**Rachel Consultant**

China Supplier Intelligence & Procurement Consultant

# Supplier Intelligence Report

Electronics / PCBA Supplier — Anonymized Demonstration Sample

**SAMPLE · DEMONSTRATION VERSION — fictionalized / anonymized**

Service tier: Supplier Intelligence Report — desktop review, no site visit

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

**Supplier:** Factory B, Shenzhen / Dongguan, China (fictionalized)

**Product / Stage:** PCBA + Box Build · DVT / Pilot → First Production

**Report Ref:** RC-SIR-DEMO-001

**Date:** 2026-09-27

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

## Engagement Context

The client is preparing to move an IoT hardware product from DVT/pilot builds toward first production. The decision is whether Factory B is suitable for a controlled pilot and whether commercial exposure can be increased before an on-site verification.

**Key requirements:** PCBA and box-build capability; controlled BOM/AVL; transparent outsourcing; traceable critical-component sourcing; relevant quality-system evidence; and a contracting/payment path aligned with the actual manufacturer.

**Methodology:** Client Requirement → Evidence → Findings → Risk → Procurement Implication → Recommended Action. Supplier statements are identified as such and are not treated as independently verified facts.

## 1. Executive Summary & Verdict

### CONDITIONAL — Proceed with Conditions

**Overall risk:** Medium.

Factory B appears potentially suitable for a controlled DVT/pilot build, but the evidence does not support unrestricted scale-up or high commercial exposure yet.

**Material findings:** the commercial and manufacturing entities are related but not identical; SMT/main assembly are represented as in-house while selected special processes are outsourced; certificate scope needs final entity/site confirmation; ramp capacity is plausible but unverified; critical-IC sourcing and substitution controls need tighter written rules.

**Procurement implication:** treat Factory B as a candidate for a controlled pilot, not yet a fully cleared production supplier.

**Recommended action:** close entity alignment, BOM/AVL and substitution controls, outsourcing disclosure, certificate scope and capacity evidence; use a limited pilot PO before scale-up.

## 2. Company Information

**Evidence:** DOC-01 business-registration extract; DOC-02 supplier profile; CLIENT-01 requirement pack.

**Finding:** Quotation is from a Shenzhen commercial entity; manufacturing is represented as taking place at a related Dongguan operating site.

**Risk:** Medium. Multi-entity structure is not inherently negative, but creates contracting, invoice, beneficiary, certification and accountability questions.

**Procurement implication / action:** require a written entity map and documentary relationship before PO release.

## 3. Ownership & Corporate Structure

**Evidence:** DOC-01; DOC-03 related-company declaration; WEB-01 corporate-information cross-check.

**Finding:** The entities show a stated common ownership/management relationship, but authorization for sales, manufacturing and payment is not fully documented.

**Risk:** Medium. **Action:** obtain a signed relationship/authorization statement and define responsibilities in Agreement/PO.

## 4. Production Capability

**Evidence:** DOC-04 equipment list; DOC-05 process summary; INTERVIEW-01 supplier management call.

**Finding:** Supplier-stated capability includes SMT, DIP/hand assembly, functional test, final assembly and box build. Conformal coating and selected mechanical/surface-treatment processes are stated to be outsourced.

**Unverified:** line utilization, OEE, actual monthly output, maintenance condition and peak-season loading.

**Risk:** Medium. **Procurement implication:** process fit is plausible, but outsourced processes and unverified capacity can affect traceability, lead time and root-cause ownership.

**Action:** require approved subcontractor/process list, process ownership matrix and capacity evidence; verify on site before major scale-up.

## 5. Product Capability

**Evidence:** DOC-06 capability matrix; CLIENT-01.

**Finding:** Represented experience is broadly relevant to mixed SMT/THT IoT assemblies and box build; prototype/pilot quantities are stated to be supported.

**Gap:** no independent evidence proves performance on the client's exact PCB complexity, test coverage or enclosure integration.

**Risk:** Medium-Low for pilot; Medium for immediate scale-up. **Action:** use pilot to validate DFM, first-article quality, test execution, workmanship, rework control and box-build integration.

## 6. Quality Management

**Evidence:** DOC-07 quality manual excerpt; DOC-08 sample inspection records; INTERVIEW-01.

**Finding:** Documented controls cover incoming inspection, in-process checks, first-article review, final inspection and nonconformance handling.

**Unverified:** implementation consistency was not observed on site. **Risk:** Medium.

**Action:** define client-specific CTQs, inspection/test records and defect-escalation rules for the pilot; verify implementation during the on-site visit.

## 7. Certifications

**Evidence:** DOC-09 certificate copy; WEB-02 issuer/database spot check.

**Finding:** Quality-system certificate appears current in the demonstration evidence, but reliance depends on confirming holder, address and scope cover the manufacturing entity/site.

**Risk:** Medium until alignment is confirmed. **Action:** confirm certificate number, holder, site, scope and validity directly against issuer/database.

## 8. Export Experience & Trade Records

**Evidence:** DOC-02; WEB-03 trade/export signal; INTERVIEW-01.

**Finding:** Signals are consistent with some export-facing activity but do not prove quality, order volume or performance on comparable IoT programs.

**Risk:** Low-Medium. **Action:** request relevant project references or anonymized case evidence where commercially possible.

## 9. Business Background & Credit

**Evidence:** WEB-01; DOC-01.

**Finding:** No material adverse item is identified in the fictionalized evidence set. This is not a credit guarantee.

**Risk:** Low based on reviewed sample evidence. **Action:** increase commercial exposure progressively with verified performance.

