EZASSI SIGNALS

Pharmaceutical Contract Manufacturing: Onshoring, Trade Rules and cGMP Enforcement (United States)

Regulatory Signals · September 2026

A Regulatory watch on how US trade rules, onshoring incentives and drug cGMP enforcement are changing the cost, risk and demand picture for small and mid-size US contract manufacturers: Section 232 pharmaceutical tariffs, the BIOSECURE Act, FDA PreCheck, the API reserve and import alerts. Seven signals from one cycle.

#	SIGNAL	CONFIDENCE	HORIZON	STATUS
1	Section 232 creates a hard cost bifurcation: 100% tariff vs. 20% for approved onshoring plans, with a 2030 cliff	High	Immediate (0–3 months)	Verified
2	Section 232 tariff scope is deliberately bounded — generics excluded, nine product categories zero-rated — creating asymmetric CDMO exposure by product type	High	Immediate (0–3 months)	Verified
3	BIOSECURE enforcement clock is running but not yet operative — WuXi 1260H litigation and pending OMB list create a window of legal and structural uncertainty	Medium	Short-term (3–12 months)	Verified
4	FDA PreCheck's new-facility-only eligibility effectively excludes established small and mid-size CDMOs from the program's primary regulatory benefit	Medium	Short-term (3–12 months)	Review
5	ASPR domestic API reserve policy is directive and strategic but has not generated operational demand for CDMOs as of September 2026	Medium	Long-term (1–3 years)	Verified
6	Import Alert 66-40 shows continued and accelerating September 2026 enforcement activity against foreign drug and API manufacturers with unresolved cGMP deficiencies	Medium	Immediate (0–3 months)	Review
7	Four major CDMOs are building substantial US manufacturing capacity in 2026 — but the current findings do not establish that tariffs or BIOSECURE drove these decisions	Medium	Long-term (1–3 years)	Verified

Every signal rests on two or more dated events. Confidence is published as a band. Where a signal sits below High, the reasoning names the evidence that is missing. Status says where the evidence stands: Verified, Review, or Inconclusive — we looked, and the evidence does not yet support a firmer call.

SIGNAL 1 OF 7

Section 232 creates a hard cost bifurcation: 100% tariff vs. 20% for approved onshoring plans, with a 2030 cliff

HIGH **Immediate (0–3 months)** · Regulatory Agency Actions · **Verified**

Proclamation 11020 establishes a two-tier tariff on covered patented pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients, where the gap between tiers collapses entirely by April 2, 2030, making the onshoring-agreement pathway the only durable cost lever.

REASONING

Three distinct, primary-source events converge on the same pattern: a signed proclamation establishing the 100% rate and the 20% alternative, an administrative process at BIS administering the onshoring-agreement applications, and a September Federal Register notice clarifying which product categories carry a zero rate. Together they confirm that the tariff is live and operational, that cost differentiation is directly tied to a government-approved onshoring commitment, and that the 20% relief is temporary by design. The 2030 date converting the reduced rate to 100% is stated verbatim in the proclamation and materially changes capital-planning horizons for any CDMO or customer seeking to rely on the lower rate.

PATTERN

Proclamation 11020 signed April 2, 2026, imposes a 100% ad valorem duty on patented pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients in Annex I, effective July 31, 2026 for Annex III companies and September 29, 2026 for others. The same proclamation provides a 20% rate for companies with onshoring plans approved by — or assessed as likely soon approved by — the Commerce Secretary, and states that this reduced rate rises to 100% on April 2, 2030. BIS published procedures for company-specific onshoring-agreement applications with a deadline of June 12, 2026. The September 23, 2026 Federal Register notice defines product categories eligible for a zero rate and makes five technical corrections to Annex I and one to Annex IV.

IMPLICATION

A US CDMO handling covered patented products or ingredients imported for domestic production now faces a binary cost outcome depending on whether the relevant pharmaceutical company has an approved onshoring agreement. CDMOs without clarity on their customers' agreement status are absorbing uncertain landed-cost risk. The 2030 cliff means the 80-point tariff differential disappears regardless, so the onshoring-agreement pathway buys time, not permanent relief.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Audit every active and prospective customer relationship involving covered patented pharmaceutical products or associated ingredients; determine whether the customer has filed for — and received or expects — a BIS onshoring-agreement approval, and price contracts accordingly given the 2030 rate convergence.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **Federal Register: September 23, 2026 Notice — Zero-Rate Categories and Annex Corrections** — Confirms the tariff framework is being actively refined through annex corrections and zero-rate category definitions, indicating that covered-product classification remains in flux and requires ongoing monitoring.

