DESIGNED TO LEAD · ISSUE #08

The Supplier They Qualified Before They Needed To.

THE CONSULTING ROOM

Why the tariff wasn't the crisis; the timeline was.

MARITZA BARRUOS · LONGEVITYBYDESIGNED.COM

COLUMN C · THE CONSULTING ROOM · CONSULTING TIPS & CASE STUDIES

The supplier they qualified before they needed to, and why the timeline, not the tariff, was the real test.

Two operations I can describe as a composite of ones I have seen, call them Plant A and Plant B, built nearly identical devices in the same Class III category. They sourced a critical precision-machined component from the same tariff-exposed region. When a new duty landed on that component, both faced the same cost increase, to the dollar. Same exposure, same math, same line item bleeding on the same P&L.

They did not have the same outcome. Plant B absorbed the increase, activated a second supplier it had qualified eighteen months earlier, and shifted volume over two quarters. Plant A had one supplier, a name on a list of "potential alternates" no one had ever validated, and a design that could not accept a substitute component without a full verification and validation cycle. Plant A spent the next two years paying the tariff; because two years was how long it would take to qualify its way out of it.

> *"The tariff hit both of them equally. The difference was that one had already bought itself time, and the other was starting a clock it could not beat."*

This is the pattern worth naming, because it is invisible right up until the moment it is decisive. The tariff is a cost problem, and cost problems feel urgent. But in regulated device manufacturing, the binding constraint is almost never cost. It is time; and specifically, the revalidation time that a component change triggers.

Why the timeline is the constraint, not the cost

In most industries, a supplier change is a procurement decision measured in weeks. In regulated manufacturing, changing a component on a critical path triggers design verification and validation, and for a Class III device that timeline is measured in quarters or years, not weeks. Analysts tracking the current trade environment have made the point directly: supply-chain rigidity in regulated devices limits near-term reshoring precisely because component changes can require years of revalidation under FDA and international quality requirements.

That single fact rewrites the whole decision. It means the option to switch suppliers cannot be exercised in the moment you need it. By the time a tariff is announced, the runway to qualify an alternative before it bites is often already gone. Plant B's advantage was not foresight about tariffs; it could not have predicted the specific duty. Its advantage was that it had done the slow, unglamorous validation work in calm conditions, so that when disruption arrived, the option already existed. Plant A had the same eighteen months available to it. It simply spent them on other priorities, because nothing was on fire yet.

Sources: Medical Economics, "What the Supreme Court's tariff ruling means for medtech and device costs" (Jul. 2026); MedDeviceGuide, "Medical Device Tariffs & Trade War Impact 2026" (Apr. 2026)

What actually changed since the spring, and why the volatility is now structural

When this newsletter last covered tariffs, the picture was a set of duties and an open question about their legality. Since then, the environment has not settled; it has fragmented across multiple legal authorities, which makes it more durable, not less. Leadership teams waiting for "certainty" before they act should understand what they are actually waiting for.

On February 20, 2026, the U.S. Supreme Court held in a 6 to 3 decision that the International Emergency Economic Powers Act does not authorize the president to impose tariffs, striking down the IEEPA-based duties. That did not end tariffs. Within hours, the administration moved to alternative authorities: a global surcharge under Section 122 of the Trade Act, up to 15% for 150 days, took effect February 24, alongside signaled reliance on Sections 301 and 232 going forward. One authority closed; three others opened.

TRADE SIGNAL

The device-specific threads are still live. The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative has been building a formal Section 301 record, a more legally defensible basis than IEEPA, with public hearings held in May 2026 and a target completion date of July 24, 2026. Separately, the Section 232 national-security investigation into imports of medical equipment and devices, initiated in September 2025, remains open, with the 270-day review pointing to a determination in the summer of 2026. Neither has produced a final device tariff yet. Both could.

One distinction matters here, and it is easy to get wrong. The 100% Section 232 tariffs that took effect July 31, 2026 apply to patented pharmaceuticals and their ingredients; not to medical devices. The device determination is still pending. A leadership team that reads "100% tariff, July 31" and assumes its devices are now dutiable has misread the map; a team that assumes devices are therefore safe has misread it in

the other direction. The honest reading is that the device question is unresolved and actively moving through two separate authorities at once.

Sources: Holland & Knight, "Supreme Court Strikes Down IEEPA Tariffs" (Feb. 2026); MDDI, "5 Key Medtech Takeaways from the Supreme Court Tariff Ruling" (2026); Crowell & Moring, "Section 232 Tariffs on Patented Pharmaceutical Imports" (Jul. 2026); Supply Chain Dive, "Section 232 probe reignites tariff uncertainty for medtech firms" (Oct. 2025)

The takeaway for an operations leader is not which authority prevails. It is that "wait until it's clear" is no longer a neutral position. The volatility has become a standing feature of the environment, and the revalidation clock does not pause while you wait for a headline. Every quarter spent waiting is a quarter subtracted from the runway you would need to qualify an alternative before the next duty lands.

The diagnostic: a single-source dependency audit

When I work with a leadership team on this, I am not trying to predict the next tariff. I am trying to surface where the operation has no options; because that is the real exposure, and it is knowable today. Three questions do most of the work.

First: where are your single-source components on the critical path? Not all of them; the ones whose loss would stop a line or a shipment. Most teams can produce this list in an afternoon, and most are quietly surprised by how short and how concentrated it is.

Second: for each one, what is the revalidation timeline to switch, and do you have that much runway? This is the question that converts a procurement concern into a design one. If qualifying an alternative takes eighteen months, and a tariff could be announced with ninety days' notice, the math is already decided. You cannot start the clock after the announcement and finish in time.

Third: for each single-source part, do you have a qualified alternative already in the system, or only a name on a list? This is the distinction between Plant A and Plant B, and it is the entire ballgame. A validated second source is an option you can exercise. An unvalidated "potential alternate" is a hope with a two-year lead time attached.

> **THE DESIGN SIGNAL**
>
> Most teams pass the first question, hesitate on the second, and fail the third. They can name their single-source parts. They know, roughly, that switching is slow. But when asked how many of their critical alternates are actually qualified and ready to activate, the honest answer is often none. That gap, named parts, unqualified alternatives, is the exposure, and it does not show up on any dashboard until a duty makes it visible.

The design question underneath the tariff

Resilience is not purchased in the moment of disruption. It is designed in the quiet before it. Plant B did not out-forecast Plant A; neither of them predicted the specific tariff, and forecasting was never the point.

Plant B had simply built optionality as a standing practice: it treated a qualified second source not as an expense to defer until needed, but as insurance that only works if you buy it before the fire.

The companies most exposed right now are not the ones that made bad decisions. They made rational decisions, single-source for cost, lean for efficiency, in a trade environment that has since changed underneath them. The question for a leadership team is not how to have predicted this. It is whether the operation is being designed, now, to hold options it can actually exercise when the environment shifts again. Because it will shift again, and the revalidation clock will be exactly as long as it is today.

ONE QUESTION TO CARRY THIS WEEK:

Name your most critical single-source component. If a tariff on it were announced tomorrow with ninety days' notice, is your alternative already qualified and ready to activate, or would you be starting a validation clock you cannot finish in time? Be honest about which one it is.

The tariff is the same for everyone. The runway is what you design; and you design it before you need it, or not at all.

Maritza Barruos

Founder & President, Longevity by Designed LLC

mbp@longevitybydesigned.com · www.longevitybydesigned.com · 619-981-0941