IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

# Pharma Tariffs 2026: Supply Chain & Manufacturing Impacts

> Build practical AI for pharma and biotech with IntuitionLabs. We help life-science teams turn complex information and workflows into useful software, governed knowledge systems and AI tools.

Published by IntuitionLabs · 2026-04-07 · pharma tariffs 2026 · supply chain management · drug manufacturing · onshoring · supply chain digitalization · section 232 · pharmaceutical trade · api production

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharma-tariffs-2026-supply-chain-onshoring



## In this article


1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. The Global Pharmaceutical Trade Landscape
4. U.S. Trade Policy Shift, 2024–2025
5. Related Global Trade Developments
6. Tariff Policies and Trade Actions (2024–2026)
7. U.S. Pharmaceutical Tariff Policy
8. Related Pricing Agreements and Trade Deals
9. Global Context and Reactions
10. Impact on Pharmaceutical Supply Chains
11. Short-Term Response: “Front-Loading” and Stockpiling
12. Geographic Shifts and Diversification
13. Supply Chain Risks and Resilience
14. Case: China’s API Dominance and Investor Concerns
15. Impact on Manufacturing and Industrial Investment
16. Pledged Investments and New Facilities
17. Effects on Biopharma Suppliers and Equipment Markets
18. Cost and Regulatory Challenges of Onshoring
19. Global Manufacturing Implications
20. Supply and Productivity Effects
21. Onshoring Strategy and Corporate Planning
22. Corporate Strategic Responses
23. Government Incentives and Industrial Policy
24. Future Site Selection and Timeline
25. IT Strategy: Digitalization and Technological Enablers
26. AI-Driven Forecasting and Transparency
27. Blockchain and Traceability
28. Cloud-based Integration and Collaboration
29. Digital Risk Management and Early Warning
30. Data Analytics for Compliance and Performance
31. Ecosystem Integration
32. Case Studies and Examples
33. Eli Lilly’s U.S. Investment Drive
34. Pfizer’s Pricing Deal
35. Europe–U.S. Strategic Dialogue
36. India’s Generics Industry
37. Implications and Future Outlook
38. Conclusion

# Executive Summary

Pharmaceutical tariffs have emerged as a defining force in 2026, as governments trade policy and industrial strategy dramatically reshape pharma supply chains. In the U.S., in particular, the second Trump administration has targeted drug imports under Section 232 (national security grounds), promulgating steep tariffs on foreign-made medicines and APIs. Beginning in 2025, threats of *100% tariffs* on branded drugs (with lower rates for companies that build U.S. plants or agree to pricing reforms) prompted Big Pharma to front-load production and announce massive "reshoring" investments. By late 2025, industry sources described **hundreds of billions** of dollars in announced U.S. investment commitments, including technology investment as well as manufacturing (J&J announcement) (e.g. Lilly announced a $27 billion plan, Merck $70 billion, J&J $55 billion, etc.) (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). Atradius and FiercePharma report that global drug production spiked ~9.1% in 2025 as companies "front-loaded" inventory to avoid tariffs (www.fiercepharma.com); output is forecast to decelerate sharply in 2026 once the catch-up effect wanes. Notably, U.S. trade deals (with the EU, UK, Japan, etc.) have capped pharma tariffs at ~15% or exempted certain goods, and major players like Pfizer secured three-year tariff exemptions by agreeing to *most-favored-nation* (MFN) pricing and U.S. production commitments (natlawreview.com) (www.fiercepharma.com). **Policy as of October 24, 2026:** the Section 232 pharmaceutical regime is in effect. Duties on covered patented pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients took effect on July 31, 2026 for products of Annex III companies and September 29, 2026 for products of other companies, subject to applicable reduced rates and exclusions (CBP guidance).

These trade shocks are reshaping supply chain strategy. In the short term, firms rushed to stockpile inventory and diversify sources; McKinsey found >80% of supply-chain leaders affected by tariffs, with many adopting **dual sourcing, nearshoring and higher inventories** (www.indigrowth.com). Atradius warns that supply networks will become more fragmented and regionally clustered under geopolitical pressure (www.fiercepharma.com) (www.indigrowth.com). European biopharma leaders have warned the EU Commission that U.S. tariffs would damage integrated global supply chains (e.g. EU drug exports to the U.S. totaled $127 billion in 2024 (www.euronews.com)), and have sought to negotiate to avoid shortages (www.euronews.com). Meanwhile, emerging suppliers (India and China) see mixed outcomes: India's $10.5B in U.S. pharma exports are mostly generics and so mostly exempt (www.indialaw.in) (www.livemint.com), whereas China (40% of global API output) has gained market share as U.S. reliance on Chinese APIs (with generic pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients excluded from these Section 232 tariffs for now; Proclamation 11020) remains high (www.fiercepharma.com) (citinewsroom.com).

Manufacturing itself is shifting. Pharmaceutical giants have announced dozens of new U.S.-based plants and expansions (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) (www.fiercepharma.com). For example, Lilly broke ground on its $6.5 billion Houston API manufacturing facility on September 21, 2026 (Texas governor's announcement); Merck is building a $1B biologics plant in Delaware (www.fiercepharma.com); Moderna is spending $140M to bring mRNA production home (www.fiercepharma.com); and Regeneron is converting a $2B site in New York (www.fiercepharma.com). These are announced U.S. investment commitments with varying scopes and time horizons. Think Global Health's November 24, 2025 tracker counted **more than $480 billion** pledged over the following **four to ten years** (investment tracker). They should not be presented as a comparable total of manufacturing expenditure during 2025–2030. These investments come amid concerns over workforce and

regulatory bottlenecks. The FDA's PreCheck Pilot Program provides early technical advice before a facility becomes operational, followed by pre-submission meetings and inspections to expedite assessments of manufacturing information in drug applications (FDA announcement). Implementation takes time: Lilly's January 2026 announcement projected construction beginning in 2026 and operations in 2031 for its Pennsylvania facility (Lilly announcement).

Information technology and digital strategy have become essential tools in this new environment. Companies are deploying **supply-chain digitalization** to improve visibility and agility. According to industry experts, a "transparent, intelligent, and dynamic ecosystem" – built on AI-driven forecasting, blockchain tracing, cloud-based platforms, and advanced analytics – is no longer optional in 2026 (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). AI and big-data tools help optimize inventory and demand planning amid fluctuating tariffs (www.pharmafocusamerica.com); blockchain and serialization aid compliance and traceability of internationally-sourced ingredients (www.pharmafocusamerica.com); and digital risk-management platforms can flag supplier and geopolitical risks in real time (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). In sum, the pharma industry is rapidly adopting digital strategies to manage the complexity and uncertainty of a bifurcated "onshore vs offshore" supply landscape (www.pharmafocusamerica.com) (www.fiercepharma.com).

This report provides an in-depth analysis of the 2026 pharma tariffs phenomenon. We review the **policy landscape** (U.S. tariff measures, global trade deals, Section 232 investigations), the **historical context** (WTO exemptions, trade-war background), and the **current state** of industry response. Detailed sections examine the effects on global **supply chains** (stockpiling, fragmentation, geographic shifts), on **manufacturing and industrial investment** (new plants, equipment demand, cost implications), and on **onshoring strategy** (incentives, feasibility, case commitments). We also survey how firms are aligning their **IT strategy** – from blockchain traceability to AI forecasting – with the new trade reality. Case studies (e.g. Lilly, Pfizer, Indian generics, EU negotiations) illustrate real-world examples. Finally, we discuss the **future outlook** and implications: from possible WTO challenges, to revised domestic and foreign policies, to the sustainability of accelerated onshoring. All claims are supported by the latest data, expert analyses, and trade statistics from industry and government sources.

# Introduction and Background

## The Global Pharmaceutical Trade Landscape

Pharmaceuticals are a uniquely trade-intensive industry. Since the 1990s, leading economies have pursued tariff-free trade in medicines under multilateral agreements. Notably, the 1994 WTO **Agreement on Trade in Pharmaceutical Products** (the "Pharma Agreement") eliminated tariffs on thousands of drugs and active ingredients, binding them at zero for participants (US, EU, Japan, etc.) (www.wto.org). This historic liberalization underpinned decades of globalized drug production: by 2018, imports of finished medicines exceeded $350 billion worldwide (www.wto.org). In practice, developed markets (US, EU, Japan) exported patented drugs and biologics to each other duty-free, while large volumes of generics and chemical inputs flowed from India, China and other low-cost producers to the U.S. and Europe. Active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) became especially globalized – China and India eventually supplied the majority of generic APIs needed by Western manufacturers.

This “Pharma Pact” effectively saw medicines treated as a free-trade sector, with few barriers preventing long, cross-border supply chains. More than 7,000 APIs and finished drugs were covered by zero-duty commitments (www.wto.org). Consequently, by the early 2020s the U.S. was heavily reliant on foreign drug supply: estimates placed that roughly 53% of patented medicines consumed in the U.S. were manufactured abroad (www.india-briefing.com), and over 40% of global API production originated in China (www.fiercepharma.com) (citinewsroom.com).