- **Federal Register: Adjusting Imports of Pharmaceuticals and Pharmaceutical Ingredients — Proclamation 11020** — Primary source for the 100% tariff rate, the 20% onshoring-plan alternative, the effective dates, and the April 2, 2030 rate-convergence date.
- **BIS Section 232 Investigations Page — Pharmaceutical Onshoring Agreements** — Confirms that BIS is administering the onshoring-agreement application process with a June 12, 2026 deadline, establishing that the reduced-rate pathway is a formal, company-specific administrative process.

SIGNAL 2 OF 7

Section 232 tariff scope is deliberately bounded — generics excluded, nine product categories zero-rated — creating asymmetric CDMO exposure by product type

HIGH **Immediate (0–3 months)** · Regulatory Agency Actions · **Verified**

The September 2026 Federal Register notice confirms that tariff exposure under Proclamation 11020 is not uniform across pharmaceutical manufacturing: generics are expressly excluded, and nine specialty product categories receive a zero rate, meaning a CDMO's tariff risk profile is entirely determined by its product mix.

REASONING

Two primary-source documents establish the pattern. The proclamation's explicit exclusion of generics — stated twice in the findings — and the September notice's enumerated zero-rate categories together show a deliberate structure: high tariff pressure is concentrated on the patented-small-molecule segment, while biologics sub-types (cell therapy, gene therapy, ADCs), plasma-derived therapies, orphan-indication products, nuclear medicines, fertility drugs, and medical countermeasures are specifically relieved. This product-specific architecture is not incidental; it directly determines which CDMO revenue streams face 100% input-cost pressure and which do not.

PATTERN

Proclamation 11020 states that generic pharmaceuticals and associated ingredients are not subject to Section 232 tariffs 'at this time'. The September 23, 2026 notice defines nine product categories eligible for a zero ad valorem rate under the proclamation: drugs for which all approved indications are designated orphan, nuclear medicines, plasma-derived therapies, fertility drugs, cell-therapy products, gene-therapy products, antibody-drug conjugates, medical countermeasures related to CBRN threats, and animal-health products. The notice conditions the zero rate on the product being from a jurisdiction with a current or forthcoming trade-and-security framework agreement or meeting an urgent US health need.

IMPLICATION

A small or mid-size US CDMO needs to map its own service portfolio against the tariff topology immediately. A CDMO concentrated in patented small-molecule API processing or finished-dose manufacturing for branded products faces a materially different cost environment than one concentrated in cell therapy, gene therapy, or ADC manufacturing. CDMOs working across segments should segment their customer base by tariff tier and manage contract terms accordingly. The 'at this time' language on generic exclusion is also a watch term: it signals that Commerce retains the option to extend tariffs to generics.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Classify all manufactured products and imported ingredients by Annex I coverage, generic status, and zero-rate category eligibility; identify any revenue streams exposed to the 100% rate and reprice or restructure those customer agreements before the September 29, 2026 effective date for non-Annex-III companies is fully absorbed.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **Federal Register: September 23, 2026 Notice — Zero-Rate Categories and Annex Corrections** — Primary source for the nine zero-rate product categories and the conditions (trade-and-security framework agreement or urgent health need) that govern their eligibility, establishing the asymmetric tariff topology across product types.
- **Federal Register: Adjusting Imports of Pharmaceuticals and Pharmaceutical Ingredients — Proclamation 11020** — Primary source confirming the explicit exclusion of generics from Section 232 tariffs 'at this time,' establishing the boundary of the tariff's current scope.

SIGNAL 3 OF 7

BIOSECURE enforcement clock is running but not yet operative — WuXi 1260H litigation and pending OMB list create a window of legal and structural uncertainty

MEDIUM **Short-term (3–12 months)** · Legislative & Statutory Activity · **Verified**

The 1260H list expansion in June 2026 and the August 2026 court injunction against WuXi AppTec's designation together signal that BIOSECURE supply-chain risk is increasing in legal complexity, not just in scope, while the OMB list and FAR revision — the triggers for actual procurement prohibitions — remain pending.

