Rachel Consultant

China Supplier Intelligence & Procurement Consultant

Supplier Selection Summary

Electronics / PCBA Supplier Comparison — Anonymized Demonstration Sample

SAMPLE · DEMONSTRATION VERSION — fictionalized / anonymized

Service tier: Supplier Selection Support — supplier comparison and capability-based shortlist

Prepared for: [Client] — US-based IoT startup

Scope: 4 candidate suppliers → capability-based shortlist (fictionalized)

Product / Stage: PCBA + Box Build · pre-sample selection

Report Ref: RC-SSS-DEMO-001

Date: 2026-09-27

DEMONSTRATION SAMPLE. Suppliers, entities, quotations, documents and findings are fictionalized/anonymized to demonstrate the reporting method. This is not a report about real companies.

Engagement Context

The client is sourcing a PCBA and box-build partner for an IoT device moving from DVT toward first production. Four candidates were identified through two sourcing rounds and an initial screening round; this summary determines which suppliers should receive paid samples and further verification, and which should not.

Selection approach: requirement → screening → comparable quotation basis → evidence review → capability-based shortlist. Suppliers are not ranked by price alone; ability to meet the requirement, control critical components and provide traceable quality evidence carry equal weight.

Quotation normalization: all candidates were compared on the same BOM revision, quantity (1,000 units, EXW), Incoterm and test scope, with tooling / NRE shown separately. Where a supplier did not provide a stated element, it is recorded as not provided rather than estimated.

1. Executive Summary & Recommendation

SHORTLISTED — Supplier A (primary) · Supplier B (backup)

Supplier A is recommended as the primary candidate and Supplier B is retained as a working backup, subject to the conditions below. Supplier C is workable only for a simplified assembly scope and Supplier D is not recommended at this stage.

Material findings: Supplier A and Supplier B are the only candidates whose stated capability covers the full requirement (PCBA plus box build); Supplier A shows the strongest requirement fit and the most complete critical-component evidence, but its certificate holder differs from the quoting entity and its payment path is not yet documented; Supplier B is aligned on entity and certificate but subcontracts part of box build; Supplier C is the lowest-cost quote but does not offer box build and provided no certification evidence; Supplier D is a trading company whose production footprint could not be verified and whose payment terms require 100% prepayment.

Basis of recommendation: the normalized comparison in §3 and the commercial and risk factors in §5. No supplier was selected on price alone.

Conditions before samples are released:

- Written confirmation that the contracting entity and the bank beneficiary match the quoting entity for Supplier A and Supplier B.
- Client-approved AVL and a no-substitution rule signed before any sample or production order is released.
- Sample PO to reference the same BOM revision, quantity basis and test scope used in this comparison.
- Certificate holder, site and scope alignment confirmed directly with the issuer for Supplier A.

Rachel Consultant has no commission, rebate or referral relationship with any supplier compared in this report.

2. Client Requirement & Shortlist Basis

Requirement: PCBA assembly and box build for an IoT device; mixed SMT / THT; functional test; controlled BOM / AVL with no unauthorized substitution; traceable critical-component sourcing; annual volume 1,000–5,000 units; first production targeted within five months.

Screening funnel: 11 suppliers identified → 6 responded to the requirement pack → 4 provided a comparable quotation basis → 4 carried into this comparison. Suppliers were removed at screening for capability (no box build), documentation (quotation basis not provided) or commercial fit (MOQ above the plan).

Screening is based on supplier-provided documents and public records only. Nothing in this summary reflects an on-site visit.

3. Comparison Matrix

Item	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	Supplier D
Entity type	Integrated PCBA manufacturer, Shenzhen	PCBA manufacturer with trading arm, Dongguan	Assembly house, Dongguan	Trading company, Shenzhen (office only)
Requirement fit	**Strong** — SMT/THT and box build in-house	**Strong** — SMT/THT in-house; box build partly outsourced	**Partial** — assembly only, no box build	**Partial** — assembly outsourced, not verified
Quote basis (1,000 units, EXW)	Provided — tooling shown separately	Provided — tooling shown separately	Provided — assembly only	Provided — not itemized
Unit price basis	Mid	Mid	**Lowest**	**Highest**
Tooling / NRE	USD 2,150, separate	USD 3,400, separate	Not applicable	Not itemized
MOQ	300 units	500 units	500 units	1,000 units
Sample lead time	12 days (stated)	15 days (stated)	10 days (stated)	20 days (stated)
Production lead time	25–30 days (stated)	30–35 days (stated)	Not confirmed	Not confirmed
Payment terms	30% deposit / 70% before shipment	30% deposit / 70% before shipment	50% / 50%	100% before production