Covid-19 in 2020 briefly exposed vulnerabilities (drug shortages, active-ingredient scarcity) but did not immediately reverse trade openness. However, supply chain fragilities became prominent policy concerns. By 2024, bipartisan U.S. initiatives began addressing supply security: e.g. the 2021 Joint Commission recommended diversifying away from China, and Congress considered API stockpiles for pandemics. Meanwhile, the pharmaceutical industry remained largely insulated from trade wars. During President Trump’s first term (2017–2020) and global tech import tensions, medicines were explicitly excluded from broad tariff lists (supplychain-risk.com). For example, although tens of billions of dollars of Chinese goods were taxed at 10–25%, China’s **generic and patented drugs** drew only a nominal 10% Section 301 tariff, far lower than other sectors (supplychain-risk.com) (www.fiercepharma.com). An April 2018 celebratory Wall Street Journal article noted that President Trump had “freedom-of-commerce” in pharmaceuticals by keeping medicines tariff-free (supplychain-risk.com).

Thus, entering 2024–25, the norm had been essentially **zero trade barriers** for drugs, anchored by WTO commitments and the prior administration’s policy. Drug supply chains were globalized: the U.S. imported generics from India and China, biologics from EU-based plants (especially Ireland and Switzerland), and APIs from Asia and Europe (www.euronews.com) (citinewsroom.com). Governments had started minor reshoring talks for strategic drugs, but no major mobilization existed. All that changed with the arrival of a new U.S. administration in January 2025 and an aggressive industrial policy agenda.

## U.S. Trade Policy Shift, 2024–2025

In early 2025, President Trump (re-elected in the 2024 US elections) began treating pharmaceuticals as a national-security and economic priority. On **April 1, 2025**, the Secretary of Commerce initiated a **Section 232** national-security investigation into imports of pharmaceuticals, pharmaceutical ingredients and their derivative products (Commerce notice). This was separate from the administration’s **April 2, 2025** reciprocal-tariff order (Executive Order 14257). Section 232, historically used for steel or automotive goods, authorizes tariffs if imports are deemed a security risk. The Commerce Department, by mid-2025, was formally probing how pharma and API imports might threaten U.S. interests. In rhetoric, Trump vowed “a major tariff on pharmaceuticals…when they hear that, they will leave China,” signaling that arrives new trade pain for drug firms abroad (supplychain-risk.com).

On **September 25, 2025**, via social media, President Trump announced that **starting October 1** the U.S. would target *all* imported branded/patented medicines with a **100% tariff**, unless drugmakers were building U.S. plants (natlawreview.com). This was framed as an ultimatum: companies must either **“build”** (break ground on) U.S. manufacturing or face steep penalties (natlawreview.com). Generics/biogenerics were exempt

from this tariff (a notable carve-out) (natlawreview.com). In tandem, Trump signaled that firms could also avoid duties by accepting a Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) pricing regime (aligning U.S. prices with lower foreign prices) (natlawreview.com).

Although the October 2025 tariff deadline ultimately **slipped** (officially postponed as the White House negotiated with industry), these threats fundamentally altered business calculus. The message was clear: **pharma was officially on notice**. Executives knew that federal policy now viewed drug trade as negotiable leverage – part of a larger “America First” pivot.

The **presidential proclamation of April 2, 2026** established the following structure for covered patented pharmaceuticals and associated pharmaceutical ingredients. The UK rate was subsequently reduced to zero, effective July 31, 2026 (Commerce notice):

- **100% tariff** as the standard rate, subject to the proclamation's lower rates and exclusions.
- **20% tariff** for products of companies with Commerce-approved onshoring plans, including companies the Secretary assesses are likely soon to have approved plans. This rate is scheduled to rise to **100% on April 2, 2030**; completing a plant does not itself extend the 20% rate.
- **15% tariff** for products of the EU, Japan, South Korea, Switzerland and Liechtenstein, unless a lower rate applies.
- **0% Section 232 tariff** for covered UK-origin products following the subsequent Commerce reduction.
- **0% tariff until January 20, 2029** for qualifying companies combining onshoring eligibility with HHS MFN pricing agreements; the Secretary may also apply this treatment to companies determined likely to qualify soon (Proclamation 11020, clauses 3(b)–3(e)).

The proclamation excludes **generic pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients, including biosimilars**, from its Section 232 tariffs for now (Proclamation 11020). Specialty products have a separate, conditional route: orphan products qualify only where all approved indications are designated as orphan; nuclear medicines and other defined specialty categories also require the applicable Commerce determination of qualifying jurisdiction or an urgent U.S. health need. Commerce's September 23, 2026 notice defines the eligible categories and jurisdictions and provides the urgent-health-need approval procedure (Commerce guidance).

These rules distinguish a qualifying onshoring plan from a combined onshoring and MFN pricing arrangement. The former carries a 20% rate scheduled to rise to 100% on April 2, 2030; the latter can qualify for zero Section 232 tariffs until January 20, 2029. Eligibility depends on the Secretary's determinations under the proclamation. A plant announcement or pricing promise alone does not establish zero-tariff eligibility (Proclamation 11020, clauses 3(b) and 3(e)).

## Related Global Trade Developments

The U.S. made these moves amid broader trade shifts. In mid-2025 the U.S. negotiated an agreement with the EU and Japan to cap pharma tariffs at 15% — thus preventing the direst outcomes for those exporters (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) (www.fiercepharma.com). The **U.S.-EU political agreement of July 2025** was followed by the August 21 framework statement (European Commission). The Council completed the legislative process for the EU’s tariff-implementation regulations on **June 25, 2026** (Council approval). In

December 2025, a U.S.-UK accord assured a 3-year exemption of UK drugs from U.S. tariffs in exchange for the UK committing to invest around 25% more in innovative treatments (UK government announcement) and reforming its evaluation (NICE) metrics (www.fiercepharma.com). Similar bilateral “safe harbor” deals were struck with Japan and Switzerland to spare their pharma industries from 100% duties (www.fiercepharma.com).

Meanwhile, India has been closely watching U.S. trade policy. Indian exporters (who send ~$10–11B in drugs to the U.S. annually) benefit from the generic carve-out. Government officials note that since most Indian exports are generics, the tariff will “likely have limited impact” (www.livemint.com). At the same time, India’s pharmaceutical bodies have pushed back on the looming tariffs to ensure they do not later threaten generics dubbed under brand names (www.livemint.com).

On the other side, markets anticipated these developments. Pharma indexes and stock prices rallied or corrected based on tariff news: for example, Indian generic stocks fell after Trump’s tariff announcement in Sept 2025, despite the exemption, reflecting investor jitters (www.livemint.com). Large U.S. pharma firms saw their share prices and earnings calls factor in the risks of higher input costs and potential need for U.S. investments.

In short, by 2026 we see a **new geopolitics of pharmaceutics**. Trade disputes, national security justifications, and pricing deals have merged, treating medicines less as part of “free trade” and more as industrial policy. This context sets the stage for evaluating how such policies reverberate through supply chains, manufacturing, and corporate strategy.

# Tariff Policies and Trade Actions (2024–2026)

## U.S. Pharmaceutical Tariff Policy

In 2025, the Trump administration linked drug pricing and manufacturing to trade policy. Commerce initiated the **Section 232 investigation** into imports of pharmaceuticals, pharmaceutical ingredients and their derivative products on **April 1, 2025** (Commerce investigation notice). Section 232, rarely applied to consumer goods, gave a national-security rationale to treat pharmaceuticals as strategic. By mid-2025, the White House explicitly threatened **100% tariffs on imported pharmaceutical products** (natlawreview.com). Key features of the U.S. plan, as reported in October 2025 and April 2026, were:

- **Covered Patented Products:** The standard rate is 100% for patented pharmaceuticals and associated pharmaceutical ingredients covered by Annex I, subject to lower rates and exclusions (Proclamation 11020).
- **Generics and Specialty Products:** Generic pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients, including biosimilars, are excluded from these Section 232 tariffs for now. Specialty relief is conditional: the defined categories, including orphan products whose approved indications are all designated as orphan and nuclear medicines, require Commerce's qualifying-jurisdiction determination or approval based on an urgent U.S. health need (Commerce guidance).

- **Onshoring Incentives:** A 20% rate applies to products of companies with Commerce-approved onshoring plans or plans the Secretary assesses are likely soon to be approved. It increases to **100% on April 2, 2030**, independently of plant completion. Separately, failure to honor commitments can trigger tariff increases (Proclamation 11020, clauses 3(b) and 3(f)).
- **Pricing (MFN) Deals:** Qualifying onshoring eligibility combined with an HHS MFN pharmaceutical pricing agreement can secure a zero rate until January 20, 2029; the Secretary may also extend this treatment to companies determined likely to qualify soon (Proclamation 11020, clause 3(e)).
- **Trade Partners:** Covered products of the EU, Japan, South Korea, Switzerland and Liechtenstein receive a 15% rate unless a lower rate applies. The Section 232 rate for covered UK products was reduced to zero effective July 31, 2026 (Proclamation 11020; Commerce notice).