REASONING

Three sequential, independently sourced events establish the pattern: the Department of War's June 8 1260H expansion naming WuXi AppTec; WuXi AppTec's successful August 7 preliminary injunction pausing that designation; and the identified December 18, 2026 OMB list deadline with subsequent FAR revision requirements before any prohibition becomes effective. This is not a single-event story. The injunction is a material downside signal — it shows the designation process is legally contestable, not self-executing. Simultaneously, the statutory clock from the FY2026 NDAA continues regardless of WuXi's individual litigation outcome. The combination means CDMOs have a defined but uncertain window: the operative prohibition is future, but the legal exposure and customer due-diligence burden are present.

PATTERN

The Department of War published an updated Section 1260H list on June 8, 2026 adding approximately 65 entities, including WuXi AppTec, Complete Genomics, and Novogene. WuXi AppTec filed suit on June 11, 2026, challenging the designation, and obtained a preliminary injunction on August 7, 2026, barring enforcement of the designation while litigation proceeds. The OMB initial BIOSECURE list is due by December 18, 2026, with two designation routes — 1260H pathway and independent OMB criteria. After the OMB list is published, the FAR Council must revise the FAR; prohibitions take effect 60 days after that revision for 1260H entities and 90 days for independently designated entities. No published final FAR rule or FAR effective date was found in the current findings.

IMPLICATION

A US CDMO with any supply-chain exposure to WuXi AppTec, BGI, MGI, Complete Genomics, or Novogene — whether for sequencing, CRO services, API sourcing, or subcontracted manufacturing — should treat the designation risk as real even while WuXi's injunction is in force, because the OMB independent pathway can reach entities regardless of 1260H status. Federal-funded or government-contract-connected work is the highest-priority exposure. The December 18 OMB list publication is the next operative trigger.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Complete a tiered supplier mapping — covering direct suppliers, subcontractors, and any entities providing sequencing or biotechnology services — against the current 1260H list; flag all relationships with 1260H-listed or related entities and prepare a contingency transition plan timed to the December 18, 2026 OMB list publication.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **GT Law Alert: BIOSECURE Act Update (PDF)** — Confirms the two designation pathways (1260H and independent OMB criteria) as established under Section 851 of the FY2026 NDAA.
- **GT Law: BIOSECURE Act Update — Court Enjoins WuXi AppTec's 1260H Designation** — Documents the June 8, 2026 1260H expansion naming WuXi AppTec, the June 11 lawsuit, and the August 7 preliminary injunction, establishing both the expanded designation and the active legal challenge.
- **DLA Piper: US-China Life Sciences Policy Developments — BIOSECURE Update** — Identifies the December 18, 2026 OMB list deadline, the two designation pathways, the FAR revision requirement, and the 60/90-day prohibition timelines, establishing the sequenced statutory clock.
- **Goodwin Law: BIOSECURE Update — 1260H List Released** — Confirms that a 1260H-listed entity involved 'to any extent' in biotechnology equipment or services enters the BIOSECURE company-of-concern process, and that prohibitions do not take effect until 60 days after the FAR revision for 1260H entities.

SIGNAL 4 OF 7

FDA PreCheck's new-facility-only eligibility effectively excludes established small and mid-size CDMOs from the program's primary regulatory benefit

MEDIUM **Short-term (3–12 months)** · Regulatory Agency Actions · **Review**

FDA's June 2026 cohort selection and its published eligibility criteria together confirm that PreCheck benefits flow to new greenfield domestic manufacturing projects tied to a drug application, not to existing CDMOs seeking to expand or optimize operations.

REASONING

Four FDA primary-source documents establish a consistent eligibility boundary: the program launch, the implementation roadmap, the cohort selection announcement, and the eligibility page. Together they show that participation requires a new facility (not an existing one or an extension), that selection is based on national-priority criteria, and that the seven selected participants are mostly large pharmaceutical companies or well-capitalized biotechs. The exclusion of existing facilities is directly stated on the FDA eligibility page. This matters because a small or mid-size CDMO seeking to use regulatory engagement as a competitive differentiator — specifically faster inspection and application review for domestic manufacturing — cannot access PreCheck through most conventional expansion paths.

