

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

Ashvamitra Engineering Works

Prepared for	Harlow & Vance Ltd, Birmingham — Purchasing Manager
Assessment reference	VLK-SAMPLE-01
Supplier as quoted	Ashvamitra Engineering Works
Registered entity	Ashvamitra Enterprises (the entity on the GST registration — see checkpoint 01)
Report issued	29 August 2026
Carried out by	Tanmay Mene, Velkor Ventures

SCOPE OF THIS ASSESSMENT

This assessment covered:

A desk review of the public registers and of the documents the supplier provided, structured questions put to the supplier by email and on one call, and a site visit to the address given on the quotation. The requirement assessed was 8,000 pressed and welded stainless steel components per year for commercial kitchen equipment, to drawings supplied by the buyer.

This assessment did not cover:

Financial standing, solvency and credit history. Independent laboratory testing of any product or material. The premises of the subcontractor named at checkpoint 02, which were not visited. Any assessment of the supplier's conduct with other buyers.

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	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	The firm is real and registered, but the quoting name and the registered name differ and that is unresolved.
02	Capability	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	Pressing and welding were observed on site. Finishing is subcontracted, contrary to the claim made.
03	Documentation	NOT VERIFIED	The certificate's scope does not cover this product, and its accreditation body could not be found to exist.
04	Commercial Fit	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	Terms fit the requirement. The quoted price is ex-works, not FOB, which changes the comparison.
05	Export Capability	OPEN QUESTION	An IEC is active. Whether this firm has exported in its own name could not be established either way.
06	Risk	PARTIALLY VERIFIED	Three questions remain open and are answerable by the supplier. One certificate did not hold up.

OPEN QUESTIONS CARRIED FORWARD

1. Which legal entity would contract with the buyer, and which one issues the invoice? The quotation letterhead and the GST registration do not carry the same name.
2. Where does finishing actually take place, under whose quality control, and would the buyer's order pass through that unit?
3. On the two EU shipments the supplier described, was Ashvamitra the exporter of record, or the manufacturer behind a merchant exporter? This changes who is answerable for the export documentation.

Findings

01 Identity

Who is this company, legally and commercially?

Supplier's claim	"We are a manufacturer, established 2009, working directly with export buyers."
Source of the claim	The supplier's quotation letterhead and their reply to the first set of questions, 22 July.
What was checked	GST taxpayer search for the entity named on the quotation and for the registered name. IEC. Udyam. MCA/CIN search — the firm is a partnership, so it does not appear there. Export promotion council registration and the class registered under.
What was found	A GST registration exists in Maharashtra, active, registered 2011 rather than 2009. Its declared nature of business lists manufacturing and wholesale trade, not manufacturing alone. The name on that registration is Ashvamisra Enterprises. The quotation is issued on the letterhead of Ashvamisra Engineering Works. The supplier was asked about this and described them as "the same firm, two names", which the registers neither confirm nor contradict. An IEC exists against the registered name. Udyam registration shows a manufacturing activity within the small-enterprise investment band.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	The firm exists, is registered to export, and is registered for a manufacturing activity. But the buyer does not yet know which entity would be on the contract and the invoice, and the 2009 founding date is not supported by the registration record. Neither point is an accusation; both are worth settling in writing before an advance is paid, because a payment to the wrong entity is difficult to unwind from abroad.

02 Capability

Can they actually produce what is being bought?

Supplier's claim	"All operations are in-house — pressing, welding, finishing and inspection — at our own unit."
Source of the claim	The supplier's written reply of 22 July, repeated on the call of 5 August.
What was checked	Observation of the premises, equipment and work in progress against the buyer's drawings, and which stages are carried out on site. Where a stage was said to happen elsewhere, who carries it out and whether that was established.

What was found	Pressing, welding and tooling are carried out at the unit visited, on equipment observed running. The tool room makes its own dies, which is consistent with the tolerances quoted. Finishing — deburring and passivation — is not carried out on site. It is done at a partner's unit about 4 km away, which was not visited. The claim of “all operations in-house” is therefore inaccurate as stated, though the capability to press and weld the buyer's part was observed directly.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	The supplier can make the part. The buyer should proceed on the basis that a finishing step happens outside the supplier's own walls, which matters for a stainless component where passivation determines corrosion performance. Whether that is acceptable is a commercial decision, not a verification finding — but it should be a decision, not a surprise.

03 Documentation

Do the documents support what is claimed?