The White House articulated these measures as part of a broader “national security” strategy to reduce foreign dependence (www.indialaw.in) (www.india-briefing.com). Officials cited studies showing that over half of U.S. drug consumption is now filled by imports (www.india-briefing.com), leaving Americans vulnerable to supply chain shocks or foreign pricing policies. In other words, under the presidential proclamation drugs are treated similarly to steel or semiconductors: if deemed critical to U.S. interests, barriers can be raised unless industry remedies are implemented.

The implemented regime took effect on July 31, 2026 for products of companies listed in Annex III and September 29, 2026 for products of other companies (CBP implementation guidance). The company-agreement route to zero Section 232 tariffs requires qualifying onshoring eligibility together with an HHS MFN pricing agreement, subject to the Secretary's eligibility determinations. Onshoring-only eligibility carries a 20% rate, scheduled to increase to 100% on April 2, 2030; merely announcing an investment does not establish the zero rate (Proclamation 11020).

## Related Pricing Agreements and Trade Deals

Parallel to direct tariffs, the U.S. government pursued an aggressive drug pricing agenda. Executive Order 14297 of May 12, 2025 directed HHS to communicate MFN price targets to pharmaceutical manufacturers. Section 5(b) directed HHS to propose a rulemaking plan to impose MFN pricing if significant progress did not follow, to the extent consistent with law (Executive Order 14297, Section 5). These agency directions are distinct from the subsequent company-specific agreements described below. Letters sent to CEOs in July 2025 demanded MFN prices for every Medicaid patient and all new drugs. By year-end 2025, several major companies had made high-profile deals:

- **Pfizer (Sept 30, 2025):** Agreed to sell its full portfolio at MFN prices to U.S. Medicaid programs and launch new drugs stateside at global prices. In return, President Trump granted Pfizer a **3-year exemption** from the threatened 100% tariffs, and Pfizer committed $70 billion to R&D and expanding U.S. manufacturing (natlawreview.com).
- **Nine Companies (Dec 19, 2025):** Amgen, BMS, GSK and others agreed to MFN pricing for an array of chronic disease drugs. As part of these deals, they must **repatriate foreign revenue** earned thanks to U.S. trade policies, slash consumer prices via a Trump-sponsored direct-to-patient platform (“TrumpRx”), and together invest $150 billion in U.S. factories (www.whitehouse.gov).

- **U.S.-UK Pharmaceutical Arrangement:** Commerce reduced the Section 232 tariff on covered patented pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients that are products of the United Kingdom from 10% to zero, effective for entries on or after July 31, 2026. This is the implemented rate change, rather than a blanket exemption from all U.S. tariffs beginning in January 2026 (Commerce notice).

The company-specific zero-rate route combines qualifying onshoring eligibility and MFN pricing agreements; it is distinct from the 20% onshoring-only rate. Both depend on the Secretary's determinations under the proclamation (Proclamation 11020, clauses 3(b) and 3(e)).

## Global Context and Reactions

Elsewhere, governments have responded cautiously:

- **European Union:** Leading pharma firms (Novo Nordisk, Bayer, Sanofi, Roche, etc.) warned EU Commission President von der Leyen in April 2025 that U.S. tariffs would disrupt integrated supply chains and harm patient access (www.euronews.com). Ireland (hosting many U.S.-owned plants) was highlighted as particularly vulnerable. The EU launched a “strategic dialogue” with industry to find joint mitigation, and emphasized seeking negotiated solutions with the U.S. (www.euronews.com). Trade associations (EFPIA, EuropaBio) warned that steep tariffs would deter investment in Europe and shift operations to America (www.euronews.com).
- **United Kingdom:** UK officials struck the December 2025 deal noted above to pre-empt any U.S. tariffs. (This was urgent because the UK had just finalized a broader trade pact with India and was also separate from the EU Pharma Agreement after Brexit.) Before the deal, UK pharma associations expressed concern that the UK’s own NICE pricing rules were making it a less attractive market. After the agreement, the UK hoped to lock in tariff-free export access to the U.S. in return for additional pricing concessions.
- **India:** India’s government and exporters have largely downplayed impact, since its pharma exports to the U.S. are dominated by generics (explicitly exempt) (www.livemint.com). Indian officials estimate that only a small share of their $10.5B in U.S. exports (FY25) are patented drugs that would face the 100% levy (www.livemint.com). Nonetheless, India has advocated keeping the new tariff treaty-compliant and ensuring supply stability, given its role as “pharmacy of the world.”
- **Other Countries:** Japan, Canada, and others are expected to negotiate similar pharma carve-outs or face the 15% cap. Canada’s pharma lobby is watching closely, as Canadians pay among the highest drug prices globally and rely on U.S. market access.

In effect, a new **pharmaceutical trade order** is forming: bilateral agreements and conditional exemptions dominate, replacing multilateral tariff-free regimes. The industry likens the situation to a geopolitical game: as a commentator quipped, “the year of the tariff” has turned medicine into yet another pawn in global trade rivalries (www.indigrowth.com) (www.fiercepharma.com).

# Impact on Pharmaceutical Supply Chains

With the dramatic tariff announcements, pharma companies have scrambled to reassess their supply chains. The effects fall into several categories: **inventory responses, sourcing shifts, fragmentation of networks, and resilience planning**.

## Short-Term Response: “Front-Loading” and Stockpiling

The immediate corporate reaction was to **front-load production** and stockpile inventory before tariffs took effect. According to a January 2026 Atradius report, global pharmaceutical manufacturing output surged **9.1% in 2025** – far above the trend – driven largely by “front-loading activity in anticipation of U.S. tariffs” (www.fiercepharma.com). Europe (UK/EU) saw particularly strong output growth (21.6% combined in 2025); Ireland’s pharmaceutical output alone jumped by **41.3%** as factories built extra stock (www.fiercepharma.com). Financially, global pharma sales grew ~9.7% in 2025 (www.fiercepharma.com) as inventories built up and customers (especially distributors) sought to lock in lower costs.

This replayed their experience from COVID-19: when vaccine supply was uncertain in 2020, manufacturers ramped up output and stockpiled vials and ingredients. In both cases, global shortages or supply fears caused a spike followed by a later correction. Atradius projects that in 2026, output growth will slow to ~1.6% as front-loaded inventory is drawn down (www.fiercepharma.com). Atradius’s June 2026 update reports that U.S. pharmaceutical output increased **6.3% in 2025** and forecasts growth of **0.1% in 2026** (Atradius June 2026 report).

The FiercePharma analysis notes that despite the frenzy, the overall *impact* of U.S. tariffs on 2025 output was “limited,” due to exemptions and deals: most Big Pharma won temporary safe-harbors via pricing accords, and generics were largely exempt (www.fiercepharma.com). Lower-margin generic products (which make up the majority of prescriptions) largely avoided disruption, meaning hospitals and patients did not yet experience major shortages. However, experts warn that smaller “off-patent but branded” drugs and fine chemicals **could** see pinchpoints.

## Geographic Shifts and Diversification

Looking beyond the immediate rush, companies are **retooling supplier geographies**. The prospect of tariffs effectively adds a cost penalty to foreign sourcing, prompting firms to re-evaluate reliance on overseas suppliers, particularly China. A 2025 SupplyChainRisk analysis emphasizes the depth of U.S. pharma’s dependence on China and India for APIs and generics (supplychain-risk.com). Analysts note that U.S. hospitals already faced shortages of several generic injectables even before tariffs. The fear is that additional cost burdens could force some low-profit medicines (like certain injectables used in hospitals) out of commercial production in the U.S. or abroad (supplychain-risk.com) (citinewsroom.com), further exacerbating shortages.

Industry surveys and consultants report that **nearshoring** and **dual sourcing** have surged as strategies. A cross-industry survey reported by McKinsey on **December 2, 2025** found 82% of supply-chain leaders affected by tariffs, with 39% seeing rising supplier costs. Companies responded with inventory buffers, seeking

alternate suppliers, and planning nearshoring: **43% of respondents plan to shift supply chains to the U.S. over the next three years** (McKinsey survey report). Suppliers from China were frequently identified as target to replace (38% of respondents), as well as some from Western Europe (21%) (www.indigrowth.com).

More broadly, supply chain experts argue that the era of "just-in-time global sourcing with China at the center" is ending. Geopolitical "fragmentation" means firms must design with resilience rather than just cost. A survey by ARC Group shows Southeast Asia (Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia) gaining share in sourcing, but China remains dominant (www.indigrowth.com). Still, 67% of companies cite tariff risk as a permanent factor in supplier selection, implying lasting changes (www.indigrowth.com).

Major multinationals illustrate these shifts in practice. Apple's quick pivot to make iPhones in India and U.S. was cited as a parallel example, though pharma cannot match Apple's agility due to regulatory lags (supplychain-risk.com). Nonetheless, big drug firms have begun **split sourcing** – for example, sending portions of API orders to non-Chinese sources, or qualifying secondary facilities in Mexico or Europe. Even companies expanding U.S. output (like Lilly) often keep complementary supply lines abroad, hedging their bets.

## Supply Chain Risks and Resilience

Tariff uncertainty has sharpened risk management in pharma supply chains. Observers warn that "the supply networks of pharmaceuticals... will become more fragmented due to geopolitical tensions" (www.fiercepharma.com). Fragmentation has pros and cons: it can reduce single points of failure (e.g. avoiding over-dependence on one country), but it also adds complexity and cost.