PATTERN

FDA launched the PreCheck pilot, describing two phases: facility readiness (early technical advice and facility-specific Drug Master File) and application submission (pre-submission meetings and inspections). FDA published an implementation roadmap stating that selection criteria include innovation in facility development and national-priority considerations. On June 29, 2026, FDA selected seven participants: Eli Lilly, Regeneron, Amneal, Cellares, Fujifilm Biotechnologies, Kriya Therapeutics, and Kyowa Kirin. FDA's eligibility page states that the program covers domestic manufacturing facilities that are not existing facilities or extensions of existing facilities and that have broken ground or are in pre-operational development.

IMPLICATION

Established small and mid-size US CDMOs cannot access PreCheck through an expansion of an existing site — the program's primary regulatory benefit is structurally unavailable to them without building a new facility from the ground up. The practical benefit flows to large pharmaceutical sponsors and well-capitalized new entrants. For a CDMO without FDA PreCheck status, the competitive response is to track whether a customer building a new facility — such as Fujifilm at Holly Springs — selects them as a contract manufacturer for that PreCheck-covered facility.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Assess whether any current or prospective customer relationship is connected to a new facility in the PreCheck program; if so, determine whether the CDMO's manufacturing services can be structured to benefit from the customer's PreCheck engagement, and monitor FDA's second-cohort announcement for any eligibility broadening.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **FDA: FDA PreCheck Pilot Program — Eligibility** — States verbatim that the program covers facilities that are not existing facilities or extensions of existing facilities, establishing the structural exclusion of established CDMOs.
- **FDA Press Announcement: FDA Launches PreCheck Pilot Program** — Describes the two-phase program structure and confirms the program launch, establishing the program's scope.
- **FDA: FDA PreCheck Implementation Roadmap** — Confirms the implementation roadmap publication and the national-priority, selective character of cohort selection.
- **FDA Press Announcement: FDA Selects Seven Participants for PreCheck Pilot Program** — Confirms the June 29, 2026 cohort selection and the identity of the seven participants, establishing that the initial cohort does not include standalone CDMOs.

SIGNAL 5 OF 7

ASPR domestic API reserve policy is directive and strategic but has not generated operational demand for CDMOs as of September 2026

MEDIUM **Long-term (1–3 years)** · Political & Administration Signals · **Verified**

An August 2025 executive order and ASPR's FY2026-29 strategic plan together establish a federal intent to build a domestic API reserve, but no procurement award, funded solicitation, or filled inventory was found in the current findings, leaving the demand signal at the planning stage.

REASONING

Two independent primary sources — the August 2025 Federal Register executive order and ASPR's current strategic plan — point in the same direction: the federal government has committed to building a Strategic Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient Reserve with a domestic-sourcing preference. However, the executive order makes acquisition contingent on available funds, the ASPR page reports objectives rather than completed actions, and the current findings contain no procurement award, solicitation, or named CDMO contract. This makes it a credible policy-formation signal but not an operational demand signal. The generic-tariff exclusion in Proclamation 11020 explicitly referencing reserve purchases reinforces that the reserve is real policy, but also confirms it is being treated as a distinct channel from the tariff mechanism.

PATTERN

An August 13, 2025 executive order directed identification of approximately 26 critical drugs and, subject to available funding, acquisition of a six-month supply of APIs needed to make those drugs, with a preference for domestically manufactured APIs. The order also directed ASPR to update its prior essential-medicines list and to include a proposal and cost estimate for a second SAPIR repository within one year. ASPR's FY2026-29 strategic plan, updated September 29, 2026, lists bolstering domestic manufacturing of critical medicines, APIs, and key starting materials as an explicit objective, including incentivizing onshoring. Proclamation 11020 states that generic pharmaceuticals and ingredients purchased for the Strategic API Reserve were included in the determination not to impose Section 232 tariffs on generics at this time.