Item	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	Supplier D
Certification evidence	ISO 9001 — holder differs from quoting entity	ISO 9001 — holder aligned with quoting entity	None provided	None provided
Critical-component control	AVL stated; substitution policy not written	AVL stated; change notification stated	Not addressed	Not addressed
Verification status	Desktop review only — not verified on site	Desktop review only — not verified on site	Desktop review only	Desktop review only
Key risk	Certificate holder / site mismatch; payment path not documented	Visibility of subcontracted box build	No box build; no certification evidence	No verified production footprint
Evidence	E-01 – E-07	E-08 – E-13	E-14 – E-16	E-17 – E-19

Prices are shown as a basis (lowest / mid / highest) rather than absolute figures to keep this sample anonymized. Lowest price is not the default selection criterion.

4. Supplier Mini Profiles

Supplier A — Integrated PCBA manufacturer, Shenzhen

Why shortlisted: only candidate with SMT, THT and box build stated as in-house, and the most complete response against the requirement pack.

Verified facts: registration active; business scope includes manufacture of electronic products; quotation issued against the client BOM revision; sample lead time and MOQ consistent with the plan.

Supplier claims: monthly capacity supports the planned ramp; critical components are sourced through approved channels; box build is completed in-house.

Evidence gaps: the ISO 9001 holder name differs from the quoting entity; no written substitution policy; beneficiary and invoice issuer not yet confirmed; capacity not evidenced by utilisation data.

Procurement implication: the best technical fit of the four, but two administrative items (entity/certificate alignment and payment path) must be closed before a deposit is paid.

Next verification action: request written entity and beneficiary confirmation, certificate holder/site/scope check and a signed AVL; then release a paid sample.

Supplier B — PCBA manufacturer with trading arm, Dongguan

Why shortlisted: full process coverage including box build, with the cleanest documentation of the four — quote, certificate and payment details all held by the same entity.

Verified facts: registration active; certificate holder matches the quoting entity; quotation provided on the same BOM revision and quantity basis.

Supplier claims: box build is performed partly by a long-term subcontracted partner; tooling can be transferred if volumes increase.

Evidence gaps: the subcontracted box-build partner is not named; tooling/NRE is higher than Supplier A; no written change-notification procedure was provided.

Procurement implication: a credible primary or backup, but the outsourced box-build step must be disclosed, approved and traceable to the client lot before production.

Next verification action: request the subcontracted partner identity, an approved subcontractor procedure and a re-quote on the same basis.

Supplier C — Assembly house, Dongguan

Why shortlisted: lowest normalized assembly price and the shortest stated sample lead time.

Verified facts: quotation provided on the same BOM revision and quantity basis; MOQ within the plan.

Supplier claims: box build can be arranged through a partner if required.

Evidence gaps: no certification evidence provided; no box build in-house; no critical-component control described; production lead time not confirmed.

Procurement implication: usable only for a simplified assembly-only scope, and only after certification and box-build arrangements are provided in writing.

Next verification action: hold — no sample until capability and certification evidence are submitted.

Supplier D — Trading company, Shenzhen

Why shortlisted: responded quickly with a complete-looking quotation.

Verified facts: registered as a trading entity; no manufacturing site identified in the reviewed records.

Supplier claims: assembly is arranged with a partner factory; quality is managed by the trading team.

Evidence gaps: production footprint not verifiable; quotation not itemized; no certification evidence; 100% prepayment requested.

Procurement implication: the payment terms, unverified production footprint and absence of itemization combine into an exposure profile that is not acceptable for a first order.

Next verification action: not recommended at this stage; re-open only if a manufacturing entity and itemized quotation are provided.

