “associate units”. Asked to name those units, they said they would confirm and had not done so by the date of this report. The monthly capacity figure rests on the supplier's statement alone.
Status	OPEN QUESTION
What this means for you	This is an open question because of what this engagement covered, not because of anything the supplier did. A desk review cannot see inside a building. Nothing found here suggests the capability claim is false; nothing found here supports it either. If capability matters to this decision — and for a 12,000-piece order to a retailer's specification it usually does — the honest answer is that it takes a visit, and that this report is not one.

03 Documentation

Do the documents support what is claimed?

Supplier's claim	“Our cotton is certified organic. Certificate attached.” A scope certificate was supplied as a PDF.
Source of the claim	Email attachment from the supplier, 5 September.
What was checked	The certificate read for the certified entity, the scope of products covered, the validity dates and the issuing certification body. The licence number checked against the standard's own public database of certified operators. Whether a transaction certificate — which is what evidences a specific shipment, rather than the operator's general status — exists for this order.
What was found	The certificate names the supplier and a certification body that exists and is recognised by the standard. Two problems. Its validity period ends before the shipment window the supplier quoted, so even if everything else were in order it would not cover these goods. And the licence number printed on it returned no match in the standard's public database of certified operators, where a valid licence is normally findable. The supplier was asked about both points and said renewal was “in process”. No transaction certificate exists for this order, which is expected at this stage, since one is issued against a shipment.
Status	NOT VERIFIED
What this means for you	The organic claim is not established, and this is the one finding in this file that is negative rather than merely open. It is not an allegation of forgery and nothing here supports one. But an EU retailer selling these as organic will ask for a transaction certificate at the point of shipment, and on the present evidence there is no valid scope certificate for one to be issued against. That is a problem that surfaces late and lands on the importer.

04 Commercial Fit

Do the terms and the operation fit this requirement?

Supplier's claim	"MOQ 1,000 pieces per colour. Lead time 60 days from approved sample and receipt of advance. Price FOB Tuticorin. 30% advance, balance against documents."
Source of the claim	The quotation of 2 September.
What was checked	MOQ, pricing basis, payment terms and lead time against the buyer's actual requirement and the delivery date given to their own customer. Whether the order size is a reasonable fit for the scale claimed. What the quoted price does and does not include.
What was found	The MOQ is comfortably below the buyer's per-colour quantity. The order is a small share of the stated monthly capacity, so it is not a stretching order on the supplier's own numbers. The price is quoted FOB Tuticorin; the buyer had been comparing it against a CIF Rotterdam quotation from another supplier, so the two figures were not comparable as read. On lead time: 60 days from approved sample, plus sample approval, plus roughly three weeks' sea transit to Rotterdam, plus clearance, runs to within a few days of the buyer's own delivery commitment, with nothing left for a re-make if the first production check fails.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	The terms fit the order. Two things need correcting before a comparison or a commitment: the quotation is FOB, so ocean freight, insurance and destination charges sit on the buyer's side and were missing from the number being compared; and the schedule has no slack. The lead time is not wrong — it is tight, and it is tight in a way that only becomes visible once transit is added to it.

05 Export Capability

Can they support the intended export?

Supplier's claim	"We ship to the EU regularly, in our own name."
Source of the claim	The call of 11 September.
What was checked	Export registration and the class registered under. Evidence that consignments have actually moved. Who is named as exporter of record. Destination-market experience and documentation practice.
What was found	The IEC is active and the council registration is in the manufacturer exporter class, meaning the firm is registered to export what it makes rather than to export goods bought from others. Asked for evidence, the supplier provided a shipping bill from a previous consignment to an EU destination naming themselves as exporter. The document is consistent with the registrations and with the account they gave. One document is not a trading history, and no wider view of their record was obtained.
Status	VERIFIED

What this means for you	The supplier exports in its own name and has done so to the EU. The buyer would be contracting with the exporter of record rather than with a manufacturer standing behind one, which simplifies who is answerable if the export documentation is wrong. This checkpoint is verified because evidence was asked for and provided — which is worth noting, given checkpoint 02, where it was asked for and was not.
--------------------------------	--

06 Risk

What is unresolved, inconsistent, or worth watching?

Supplier's claim	—
Source of the claim	This checkpoint records what the assessment left unresolved. It is not a supplier claim.
What was checked	Discrepancies between sources, gaps that could not be closed, and anything the buyer should carry into the next stage of the decision.
What was found	The organic certificate does not support the claim made for it (03), and that is the finding a retailer is most likely to trip over. Stitching is subcontracted to units the supplier has not named, so a part of this order will be made somewhere nobody in this file has identified (02). Capability was never seen, because this engagement did not include a visit. The schedule is tight enough that a failed first production check leaves no recovery (04). Against all of that: identity is clean, the export position is solid, and the supplier answered most questions promptly and without evasion.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	This report makes no recommendation and does not say whether to proceed. It says that one claim did not hold up, that two questions were asked and not answered, and that one of those — who actually stitches the garments — is answerable in a single email. If the buyer wants one action out of this document, it is to ask for the names of the stitching units and a certificate valid for the shipment window, and to read what comes back before the advance is paid.

Site record

No site visit was carried out as part of this assessment. The findings above rest on register searches, documents and what was said, as recorded against each checkpoint.

This page is not removed when no visit took place. An absent section reads as an oversight; a stated absence reads as scope.

Limitations

This assessment reflects what could be established from the sources named against each finding. It carries the following limits:

- Public registers show what has been filed, which is not always what is current. A record is accurate as at the date it was searched.
- Documents supplied by the supplier have been read and checked for consistency and, where an issuing body is named, for the existence of that body. They have not been independently authenticated with every issuer unless stated against the finding.
- Where a site visit was carried out, it records what was observed on that day. An order book, a workforce and a production line all change.
- Nothing here establishes that goods will be produced to specification. That is settled by inspection of the goods themselves, before shipment, which is separate work at a separate time.
- Where a point could not be established, it is recorded as an open question. It should not be read as either a pass or a failure.

Issued by

The work recorded in this report was carried out by the person named below, who is available to talk through any finding in it.

Name	Tanmay Mene
Role	Founder, Velkor Ventures
Contact	admin@velkor.net · +91 92703 33636
Date	19 September 2026

Velkor Ventures · 42, Shastri Nagar, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India · GSTIN 27GPBPM6257R1ZZ · IEC GPBPM6257R

This report is prepared for the buyer named on the cover and is commissioned and paid for by that buyer. It is not prepared for, paid for, or shared with the supplier assessed.