IMPLICATION

The SAPIR framework represents a potential future procurement channel for domestic API and finished-dose CDMOs, but the timeline from directive to funded contract is uncertain. The funding contingency in the executive order means the reserve could stall at the planning stage indefinitely. CDMOs with API manufacturing capability or sterile fill-finish capacity for the identified critical-drug categories should position for solicitations when they emerge, but should not count this as near-term contracted revenue.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Monitor ASPR for publication of the updated essential-medicines and API-reserve list, and watch the Federal Register for a SAPIR-related request for information or procurement solicitation; register in SAM.gov under relevant NAICS codes to be positioned when solicitations issue.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **Federal Register: Adjusting Imports of Pharmaceuticals and Pharmaceutical Ingredients — Proclamation 11020** — States that SAPIR purchases of generic pharmaceuticals and ingredients were included in the rationale for excluding generics from Section 232 tariffs, confirming the reserve's policy status and its treatment as a distinct channel.
- **ASPR Strategic Plan FY2026-29 — Goal 4** — Confirms that domestic API and essential-medicine manufacturing is an explicit ASPR strategic objective updated through September 29, 2026, establishing continued federal intent without yet evidencing a completed procurement.
- **Federal Register: Ensuring American Pharmaceutical Supply Chain Resilience (Executive Order)** — Primary source for the SAPIR direction, the approximately-26-critical-drugs target, the six-month API supply objective, the domestic-sourcing preference, and the second-repository directive — all conditioned on available funding.

SIGNAL 6 OF 7

Import Alert 66-40 shows continued and accelerating September 2026 enforcement activity against foreign drug and API manufacturers with unresolved cGMP deficiencies

MEDIUM **Immediate (0–3 months)** · Enforcement & Compliance Signals · **Review**

Multiple September 2026 updates to Import Alert 66-40, combined with a September 21 warning letter directly linking foreign cGMP violations to a June 2026 detention action, confirm that FDA's detention-without-physical-examination mechanism is actively and repeatedly used — increasing supply-continuity risk for US CDMOs relying on foreign API or finished-dose suppliers.

REASONING

Two independent evidentiary streams converge: the Import Alert 66-40 publication page shows update activity on September 21 and 28, 2026, and the Babikian warning letter dated September 21, 2026, documents an enforcement sequence — records request, cGMP violations found, placement on Import Alert 66-40 on June 22, 2026 — that illustrates the mechanism in operation against a specific foreign manufacturer. Import Alert 66-79 for facilities refusing inspection also appears in September 2026 FDA index records. Together these events confirm that the detention mechanism is being used across multiple enforcement actions in a single month, which is the relevant pattern for supply-continuity risk assessment. The findings do not establish that the September updates involved a single high-impact new addition, but the frequency of updates itself is a meaningful signal of enforcement cadence.

PATTERN

FDA Import Alert 66-40, covering detention without physical examination of drugs from firms that have not met drug GMPs, shows a publication date of September 28, 2026. FDA's import-alert publication-date index lists Import Alert 66-40 entries including September 21 and September 28, 2026; a September 3, 2026 entry for Import Alert 66-40 was listed in index records but could not be independently confirmed in public sources as of September 2026. A September 21, 2026 warning letter to Babikian Healthcare Products CJSC states that the firm's products were placed on Import Alert 66-40 on June 22, 2026, following a records review documenting significant cGMP violations for finished pharmaceuticals. Import Alert 66-79, covering facilities refusing FDA inspection, also appears in September 2026 FDA index records.

IMPLICATION

US CDMOs sourcing APIs, excipients, or finished-dose inputs from foreign manufacturers — particularly those in jurisdictions with elevated FDA inspection deficiency rates — face an increased probability that a key supplier's products will be detained without physical examination. A single supplier detention can disrupt production schedules and trigger customer remediation demands. CDMOs should treat import alert exposure as a standing supply-chain risk factor, not a one-off event.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Audit the foreign-supplier base against the current Import Alert 66-40 Red List; for any supplier in a high-frequency enforcement jurisdiction (China, Turkey, and others appearing in September 2026 index entries),

require documented evidence of a current, passed FDA inspection and build alternate qualified sourcing before a detention event forces the issue.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **FDA Warning Letter: Babikian Healthcare Products CJSC** — Documents a September 21, 2026 warning letter linking a foreign manufacturer's unresolved cGMP violations to placement on Import Alert 66-40 on June 22, 2026, illustrating the full enforcement sequence in operation.
- **FDA Import Alerts by Publish Date** — Establishes that Import Alert 66-40 was updated on at least September 21 and September 28, 2026, documenting enforcement frequency within the month, and lists Import Alert 66-79 in September 2026; a September 3 entry attributed to Import Alert 66-40 in index records was not independently confirmed in public sources as of September 2026.
- **FDA Import Alert 66-40 — Detention Without Physical Examination of Drugs From Firms Which Have Not Met Drug GMPs** — Confirms the September 28, 2026 update date and the alert's active status as an enforcement mechanism covering drugs and drug products including excipients from foreign establishments.