Supplier's claim	“We are ISO 9001 certified.” A certificate was supplied as a PDF scan.
Source of the claim	Email attachment from the supplier, 24 July.
What was checked	The certificate read for scope, dates and issuing body. The issuing certification body looked up. The accreditation body named on the certificate checked against the international directories of recognised accreditation bodies.
What was found	The certificate is current by its own dates. Its stated scope is “fabrication of steel structures”, which does not cover pressed components for food-contact equipment. The certification body named exists and has a website. The accreditation body named on the certificate could not be found in the international directories of recognised accreditation bodies, and no record of it was located through the certification body's own published material. The supplier was asked and had no further information.
Status	NOT VERIFIED
What this means for you	This does not establish that the certificate is fraudulent, and it is not alleged here. What it establishes is that the certificate does not do the job the buyer needs it to do: its scope is the wrong scope, and the accreditation behind it could not be confirmed to exist. A certificate whose accreditor cannot be found is not evidence of a quality system. If the buyer needs assurance on this point, it has to come from somewhere else.

04 Commercial Fit

Do the terms and the operation fit this requirement?

Supplier's claim	“MOQ 500 pieces, 35–40 days lead time, 50% advance and 50% against scanned documents. Our order book is full to November.”
-------------------------	--

Source of the claim	The quotation of 18 July and the call of 5 August.
What was checked	MOQ, pricing basis, payment terms and lead time against the buyer's actual requirement and delivery pattern. Whether the order size is a reasonable fit for the scale of the unit observed. Whether the order book claim could be corroborated.
What was found	The MOQ and the buyer's likely call-off quantity are compatible. The quoted lead time is consistent with the equipment and staffing observed, and the annual volume is well within what the press shop could absorb — it is a small order for this unit, not a stretching one. The pricing basis was quoted ex-works and the buyer had read it as FOB; this was a genuine misunderstanding on both sides and is now clear. The order book claim rests on the supplier's word alone; nothing was available to check it against, and nothing contradicts it.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	The commercial terms fit, with one correction: the price is ex-works, so inland haulage, terminal handling and export clearance sit on the buyer's side of the line and were not in the figure being compared against other quotations. A 50% advance to a supplier with an unresolved entity question (checkpoint 01) is the single largest exposure in this file.

05 Export Capability

Can they support the intended export?

Supplier's claim	"We export regularly to Europe, including Germany and the Netherlands."
Source of the claim	The supplier's reply of 22 July.
What was checked	Export registration, evidence that consignments have moved, experience of the destination market, documentation practice, and who handles the export leg.
What was found	An IEC exists and is active. The supplier described two shipments to the EU in the past eighteen months and named the destination country for each. Asked who was the exporter of record, they said the shipments went "through an export house". Documents naming the exporter were requested and not provided before this report was issued. Independent access to another party's customs records is limited, and no view of them was obtained. The claim is therefore neither supported nor contradicted by anything examined.
Status	OPEN QUESTION
What this means for you	This is not a negative finding and should not be read as one. Exporting through a merchant exporter is ordinary, legal and common, and many capable factories do it. But it changes who is answerable for the export documentation, and it means the supplier's own experience of the buyer's market may be less direct than the claim implies. One document — a shipping bill naming the exporter — would close this, and the buyer is in a position to ask for it.

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	Three things remain open at the close of this assessment. The quoting entity and the registered entity carry different names and the supplier's explanation could not be checked (01). The finishing step happens at premises that were not visited, and quality records for the last six months were requested and not produced (02, and the site visit record above). Whether this firm has exported in its own name is unestablished (05). Separately, the quality certificate supplied does not cover this product and its accreditation could not be confirmed (03), which is the one finding here that is negative rather than merely open.
Status	PARTIALLY VERIFIED
What this means for you	None of this says the buyer should not proceed, and this report makes no such recommendation. It says that three specific questions are answerable by the supplier at no cost, and that all three become materially harder to raise after an advance has been paid. If the buyer wants one action out of this document, it is to put those three questions in writing and read the answers before the deposit moves.

Site record

Date and time	2026-08-14
Address visited	The unit at the address printed on the quotation. It is a working factory, not an office.
Who was present	A partner of the firm and the production supervisor. The person who sent the quotation was not present and joined by phone for part of the visit.
What was shown	The press shop, the tool room, the raw material store and the despatch area. Three mechanical presses were running during the visit, two on unrelated work. The tool room holds dies made in-house. Drawings for a component of comparable complexity to the buyer's were on the shop floor and matched the process described.
What was not shown	The finishing area. Deburring and passivation were described as being carried out at a partner's unit approximately 4 km away; a visit there was requested and not arranged during the day. Quality records for the preceding six months were requested and not produced; the supervisor said they are held by the partner who was travelling.

OBSERVATIONS

The unit was operating normally and the work on the floor was consistent with what the supplier described. Nothing observed contradicted the capability claim. The two requests that were not met are recorded above and carried into checkpoint 06 rather than treated as findings against the supplier: a closed door on a single day has ordinary explanations.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Insert dated photographs below, each with a one-line caption saying what it shows.

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	29 August 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.