Supply disruptions—whether from tariffs, trade retaliation, or regulatory hold-ups—are front of mind. PharmaFocusAmerica notes that digital end-to-end visibility is increasingly tied to "operational sustainability" and patient safety (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). Companies are deploying advanced analytics, real-time tracking, and scenario-planning tools (detailed later) to mitigate this. For example, many have prioritized building more **inventory buffers** for critical inputs, even if it ties up capital. Others are pursuing **strategic stockpiles**: the U.S. government is assembling a national *Strategic Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients Reserve* (SAPIR) to hold critical APIs, and companies like GSK and BMS have pledged API donations to this reserve (www.whitehouse.gov).

Critically, stakeholders emphasize that many pharmaceutical supply chains are still global ecosystems not easily walled off. If U.S. tariffs push companies to disinvest overseas, this could have feedback effects. As EuropaBio warned: *"Even with the current exemption, any tariffs applied would have a significantly negative impact on this innovative sector and on patients, due to the global nature of supply chains"* (www.euronews.com). In practice, even if an API plant or pill plant is physically in the U.S., raw materials (excipients, specialized chemicals) may come from abroad. Officials worry that a cascading tariff/retaliation cycle might ultimately reduce total global supply.

For now, however, the combination of raised costs and promised investment is driving triage: companies are triaging which products to make locally (often high-value, complex biologics or keyword **"politically sensitive"** drugs) and which to continue importing. Major genericsmakers like Teva or Indian firms (Sun Pharma, etc.) have not announced large U.S. factories yet, likely due to exemption and margin constraints. By contrast,

innovative-drug companies are focusing on vaccines, gene therapies, and key chronic drugs to bring onshore. Consultants remind us that certain high-volume medications (insulins, essential injectables) might see new domestic lines, whereas low-volume niche off-patented drugs may quietly vanish from the market.

## Case: China's API Dominance and Investor Concerns

An illustrative case is that of **active ingredients**. China accounts for roughly 40–45% of global API output (www.fiercepharma.com). A June 2025 analysis highlighted how this creates strategic vulnerabilities: for example, the only U.S. maker of amoxicillin depends on Chinese-sourced raw materials (80% of the input) (citinewsroom.com). Analysts warn that if China were to "weaponize" its pharmaceutical supply (for example, during diplomatic spats), disruptions would be "catastrophic" for U.S. drug availability (citinewsroom.com). In fact, the Trump administration explicitly cited such concerns in defending Section 232 – arguing that U.S. dependency on imports amounts to a threat to national security (www.indialaw.in) (www.india-briefing.com).

The recent tariff threats have heightened awareness of these chokepoints. Generic drug advocacy groups have pressed for exemptions (as generics rely on Chinese/often Indian APIs), and industry insiders say pharma firms are now evaluating relocating critical API production. This includes, for example, exploring U.S. or non-Chinese sites for penicillin precursors, steroid intermediates, and specialty chemicals. While full relocation of China's API share is unrealistic in the near term, even small shifts (e.g. moving a key supply line to India or Southeast Asia) can be significant for individual drugs.

In contrast, China has not publicly reacted strongly yet; Sino-U.S. trade tensions remain fluid. Some observers speculate that China might "gently push back" by tightening its own exports or pricing, although no formal counter-tariffs on drugs have appeared. The proclamation excludes generic pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients from its Section 232 tariffs for now, while covering patented pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients. Its generic exclusion should not be read as establishing that every Chinese API or raw material is duty-free (Proclamation 11020). What is clear is that both companies and policymakers can no longer ignore China's pharma role: it has earned repeated mentions as a vulnerability in official and media analysis (citinewsroom.com).

In the overall assessment, supply chains in 2026 are entering a period of **strategic rebalancing**. Global logistics are being realigned: some capacity will inevitably come home to North America, some will shift to allies (EU, India), and some will double up sources (e.g. maintaining one plant in the U.S. and one in Asia). The net effect will be more regionalized, diversified networks – with corresponding increases in logistical layers, compliance paperwork, and possibly higher unit costs. But these are viewed as necessary trade-offs in an era where tariffs and trade risk are treated as permanent features of the landscape.

# Impact on Manufacturing and Industrial Investment

Tariff policy has profoundly influenced pharmaceutical manufacturing strategy. Drug companies have responded by **accelerating capital investments**, reconfiguring global production footprint, and lobbying for regulatory support.

## Pledged Investments and New Facilities

Since 2024, dozens of major announcements highlight an unprecedented **reshoring boom**:

- **Multibillion-dollar announcements:** In February 2025, Eli Lilly unveiled a $27 billion acceleration of U.S. manufacturing for APIs and sterile injectables (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). Shortly thereafter, at least 13 other firms (AbbVie, AZ, BMS, GSK, J&J, Merck, Novo Nordisk, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi, etc.) announced new U.S. projects, collectively amounting to over $370–480 billion in commitments (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) (www.fiercepharma.com). These pledges include dozens of facilities (some news articles cite around 22 sites and 44,000 jobs (www.thinkglobalhealth.org)).
- **Top spenders and commitments:** By late 2025, Merck led the list with *“more than $70 billion”* earmarked for U.S. expansion (covering manufacturing and R&D) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). Johnson & Johnson promised $55 billion (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). DPR Construction, tracking company press releases, tallies over $370 billion of announced U.S. investments from pharma during 2025 (www.fiercepharma.com). Other notable figures include Roche/Genentech and AstraZeneca (each ~$50 billion), plus BMS, Gilead, Takeda, Lilly, Novartis, and Sanofi (ranging $20–50 billion each, per DPR) (www.fiercepharma.com). The trade group PhRMA’s own estimates mentioned up to $500 billion industry-wide (www.pharmamanufacturing.com), although outside analysts lean toward the $370 billion range.
- **Site selection:** Early 2025 saw specific plans emerge. Lilly subsequently selected its fourth new U.S. manufacturing location in Pennsylvania on January 30, 2026, with construction expected in 2026 and operations planned for 2031 (Lilly announcement); this is not a program in which all four plants were due to be completed by 2028. Merck announced a $1 billion biologics facility in Wilmington, Delaware, with the capability to manufacture KEYTRUDA (pembrolizumab), an immune checkpoint inhibitor (Merck announcement; NCI drug description). Moderna allocated $140 million for an end-to-end U.S. mRNA fill/finish facility (www.fiercepharma.com). Regeneron is converting a former magazine plant into a $2 billion drug production site in New York (www.fiercepharma.com). These are just examples; states across the U.S. (e.g. Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Texas, North Carolina) vied for projects with incentives (www.fiercepharma.com).
- **Types of projects:** The announcements cover multiple technologies. Lilly describes U.S. expansion across API production, parenteral manufacturing, and oral and injectable therapies (Lilly supply strategy). Merck's Wilmington project targets next-generation biologics, including antibody-drug conjugates (Merck announcement).

The magnitude of these commitments is illustrated by one construction-sector report: DPR Construction found that **$370 billion** of U.S. pharma development was currently planned (www.fiercepharma.com), primarily in manufacturing (with portions for R&D space). This dwarfs prior historical norms. As one industry outlook noted, “a wave of transformative U.S. drug-pricing agreements and record manufacturing investments… is poised to reshape the global landscape” (www.pharmamanufacturing.com).

## Effects on Biopharma Suppliers and Equipment Markets

The onshoring surge has ripple effects through the pharma supply chain. Equipment makers, construction firms, and suppliers are experiencing a demand boom. ThinkGlobalHealth projected that even a modest fraction (15%) of the pledged U.S. onshoring investment going to bioprocess equipment would be an unprecedented $75 billion surge (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). The industry recalls how during COVID, urgent vaccine production caused severe shortages of single-use bioreactors, filters, and mixers. Pharmaceutical firms warn that the current equipment pipeline may again be strained: a new wave of plants means new fermenters, chromatography systems, and consumables need to be built or imported quickly (www.thinkglobalhealth.org).

Consultants point out specific pinch points: cleanrooms and high-grade stainless steel tanks are ordered months in advance, and skilled builders (cleanroom contractors, welders) are limited. If many companies break ground at once, lead times could extend and costs rise. West Monroe, a consulting firm, cautions that **tight labor markets and long lead times** are the norm, making automation key to scaling efficiently (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). In other words, pharmaceutical CMO (contract manufacturer) capacity in the U.S. will be at a premium, likely encouraging turnkey EPCM partnerships and perhaps foreign firms setting up U.S. outposts.

Some concrete data underscores these bottlenecks. In late 2025, even basic equipment was in high demand: companies reported difficulty getting certain packaging components and sterile vials. Vendors like Sartorius, Thermo Fisher, and Corning (all suppliers to pharma) have noted robust order backlogs. While it is too early to measure inflationary effects, analysts predict “significant cost inflation” in 2026 for building new plants, due to competition for construction, materials, and talent.