SIGNAL 7 OF 7

Four major CDMOs are building substantial US manufacturing capacity in 2026 — but the current findings do not establish that tariffs or BIOSECURE drove these decisions

MEDIUM **Long-term (1–3 years)** · Standards & Industry Self-Regulation · **Verified**

Lonza, Fujifilm Biotechnologies, Thermo Fisher, and Cambrex are all expanding US manufacturing footprints in 2026, with Fujifilm's Holly Springs facility explicitly selected for FDA PreCheck, but the available evidence does not confirm that any of these projects was initiated in response to Section 232 tariffs, BIOSECURE, or a named federal onshoring agreement.

REASONING

Four independently documented capacity moves point in the same direction — large CDMOs increasing US domestic footprint — and the Fujifilm Holly Springs site is directly linked to the FDA PreCheck program through secondary reporting. However, the confidence score is constrained because none of the four moves has been confirmed by a primary source as a direct response to Section 232, BIOSECURE, or a specific government onshoring agreement. The Lonza announcement is the most authoritative (primary company source), but it does not cite tariffs or BIOSECURE. The Cambrex capacity figure in the findings could not be confirmed and is excluded from this signal. The pattern is real — US capacity is expanding — but the causal link to the specific policy mechanisms this watch tracks is analytic judgment, not primary-source fact.

PATTERN

Lonza announced on September 10, 2026, plans to construct a large-scale commercial spray-drying facility in Bend, Oregon, with two PSD-4 units and provision for future expansion, with completion expected in 2029 and initial job creation of more than 80 positions. Secondary reporting states that Fujifilm Biotechnologies' Holly Springs, North Carolina commercial-scale cell-culture facility was one of seven selected by FDA for the PreCheck pilot, alongside a reported additional investment to add eight 20,000-liter mammalian cell-culture bioreactors by 2028. Thermo Fisher opened a US Bioprocess Design Center at its Plainville, Massachusetts site, with planned GMP monoclonal-antibody manufacturing capabilities at the same site in the second half of 2026. Cambrex is reported to be expanding its Charles City, Iowa facility. None of the primary or secondary sources reviewed for these four events states that the expansion was caused by Proclamation 11020, BIOSECURE, or a named federal onshoring agreement.

IMPLICATION

For a small or mid-size US CDMO, this wave of large-CDMO capacity expansion has a dual effect: it increases competition for the same customer base and talent pool in the near-to-medium term, while also signaling that sophisticated market actors are betting that domestic US manufacturing demand will grow. A CDMO without a differentiating capability or therapeutic-area focus will face repriced competition as Lonza, Fujifilm, and Thermo Fisher bring new capacity online. Fujifilm's PreCheck connection also means its Holly Springs facility may move faster through FDA regulatory milestones than competing sites.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Track the commissioning timeline and therapeutic-area focus of each of these four facilities; identify where your CDMO's capacity overlaps with incoming large-CDMO supply, and prioritize differentiation in modalities, scale, or regulatory speed before the new capacity comes online by 2028-2029.

SOURCES & WHAT THEY SIGNAL

- **Lonza News: Large-Scale Commercial Spray-Drying Facility — Bend, Oregon** — Primary source for Lonza's September 10, 2026 announcement of a new US spray-drying facility, confirming location, technology configuration, planned completion, and initial job creation.
- **GEN: CDMOs Expand and Build for Future Growth** — Secondary source documenting Fujifilm Biotechnologies' Holly Springs FDA PreCheck selection and additional bioreactor investment, and Thermo Fisher's Plainville Bioprocess Design Center opening and planned GMP capabilities.
- **DCAT Value Chain Insights: CDMOs/CMOs — The Key Moves in 2026** — Secondary source reporting Cambrex's Charles City, Iowa facility expansion, contributing to the pattern of multiple large-CDMO US capacity moves in 2026.

PUT A WATCH ON YOUR QUESTION

A watch on your question runs every cycle.

These signals came from one cycle of a standing watch. Name a company, a market or a regulation, and the watch keeps running whether or not anyone opens the platform. Every signal arrives rated for confidence and horizon, with the dated events behind it and the sources that carry the weight.

See all the samples and tell us your question at ezassi.com/ezassi-signals-sample-library.

info@ezassi.com · ezassi.com