5. Commercial & Risk Comparison

Factor	Comparison

Factor	Comparison
Landed-cost drivers	Unit price differences between A and B are within the range normally explained by component sourcing and tooling amortization; C's advantage is driven by scope (no box build, no certification support), not by efficiency.
MOQ & flexibility	A offers the lowest MOQ (300) and the most flexibility on first order size; B and C require 500; D requires 1,000 with full prepayment.
Tooling / NRE exposure	A: USD 2,150 · B: USD 3,400 · C: none · D: not itemized. Tooling ownership and transfer conditions were not stated by any candidate and must be defined before payment.
Payment exposure	A and B request 30/70; C requests 50/50; D requests 100% before production. Beneficiary and invoice issuer were only confirmed for B.
Lead-time confidence	A and C gave the shortest stated sample lead times, but only A and B described production scheduling. No candidate provided utilisation or on-time-delivery data.
Quality & compliance evidence	B is the only candidate whose certificate holder matches the quoting entity. A's holder differs. C and D provided no certification evidence.
Single-source risk	Even with A selected, retaining B as a verified backup is recommended: the two share only part of their component sourcing, so a supply interruption would not affect both identically.

6. Selection Recommendation

Decision	Supplier	Rationale
Proceed to samples	Supplier A	Best requirement fit; conditions: entity/beneficiary confirmation, certificate holder/site/scope check, signed AVL.
Retain as backup	Supplier B	Full process coverage with aligned documentation; conditions: disclose the subcontracted box-build partner and provide a re-quote on the same basis.
Hold	Supplier C	Assembly-only scope and no certification evidence; re-open only if box-build and certification documentation are provided.
Not recommended	Supplier D	Unverified production footprint, non-itemized quotation and 100% prepayment terms.

> **Finding:** Supplier A and Supplier B are the only candidates whose stated capability covers the full requirement. The difference between them is evidence quality and commercial exposure, not technical fit — which is why the recommendation is to proceed with one and keep the other warm, rather than to select a single winner now.
>
> **Procurement implication:** the comparison basis is only valid for the stated BOM revision, quantity and test scope; a change in any of these requires a new comparison.

Unverified does not automatically mean negative. Items recorded as unverified indicate information that could not be obtained at this tier, not adverse findings.

7. Recommended Next Actions

1. **Issue a paid sample PO to Supplier A** on the quoted basis, referencing the approved AVL and no-substitution rule. **Owner:** client engineering with Rachel Consultant.
2. **Obtain written entity, beneficiary and certificate holder/site/scope confirmation from Supplier A** before any deposit. **Owner:** Rachel Consultant.
3. **Keep Supplier B active** by requesting subcontracted box-build disclosure and a re-quote on the same BOM revision. **Owner:** Rachel Consultant.
4. **Do not release a sample to Supplier C or Supplier D** until the missing evidence is provided in writing.
5. **Repeat the comparison after samples**, using measured results (first-article quality, test evidence, delivery performance) instead of supplier statements.

Not covered at this tier: on-site verification, production capacity and yield validation, financial health assessment, contract negotiation and ongoing procurement execution.

Appendix — Evidence Index

E-01 Supplier A registration extract; E-02 Supplier A quotation pack; E-03 Supplier A AVL statement; E-04 Supplier A quality-system certificate; E-05 Supplier A process and outsourcing statement; E-06 Supplier A payment-terms confirmation; E-07 Supplier A box-build scope note; E-08–E-13 Supplier B equivalent pack; E-14–E-16 Supplier C quotation and correspondence; E-17–E-19 Supplier D quotation and correspondence; CLIENT-01 requirement pack; WEB-01–WEB-04 public-record checks. All are fictionalized demonstration references.

Disclaimer & Scope Limitations

This summary is procurement decision support based on supplier-provided information, quotations and public records available within the stated scope. It is not a certification, legal opinion, financial audit or product guarantee.

The comparison is valid only for the BOM revision, quantity, Incoterm, test scope and approved sources stated in this report. A change in any of these invalidates the comparison and requires re-assessment.

Rachel Consultant has no commission, rebate or referral relationship with any supplier compared here. Final technical, compliance, contractual and purchasing decisions remain with the client.

Rachel Consultant · China Supplier Intelligence

Supplier Verification · Supplier Intelligence Report · On-site Factory Verification · Supplier Selection Support

rachelsourcing.com

rachel@rachelsourcing.com