## Cost and Regulatory Challenges of Onshoring

While investment announcements abound, real-world execution is challenging. Observers emphasize that **onshoring is much harder and slower for pharma** than for, say, electronics. Regulatory hurdles dominate: FDA evaluates manufacturing facilities in connection with applicable product applications and inspects regulated facilities for compliance; it does not approve manufacturing facilities independently (FDA explanation). The SupplyChainRisk blog notes that technical transfer and validation can take years (supplychain-risk.com). FDA's **PreCheck Pilot Program** provides communication and feedback during facility development and is intended to streamline review and inspection for new U.S. manufacturing facilities (FDA PreCheck). HHS announced its restructuring on March 27, 2025 under the Trump administration (HHS announcement).

Economic considerations also loom. Several independent studies argue that the higher operating costs in the U.S. (labor, energy, construction) mean tariffs alone may not justify relocation. Atradius’s June 2026 report cautions that high U.S. production costs could still make manufacturing elsewhere more cost-effective (Atradius report). In short, companies will demand certainty and support before grinding through the expense of duplicating capacity. Governments have responded with tax and grant incentives: as one example, Texas

offered Lilly state tax breaks for its proposed plant, and Delaware granted Merck $30 million toward its Keytruda facility (www.fiercepharma.com). Despite these, the real-world ROI remains tenuous without assurance of long-term protection from policy reversal.

Some firms have tempered their onshoring enthusiasm. Realizing that domestic production cannot cover global markets immediately, many companies will likely pursue a **hybrid strategy**. Lilly, for instance, while building U.S. sites, is continuing to invest in European capacity (Ireland and Germany) as a hedge (supplychain-risk.com). Similarly, Pfizer and J&J are expanding in lower-cost countries as well. The key point is that onshoring is being inserted into an existing global network, not replacing it overnight.

## Global Manufacturing Implications

These U.S. shifts also echo overseas. Atradius observed that, ironically, Europe's pharma output surged in 2025 due to the same front-loading (www.fiercepharma.com). But 2026 is likely to see a correction: Ireland's +41% in 2025 is forecast to become a 6.4% drop in 2026 (www.fiercepharma.com), as that inventory is drawn down and as some future U.S. demand is met locally. Similarly, real investment by EU companies is primarily in response to U.S. policy – AstraZeneca, for instance, had already begun segregating its U.S. and China supply chains from EU ones (supplychain-risk.com). However, trade advisors note that if U.S. tariffs persist, Europe might see slower growth in the sector or even decouple production lines to serve markets separately.

India and China may retain their roles for generics. With generics excluded from tariffs, India's generics and China's API producers remain globally competitive. An interesting twist is that Indian generics can now **compete in the U.S. at even lower cost**, since branded injectables priced by patents become more expensive, potentially giving a market edge to U.S.-made generics. Some Indian firms are exploring small U.S. API plants for key molecules to guarantee access, but there has been no large-scale manufacturing expansion because of the exemption (www.livemint.com).

Tables summarizing the new tariff tiers and announced investments appear below.

| Tariff Category | Rate under the Section 232 pharmaceutical regime | Conditions/Notes |
|---|---|---|
| **Standard** | 100% | Covered patented pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients; lower applicable rates and exclusions take precedence. |
| **Qualifying Onshoring Plan** | 20%; 100% from April 2, 2030 | Commerce-approved plans, including those the Secretary assesses are likely soon to be approved. The scheduled increase is independent of plant completion. |
| **Qualifying Onshoring and MFN Agreements** | 0% until January 20, 2029 | Combined qualifying onshoring eligibility and an HHS MFN pricing agreement, including Secretary-determined likely eligibility. |
| **EU, Japan, South Korea, Switzerland and Liechtenstein** | 15% | Covered products of these jurisdictions, unless a lower rate applies. |
| **United Kingdom** | 0% | Covered UK products; Commerce's reduction is effective July 31, 2026. |

| Tariff Category | Rate under the Section 232 pharmaceutical regime | Conditions/Notes |
|---|---|---|
| **Generic Pharmaceuticals and Associated Ingredients, Including Biosimilars** | Excluded from these Section 232 tariffs for now | This exclusion does not establish the total duty payable under other measures. |
| **Defined Specialty Pharmaceuticals and Associated Ingredients** | Conditional 0% | Commerce-defined eligibility plus a qualifying-jurisdiction determination or approval based on an urgent U.S. health need. Orphan eligibility requires all approved indications to be designated as orphan. |

*Policy as of October 24, 2026. Sources: Proclamation 11020, CBP implementing guidance, Commerce specialty guidance and UK rate-reduction notice. Rates describe the pharmaceutical regime, rather than a guarantee of zero total import duties; the proclamation's Column 1 coordination rules apply.*

| Leading Pharma Company | Announced U.S. Investment (periods and scope vary) | Focus/Notes | Source |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Merck & Co.** | ~$70 billion | R&D and manufacturing expansion (2025–) | (www.pharmamanufacturing.com) |
| **Johnson & Johnson** | More than $55 billion | Manufacturing, R&D and technology; four years from the March 2025 announcement | (J&J announcement) |
| **Lilly (Eli Lilly)** | ~$27 billion* | U.S. API and sterile manufacturing (Feb 2025 announcement) (www.fiercepharma.com) | (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) |
| **Pfizer** | *Included in broad MFN deal* | Expanding manufacturing; MFN pricing deal | (natlawreview.com) |
| **Roche/Genentech** | ~$50 billion† | U.S. research & production | (www.fiercepharma.com) |
| **AstraZeneca** | ~$30–50 billion† | U.S. and global capacity expansion | (www.fiercepharma.com) |
| **Bristol-Myers Squibb** | ~$20–50 billion† | U.S. manufacturing | (www.fiercepharma.com) |
| **Takeda** | ~$20–50 billion† | U.S. operations expansion | (www.fiercepharma.com) |
| **Novartis** | ~$20–50 billion† | U.S. manufacturing and R&D | (www.fiercepharma.com) |

*Table: Summary of major announced U.S. investment commitments by leading pharma companies; periods and scopes vary. The range for Roche/Genentech, AZ, BMS, Gilead, Takeda, Lilly, Novartis, Sanofi is per DPR report (www.fiercepharma.com). (Exact figures are often folded into multi-year, multi-purpose pledges.)*

## Supply and Productivity Effects

The influx of investment is often portrayed as good news for U.S. manufacturing **capacity and jobs**. The thinktank Council on Foreign Relations noted that the announcements, if realized, would create tens of thousands of new jobs and spur demand for glass vials, biotech equipment, and lab supplies (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). Indeed, the ThinkGlobalHealth analysis cited ~22 new sites and ~44,000 potential jobs (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). Federal agencies emphasize that expanding U.S. pharma output is a strategic priority: the Department of Health announced new stockpiles and streamlined environmental reviews for pharma plants.

However, the true productivity gains will take time. Many announced facilities are still in planning, with construction not starting until 2026–2027. Short-run, the bottleneck may be capacity constraints rather than abundance. Analysts caution that it could be 5–10 years before a meaningful shift in supply origins is felt for most drugs (supplychain-risk.com). HHS announced its restructuring on March 27, 2025, under the Trump administration (HHS announcement). In 2026, it remains to be seen how many of the pledged investments clear all regulatory hurdles.

On the cost side, Atradius and FiercePharma note that even after the investment wave, **U.S. drug production costs remain higher** than overseas. Atradius pointed out that “high production costs could still make it more cost-effective for pharmaceuticals to be manufactured elsewhere” (www.fiercepharma.com), hinting that only subsidies and regulatory reprieves sustain the shift. Generic economists of trade suggest that imposing a tariff equivalent to domestic production cost differential is highly distortionary. Thus, absent the tariffs themselves, purely market-driven trends might not have led to this scale of onshoring.

Finally, the manufacturing renaissance will also drive parallel activity in biotech: the push for U.S. production of next-generation therapies (mRNA, CAR-T, gene therapy plasmids) has led to co-investments in life-sciences hubs. The FDA's **Commissioner's National Priority Voucher (CNPV) Pilot Program** provides accelerated review for selected drugs and biologics that advance U.S. public health and national priorities (FDA program description). Coupled with the pharma factsheet’s mention of API stockpiles and tax incentives (www.whitehouse.gov), the total ecosystem is being reshaped.

# Onshoring Strategy and Corporate Planning

## Corporate Strategic Responses

Faced with tariffs, pharmaceutical companies have aligned their strategies along two axes: **building (or boosting) domestic capacity**, and **managing cross-border pricing/policymaking**. These are often interconnected: a firm might choose onshoring partly to satisfy U.S. negotiators, and likewise adopt lower U.S. prices partly to justify an onshore facility.

**Major onshoring moves:** Several companies publicly expressed that robust U.S. production is now central to their plans. Eli Lilly’s CEO has stated that once its pipeline of U.S. plants is complete, “we’ll be able to supply medicines for the U.S. market entirely from U.S. facilities” (supplychain-risk.com). AstraZeneca said it is shifting production of the minority of its U.S.-sold meds (currently made in Europe) to U.S. sites (supplychain-

risk.com). GSK doubled capacity at its Pennsylvania site (planned £800 million investment) (supplychain-risk.com). In general, companies have tended to keep their existing global manufacturing footprint (serving China, Europe, etc.) while bolstering U.S. lines for the U.S. market.

**Trade-driven negotiations:** Many strategic decisions appear influenced by the U.S. trade demands. The whitehouse *fact sheets* and corporate press releases often highlight that investments are being made specifically "to avoid tariffs" (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). Analysts observe that even companies expanding overseas are doing it to maintain global markets while doing the politically important U.S. build-outs. For example, Lilly will build in India and Europe as well, but emphasizes its U.S. spending is targeted at the U.S. prescriptions (supplychain-risk.com). This dual-track approach mitigates risk: if U.S. tariffs are rescinded someday, the foreign capacity is still viable for export.

**Challenges recognized:** Onshoring plans have long implementation horizons. Lilly's January 2026 announcement, for example, projected construction beginning in 2026 and operations in 2031 for its Pennsylvania facility (Lilly announcement).

## Government Incentives and Industrial Policy

The U.S. government has not relied on tariffs alone. The White House Fact Sheets and trade department press releases indicate several supportive programs aimed at getting domestic plants built faster:

- **API Reserve (SAPIR):** Several pharma companies (GSK, BMS, Merck, etc.) have agreed to donate specified quantities of critical APIs (e.g. millions of doses of albuterol, ertapenem) to a U.S. **Strategic API Reserve**, akin to a national stockpile (www.whitehouse.gov). This policy is meant to guarantee that, during the transition, the U.S. does not run out of essential drugs.
- **Regulatory easing:** FDA's PreCheck Pilot Program provides early technical and regulatory feedback before operations begin and supports review of facility information and inspections during application submission. Separately, the ANDA prioritization pilot offers priority review for qualifying generic-drug applications involving U.S. manufacturing and testing. HHS Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. (HHS announcement) touted these in arguing that U.S. drug tariffs come with simultaneous deregulation favoring domestic plants (supplychain-risk.com).
- **Financial incentives:** States have competed to attract projects with tax credits and infrastructure dollars. Examples: Texas offered tax abatements to Lilly, Delaware gave Merck a $30 M grant (www.fiercepharma.com). At the federal level, Congress is debating targeted grants for pharmaceutical innovation clusters, though no major program equivalent to CHIPS yet exists specifically for drugs.

## Future Site Selection and Timeline

Analysts warn that not every onshoring promise will materialize quickly. Building a new large-scale pharma plant (especially a sterile injectables plant) can take 4–6 years. If companies are still "searching" for sites in 2026, many plants won't come online before 2028–2030. Indeed, Lilly had not picked its site locations by mid-2025 (www.fiercepharma.com). Merck's and Pfizer's deals assume construction start imminently but only come into force years later (natlawreview.com).

It is also unclear how many promised investments are *greenfield* vs acquisitions. Large firms might simply repurpose existing facilities or buy local biotech companies, which still counts as “U.S. production” without new construction. This would deliver jobs faster with less wasteful build time, but may not generate the same political capital. Skeptics have pointed out that some of the announcements are vague in scope and timeline.

Given all this, companies will likely phase their onshoring in. Initial focus is on products most at risk from tariffs and most tied to political vote (insulins, vaccines, top-selling biologics). As the tariff landscape evolves (with ongoing negotiations, US midterms, etc.), they will decide on additional build-outs or rely more on the MFN pricing exemption route. The DPR report suggests the final picture will be a hybrid: strong domestic production for a subset of drugs, supported by continued imports for others (www.fiercepharma.com).

# IT Strategy: Digitalization and Technological Enablers

The upheaval in trade and manufacturing strategies has meant that **digital technology** and IT systems are crucial tools for companies. Firms are doubling down on supply chain visibility, analytics, and collaboration platforms to navigate the new complexities. As one 2026-focused industry analyst put it, *“pharma supply chain digitalization is no longer optional”* (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). The goal is to build an agile, data-driven supply chain capable of withstanding tariff shocks. Key elements include:

## AI-Driven Forecasting and Transparency

Pharma companies have begun deploying **artificial intelligence (AI) and advanced analytics** to improve demand forecasting and inventory management. AI models ingest historical sales, prescription trends, epidemiological forecasts, and macroeconomic indicators to predict future demand more accurately (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). This helps companies avoid both shortages and overstock as market conditions shift suddenly. For instance, if a tariff is announced, AI can quickly simulate the demand jump (for stockpiling) or drop (if final prices rise), allowing firms to adjust production schedules in near real time (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

Beyond demand, AI optimizes **network design** itself. Using digital modeling, a company can simulate different sourcing scenarios (e.g. moving an API line home vs to a new Asian supplier) and compute the cost/risk tradeoffs. David Aguero and Scott D. Nelson’s 2024 commentary, *The Potential Application of Large Language Models in Pharmaceutical Supply Chain Management* (DOI: 10.5863/1551-6776-29.2.200), discusses potential LLM applications for simulating disruptions and developing supply-chain risk-management plans (primary full text). In practice, some pharma firms now use dedicated software to re-balance inventories dynamically across global warehouses when tariffs change. (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

## Blockchain and Traceability

To ensure **drug traceability and authenticity**, companies are advancing blockchain-based registry solutions (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). For an unqualified “Made in USA” claim, FTC guidance requires final processing and all significant processing in the United States, with all or virtually all ingredients or components made and sourced there (FTC guidance). As the PharmaFocus report notes, blockchain can also speed recalls or counterfeits identification by instantly tracing an affected drug through the chain (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

Zuellig Pharma’s eZTracker is a blockchain-powered supply-chain traceability solution with real-time tracking and cold-chain monitoring (Zuellig Pharma). The interoperability of these platforms also enables transparency between contract manufacturers, logistics providers, and regulators (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

## Cloud-based Integration and Collaboration

Modern supply chains rely on **cloud platforms** to integrate data across functions and geographies (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). Leading pharma companies are centralizing their ERP, warehouse management, and shipping systems in the cloud. This allows real-time communication between headquarters and plant sites, whether in New Jersey or Singapore. Cloud systems are crucial for rapid rerouting and cross-company collaboration: e.g., if a particular Indian supplier is hit by an export hold, partner plants in Europe can be repurposed.

Cloud integration also helps firms quickly scale up new U.S. plants. Rather than building from scratch, companies can spin up virtual infrastructure: digital twins of factory floors, simulation of production lines, etc. Real-time dashboards monitor plant KPIs (throughput, yield, quality) and tie them back to demand in the field. During the tariff crisis, such visibility has enabled firms to identify bottlenecks (e.g. a polymer shortage for syringes) and adapt faster than manual processes would allow.

## Digital Risk Management and Early Warning

New digital risk management tools are being widely adopted. These platforms aggregate data on weather, political events, port congestion, and supplier health. AI algorithms then flag red alerts when, say, a hurricane threatens a chemical plant in Asia or a labor strike looms in Europe. With tariffs adding one more axis of risk, these systems have grown in importance (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

For example, a company might program a rule: if the USTR issues a new tariff threat on Asia, immediately run contingency plans. The IT system would then pull alternate supplier contacts and expedited logistics options, automatically initiating quotes or drafts of shipping orders. Such “predictive resilience” tools effectively treat the tariff environment as another risk factor to manage proactively (www.pharmafocusamerica.com).

## Data Analytics for Compliance and Performance

Big data analytics also streamline **compliance tracking**. To qualify for lower tariffs, a firm must document its pricing changes and production plans in exacting detail. Cloud-based analytics can automatically generate reports (e.g. showing that a drug’s price to U.S. insurers is now equal to or lower than prices in Germany or

Japan). They can also ensure that manufacturing does happen on schedule; for example, if a planned onshore facility falls behind, the system alerts management to renegotiate terms.

Analytics platforms also measure supply chain performance in real time: order fill rates, lead time deviations, quality metrics across sites (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). The goal is continuous improvement: learning which supply lines got delayed by tariff-induced shuffling, or how a pricing deal affected sales volumes. Over time, companies gain a more granular view of how trade policy is impacting operations.

## Ecosystem Integration

Perhaps most importantly, firms are dropping siloed systems in favor of **ecosystem integration** (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). This means common data standards and shared platforms between drugmakers, CMOs, 3PLs, and even regulators. Facility registration and inspection records must be distinguished from product-application approvals: FDA does not approve manufacturing facilities independently, and registration alone does not denote approval (FDA explanation). Digital collaboration suites (often based on secure cloud networks) allow instantaneous communication with customs brokers when tariff rules change.

The advantage is that a disruption no longer affects a company in isolation. For example, if a distributor in the EU is awarded a U.S. contract, the ordering and compliance data is entered into one system which routes shipments through approved facilities and flags any tariff classification issues upfront. Without such integration, a complex supply chain would be impossible to manage under shifting regulations.

Overall, observers note that **technology is the hidden glue** facilitating onshoring. New plants will still take years to build, but IT can get companies closer to a “digital first” manufacturing mindset. As one DPR report enthused, AI and other technologies are “driving optimism” in the industry despite economic headwinds (www.fiercepharma.com). In a tariff-distorted landscape, this digital backbone—cloud platforms, AI, blockchain, etc.—becomes critical to turning ambitious onshore plans into actual, streamlined production.

# Case Studies and Examples

## Eli Lilly’s U.S. Investment Drive

Eli Lilly offers a salient example of the onshoring trend. In February 2025, Lilly publicly committed: “We will build the capacity to supply the US market entirely from US facilities” (supplychain-risk.com). By May 2025 Reuters reported Lilly was scouting a site near Houston for a **$5.9B API facility** (www.fiercepharma.com). This came on top of Lilly’s announcement that it would build *four* new U.S. plants (3 API plants and 1 injectable) over the next few years (www.fiercepharma.com). The company’s CFO noted it was negotiating with several states and expected to choose all locations by year-end (www.fiercepharma.com). Such expansion would add roughly 3,000 jobs when finished (www.fiercepharma.com).

Lilly framed these moves as responses to tariff risk: *“the billions of dollars in investment pledges… have come as the industry looks to gird against the threat of potential import tariffs”* (www.fiercepharma.com). On January 30, 2026, Lilly announced Pennsylvania as the fourth new U.S. manufacturing site in the program announced

in February 2025. Construction there was expected to begin in 2026, with operations planned for 2031 (Lilly announcement).

Interestingly, Lilly did not abandon all overseas production. It continued building in India and Germany, suggesting a dual strategy: serve the global market cost-effectively and serve the U.S. from the U.S. In earnings calls, Lilly spokespersons emphasized that geographic diversification was still important for global pipeline drugs, especially those not sold in the U.S. This underscores the case that onshoring to avoid tariffs is often specifically targeted at U.S.-sold products.

## Pfizer’s Pricing Deal

Pfizer's September 30, 2025 agreement separates several pricing commitments. The White House said every state Medicaid program would have access to MFN prices on Pfizer products (White House announcement). Pfizer described pricing newly launched medicines at parity with other key developed markets and direct-purchase discounts for the large majority of its primary-care treatments and selected specialty brands, with announced savings averaging 50% and reaching 85%. The company said the specific agreement terms remained confidential (Pfizer announcement).

Pfizer described a three-year grace period from Section 232 tariffs conditional on further U.S. manufacturing investment. It also committed an additional $70 billion to U.S. research, development and capital projects over the next few years (Pfizer announcement).

## Europe–U.S. Strategic Dialogue

Europe’s reaction formed a case in international diplomacy. In April 2025, Ursula von der Leyen convened a video meeting with pharma CEOs (Novo Nordisk, Bayer, Sanofi, Roche, etc.) after U.S. tariff threats. CEOs warned that any U.S. tariffs would hurt *both* European and American patients due to integrated supply chains (www.euronews.com). They urged the EU to negotiate with the U.S. to cap or avoid pharma tariffs.

EU officials agreed and sought solutions. The U.S. and EU reached a political agreement in **July 2025**, followed by their **August 21, 2025** framework statement (European Commission overview; joint statement). On **June 25, 2026**, the Council adopted the two regulations implementing the EU’s tariff commitments, completing that legislative process (Council announcement). The current U.S. pharmaceutical regime is a separate implementing measure: Proclamation 11020 sets a **15% Section 232 rate** for covered EU-origin patented pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients unless a lower rate applies, while generic pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients, including biosimilars, are excluded from these Section 232 tariffs for now (Proclamation 11020, clauses 3(c) and 4). The EU also reminded industry groups to reduce needless regulatory burdens (“non-tariff barriers”) to strengthen competitiveness (www.euronews.com). Post-meeting statements reiterated that tariffs could undermine patient care and investment. Notably, EU trade policy advisors have since been more proactive about expanding domestic API production and working with global partners (e.g. an EU–India pharmaceutical alliance is being discussed as of early 2026).

## India’s Generics Industry

India, as the world’s largest generic exporter, has been watching proceedings closely. Per Mint and CNBC reports (Sept 2025), most Indian drug makers felt relieved: *“India’s generic drugs… are still expected to remain outside the scope of the new tariff regime”* (www.livemint.com). Indian exports to the U.S. actually grew from $8.7B in FY24 to $10.5B by FY25 (www.livemint.com). Of that, top shipments like Cardiovascular generics and diabetes drugs will not be tariffed. Indian industry leaders publicly said the immediate impact should be limited (www.livemint.com). In fact, some hoped that relative competitiveness might improve: with patented import costs rising, American distributors may turn more to generics (Indian or U.S.) to save money.

However, Indian exporters remained cautious. Under the implemented proclamation, generic pharmaceuticals and their associated ingredients are excluded from these Section 232 tariffs for now (Proclamation 11020). The Indian government announced it was preparing a detailed analysis and would negotiate with the U.S. and show evidence on generics’ role (part of the WTO obligations discussion). Indian firms also see an opportunity: some are exploring potential U.S. manufacturing partners or even subsidiaries to tap the onshore market for their generic lines, should tariffs expand. Early conversations with U.S. companies suggest that new consortia for generics APIs (e.g., in Southeast Asia) might form.

Overall, the Indian case underscores how tariffs on branded drugs can indirectly affect global generics markets. If even branded products become scarce or price-controlled, the industry dynamics will shift. But as of 2026, India’s narrative is that their main business (off-patent drugs) remains largely unharmed, and they should position actively as reliable supply partners for U.S. consumers.

# Implications and Future Outlook

The 2026 pharmaceutical tariff saga highlights the entanglement of trade policy, health care policy, and global industry. Looking ahead:

- **Supply Chain Fragmentation:** We expect globally distributed supply chains to continue fragmenting. Already, firms speak openly about designing *“regional supply chains”* with prioritized local inputs (www.indigrowth.com). In practice, this may mean the U.S. builds out domestic manufacturing of human drugs and biologics, the EU supplements that with its local sources (as per the EU Pharma package discussions), and Asia consolidates generics production. This could increase total inventory costs worldwide but improve resilience to binary shocks.
- **Pharma Industrial Policy:** The intersection of tariffs and domestic support suggests a long-term shift toward bilateral or national industrial policy. Some analysts propose that the U.S. may maintain certain manufacturing tax credits or grants even after Trump’s term, to prevent losing the momentum (similar to how the CHIPS Act aimed for semiconductors). Others caution that if tariffs are rolled back under a future administration, many onshoring plans could stall.
- **Global Access and Price Effects:** An open question is how patient access and pricing will evolve. If some priced drugs are oriented to domestic markets at higher levels (as the U.S. demands), other countries may find them relatively more expensive. The UK agreement changes NICE’s assessment framework to enable access to medicines that might previously have been declined on cost-

effectiveness grounds (UK government announcement). Conversely, U.S. patients may get some drugs cheaper domestically via TrumpRx. There are fears that developing countries could suffer if global redistribution changes – for example, if a multinational reduces export volumes to devote more supply stateside, or if raw material shortages in Asia raise costs globally.

- **Innovation and R&D:** There is a concern that R&D could be affected. DPR's report notes domestic R&D funding was actually shrinking amid this focus on manufacturing (www.fiercepharma.com). If governments push companies to invest capital in plants instead of labs, the drug pipeline could slow. Yet some bullish views argue that more manufacturing revenue (with higher input costs) could be reinvested in innovation. It remains to be seen whether the pharma industry's primary output (new drugs) accelerates or decelerates under these strains.
- **Technology and Resilience**: On the positive side, the crisis has accelerated digital transformation. By 2030, we expect pharma supply chains to be vastly more computerized than in 2020. AI-driven demand planning, blockchain provenance, and IoT monitoring will likely be standard for Tier 1 suppliers. This could pay dividends beyond tariffs – improving quality, speed, and compliance even in normal times. Ironically, the trade war has created impetus for modernization that would have otherwise taken a decade.
- **Medical and Public Health**: Governments will closely watch drug availability and prices. To this point, generic life-saving medicines have been largely insulated; regulators understand backlash could occur if patients face drug shortages or runouts of critical vaccines. An unaddressed risk is emergency response (e.g. pandemic vaccines or antibiotics). The creation of SAPIR suggests thinking ahead: the U.S. is setting aside strategic reserves of key APIs (www.whitehouse.gov). Other nations may follow with their own stockpiles.
- **Broader Geopolitical Trends**: The pharma tariffs episode is part of a wider pattern of "securitization" of trade (rare earths, chips, medical supplies). If sustained, it could push countries toward forming blocs for pharma self-reliance. For example, the EU might increase funding for an "EU Health Union," and India might accelerate its "Pharma 3" plan for vaccines. Risk of fragmentation is real: over the next years, we might even see export controls on certain APIs or new multilateral alliances (e.g. US-Japan-EU supply chain pact) to mitigate dependency.

In sum, **the combination of lengthy supply chains, strategic onshoring, and stringent trade rules ensures that volatility is the new normal**. But this environment will also spawn innovation in logistics, biotech manufacturing technology, and policy. It remains vital for industry and government to maintain dialogue – as the EU's strategic pharma forum did – to balance national security goals with global health needs (www.euronews.com).

# Conclusion

The "Pharma Drug Tariffs 2026" case vividly illustrates how trade policy can ripple through an entire industry. In just two years, pharmaceuticals went from a tariff-protected outlier to a primary target of economic nationalism. Our research shows that these changes have triggered a profound rethinking of supply chains, with companies

stockpiling, diversifying, and pledging record-level domestic expansion (www.fiercepharma.com) (www.thinkglobalhealth.org). Manufacturing in the U.S. is poised to surge (albeit tempered by cost and regulatory hurdles), as evidenced by hundreds of billions in new investment announcements (www.fiercepharma.com) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). Global supply networks are splitting into regional spheres, and resilience (through digital transformation) has become a strategic imperative (www.pharmafocusamerica.com) (www.indigrowth.com).

We also find that policy maneuvers – tariff threats, pricing deals, export limits – have generated mixed consequences. Some goals (like reduced dependence on China or cheaper generics for U.S. patients) may be advanced; others may backfire (higher U.S. drug prices in the near term, erosion of Europe's pharma base, inefficiencies from scattered production). Many outcomes depend on implementation: if companies fully deliver on their U.S. build plans and if regulatory agencies fast-track those plants, then U.S. production could gradually decouple from imports. If smaller companies balk or costs prove prohibitive, then reliance on foreign supply (and on generics exemptions) will remain.

The use of tariffs here is a form of **industrial policy**: tariff rates and pricing incentives can encourage domestic production. Observers will need to study whether this marks a long-term shift away from the globalist trade model to a more mercantilist pharmaceutical regime. Already, other countries are revisiting their own policies: the EU's "pharmaceutical package" (intellectual property, regulatory reform) may speed up Europe's own output in response. The interplay of public health priorities and trade won't end with 2026.

What is clear is that, going forward, **supply chain agility – underpinned by data and technology – will decide which companies and nations thrive**. As the pharma sector reinvented itself in 2025–26, those with advanced IT-driven logistics, flexible production strategies, and diversified sourcing will be best positioned. We have documented how these forces are currently unfolding, drawing on the latest reports, data, and expert analyses (www.thinkglobalhealth.org) (www.pharmafocusamerica.com). We leave the reader with the understanding that this is a dynamic story: by late 2026 and beyond, new tariffs or deals may emerge, requiring continual re-adjustment.

Pharma is no longer an afterthought in trade wars. Its future path in 2026 and beyond will be a bellwether for how critical industries balance globalization and national security. This report has provided a comprehensive examination of that path, at the intersection of policy, corporate strategy, and technology, with implications for supply chains, manufacturing, and IT strategies worldwide.

**Sources:** We cited government documents (U.S. White House, WTO), industry reports (FiercePharma, Pharma Manufacturing, think tanks), reputable news outlets (Euronews, Livemint), and expert analyses (www.wto.org) (www.fiercepharma.com) (www.pharmafocusamerica.com) (natlawreview.com) to ensure a fully referenced, data-driven discussion. Each claim herein is supported by the latest available evidence.

## Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://www.jnj.com/media-center/press-releases/johnson-johnson-increases-u-s-investment-to-more-than-55-billion-over-the-next-four-years
2. https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/tracking-pharmas-progress-on-u-s-onshoring

3. https://www.pharmamanufacturing.com/editors-review/article/55339582/editors-review-reshoring-tariffs-dominate-2025s-pharma-manufacturing-news
4. https://www.fiercepharma.com/manufacturing/pharma-manufacturing-output-surged-25-countries-braced-us-tariffs-atradius
5. https://natlawreview.com/article/pivotal-week-pharmaceutical-policy-trump-administration-advances-tariff-and-drug
6. https://www.fiercepharma.com/pharma/trump-administration-locks-trade-deal-setting-uk-drug-tariffs-zero
7. https://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/USDHSCBP-42cf077
8. https://www.indigrowth.com/supply-chain-trends-2026-tariffs-nearshoring-resilience
9. https://www.euronews.com/health/2025/04/09/pharmacos-warn-eu-commission-to-negotiate-and-reduce-non-tariff-barriers
10. https://www.indialaw.in/blog/us-pharma-tariffs-2026-exporters
11. https://www.livemint.com/industry/trump-100pc-pharma-tariff-india-impact-generic-edge-11758864872060.html
12. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2026/04/adjusting-imports-of-pharmaceuticals-and-pharmaceutical-ingredients-into-the-united-states
13. https://citinewsroom.com/2025/06/trumps-tariff-threat-exposes-chinas-tight-grip-on-the-global-pharmaceuticals-industry
14. https://www.fiercepharma.com/manufacturing/amid-us-investment-push-lilly-eyes-houston-potential-home-59b-api-plant
15. https://gov.texas.gov/news/post/governor-abbott-delivers-remarks-at-lilly-groundbreaking-in-houston
16. https://www.fiercepharma.com/manufacturing/pharmas-have-poured-370b-us-manufacturing-amid-2025s-onshoring-boom-dpr
17. https://www.fda.gov/industry/fda-precheck-pilot-program
18. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-launches-precheck-pilot-program-strengthen-domestic-pharmaceutical-manufacturing
19. https://investor.lilly.com/news-releases/news-release-details/lilly-selects-pennsylvania-home-its-newest-injectable-medicine
20. https://www.pharmafocusamerica.com/articles/pharma-supply-chain-digitalization-trategies
21. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/pharma_ag_e/pharma_agreement_e.htm
22. https://www.india-briefing.com/news/us-patented-pharma-tariff-2026-india-generic-drug-exports-exempted-43899.html
23. https://supplychain-risk.com/2025/06/05/onshoring-or-pushing-against-the-tide-pharma-will-struggle-to-reconfigure-supply-chains
24. https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2025-06587.pdf
25. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/regulating-imports-with-a-reciprocal-tariff-to-rectify-trade-practices-that-contribute-to-large-and-persistent-annual-united-states-goods-trade-deficits
26. https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2026-15799.pdf
27. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/09/23/2026-19498/guidance-and-procedures-for-implementing-tariff-adjustments-for-specialty-pharmaceuticals-and
28. https://commission.europa.eu/topics/trade/eu-us-trade-deal_en
29. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2026/06/25/eu-us-trade-council-gives-final-approval-for-the-tariff-commitments-under-joint-statement
30. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/landmark-uk-us-pharmaceuticals-deal-to-safeguard-medicines-access-and-drive-vital-investmentfor-uk-patients-and-businesses
31. https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/05/delivering-most-favored-nation-prescription-drug-pricing-to-american-patients

32. https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/12/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-announces-largest-developments-to-date-in-bringing-most-favored-nation-pricing-to-american-patients?query-11-page=3
33. https://group.atradius.com/knowledge-and-research/reports/industry-trends-pharmaceuticals-june-2026
34. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/supply-chain-risk-survey?gad=1
35. https://www.merck.com/news/merck-breaks-ground-on-new-1-billion-biologics-center-of-excellence-in-wilmington-delaware
36. https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/drugs/pembrolizumab
37. https://sustainability.lilly.com/impactareas/access-supply
38. https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/it-really-fda-approved
39. https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/hhs-restructuring-doge.html
40. https://www.fda.gov/industry/fda-actions-support-and-strengthen-domestic-drug-manufacturing
41. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-alerts-and-statements/fda-announces-new-anda-prioritization-pilot-support-us-generic-drug-manufacturing-and-testing
42. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11001215
43. https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/complying-made-usa-standard
44. https://www.zuelligpharma.com/solutions/distribution
45. https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/09/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-announces-first-deal-to-bring-most-favored-nation-pricing-to-american-patients
46. https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-reaches-landmark-agreement-us-government-lower-drug
47. https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/news/joint-statement-united-states-european-union-framework-agreement-reciprocal-fair-and-balanced-trade-2025-08-21_en

THE PUBLISHER

# About IntuitionLabs

IntuitionLabs is an AI consulting, custom software development and data engineering firm serving pharmaceutical, biotechnology, medical-device and other life-science organizations. We work with clinical, regulatory, medical-affairs, commercial, quality and IT teams to connect technology decisions with the work people need to accomplish.

### AI consulting and adoption

Our AI enablement services cover readiness assessments, use-case selection, governance and policies, team workshops, adoption measurement and ongoing advisory support. We help organizations structure the information layer behind AI: source material, context, permissions and maintained knowledge that make generated answers useful and reviewable. Private LLM inference and hosted AI options support teams evaluating how to operate AI with appropriate control over their data and infrastructure.

### Software, data and life-science workflows

IntuitionLabs develops custom software for pharma and biotech, integrates enterprise systems, and builds data engineering and business intelligence solutions. Areas of focus include AI agents, regulatory research, medical writing, medical affairs, CMC information, competitive intelligence and clinical-document workflows. Our eTMF intelligence work includes cross-system reconciliation and inspection-readiness support.

### Enterprise platforms and regulated delivery

We provide Veeva services, application support, managed services, integrations and custom applications, alongside enterprise content work involving platforms such as Egnyte. For regulated workflows, our services include GxP enablement, computer-system validation and software development addressing 21 CFR Part 11 requirements. The applicable controls, validation responsibilities and acceptance criteria are defined for each engagement.

### Work with IntuitionLabs

Explore AI enablement, pharma and biotech software development, data engineering and BI, and Veeva services. Contact IntuitionLabs to discuss your workflow, information sources and implementation needs.

IntuitionLabs publishes educational research to help life-science teams make informed technology decisions. Coverage of a product or organization does not imply a client relationship, endorsement or partnership.

**Website:** https://intuitionlabs.ai

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.