## 10. Entity & Transaction Path Consistency Check

| Element | Detail |
|---|---|
| Contracting entity | Shenzhen commercial entity proposed in quotation |
| Actual manufacturer | Related Dongguan manufacturing entity |
| Invoice issuer / beneficiary | To be confirmed before PO/payment |
| Certificate holder | Requires final holder / site / scope alignment |
| Communication entity | Shenzhen commercial entity |

**Finding:** The path is not automatically unacceptable, but is insufficiently documented for an uncontrolled production order.

**Risk:** Medium-High if contract, invoice, beneficiary and manufacturer remain inconsistent or unexplained.

**Procurement implication:** mismatch can create payment-review, contractual-recourse, compliance and quality-accountability risk.

> **Recommended action:** before payment require a one-page entity/transaction map, relationship evidence, exact beneficiary, invoice issuer, manufacturing-site confirmation and responsibility allocation. Re-verify any new/unrelated beneficiary.

## 11. Industry / Market Context

PCBA suppliers commonly combine in-house core assembly with selected outsourced special processes. This is not itself a red flag; the issue is whether outsourced steps are disclosed, qualified, traceable and controlled.

Price alone is not evidence of fraud or quality. Normalize BOM revision, approved sources, test scope, yield assumptions, tooling/NRE, Incoterm, quantity and quote validity.

## 12. Risk Register

| Risk | Severity | Impact | Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| R1 · Entity/transaction ambiguity | Medium-High | payment/accountability. | entity map + authorization + beneficiary verification. |
| R2 · Capacity not independently demonstrated | Medium | ramp/lead time. | capacity records + pilot + verification before scale. |

| Risk | Severity | Impact | Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| R3 · Critical IC sourcing/substitution | High if uncontrolled | counterfeit, traceability, functional/lifecycle risk. | locked BOM/AVL, approved channels, no substitution without written client approval. |
| R4 · Outsourced special processes | Medium | traceability/quality ownership. | approved subcontractor list + records + change notification. |
| R5 · Certificate entity/scope alignment | Medium | false reliance. | issuer/database confirmation. |

## 13. Procurement Assessment

### 13.1 Client Requirement Fit

Factory B is a plausible fit for a controlled IoT PCBA + box-build pilot. Evidence is insufficient for unrestricted production ramp.

### 13.2 Core Assessment

The strongest positive is apparent process fit. The main control issue is establishing a coherent chain: contracting entity → payment beneficiary → actual manufacturer → quality responsibility → certificate scope.

The second major issue is component control. Critical IC authenticity, approved channels, date-code/traceability and substitution governance can matter more than headline assembly price.

### 13.3 Key Procurement Risks

Entity ambiguity; unverified ramp capacity; critical IC sourcing/unauthorized substitution; outsourced-process visibility; certificate holder/site/scope mismatch.

### 13.4 Negotiation / Commercial Considerations

Lock quotation basis: BOM revision, AVL, approved source/channel, quantity, test scope, yield assumptions, tooling/NRE, packaging, Incoterm and validity. Require written change notification for source, substitution, subcontracted process and manufacturing site. Avoid large non-refundable exposure before pilot acceptance.

### 13.5 Recommended Deal Structure

Controlled pilot PO; client approval over BOM/AVL and substitutions; staged payments where feasible; Agreement/PO identifies contracting entity, manufacturing site and beneficiary; outsourced processes disclosed and controlled; scale only after pilot quality, traceability and delivery performance.

### 13.6 Recommended Next Action

- Before PO/deposit: close entity map, beneficiary, invoice issuer, certificate alignment, BOM/AVL and no-substitution rule.
- Before pilot: agree CTQs, test plan, traceability, approved sourcing channels, outsourced-process list and change control.
- During pilot: capture first-article, inspection/test, defect/rework, component traceability and delivery evidence.
- Before scale-up: review pilot and conduct on-site Factory Verification if exposure/volume justifies it.

### 13.7 Verdict Rationale

CONDITIONAL — Proceed with Conditions. Evidence supports a limited validation stage, not bypassing controls. If entity/payment alignment, BOM/substitution controls or credible capacity/process evidence cannot be closed, pause the order and consider alternatives.

## 14. Evidence Gaps & Further Verification

**What we know:** relevant PCBA/box-build process coverage is represented; related commercial/manufacturing structure; documented quality procedures; export-facing activity.

**What we don't know:** actual line loading/capacity; implementation consistency; exact performance on the client's product; full subcontractor controls; final certificate/site alignment; final beneficiary/invoice path.

**How to verify:** controlled pilot evidence, direct certificate check, entity/beneficiary documents, approved-source records, capacity records and on-site Factory Verification before major scale-up.

*Principle: Unverified does not automatically mean negative. Identify uncertainty and choose the appropriate verification step.*

## 15. Alternative / Backup Supplier Suggestions

No alternative is recommended solely because of current evidence gaps. Maintain at least one backup PCBA candidate if schedule sensitivity or single-source risk justifies it; compare on the same BOM revision, quantity, test scope and commercial basis.

## Appendix — Evidence Index

*CLIENT-01 Client requirement/RFQ pack; DOC-01 registration extract; DOC-02 supplier profile; DOC-03 related-company declaration; DOC-04 equipment/capacity list; DOC-05 process/outsourcing statement; DOC-06 capability matrix; DOC-07 quality manual excerpt; DOC-08 sample inspection records; DOC-09 certificate copy; WEB-01 corporate cross-check; WEB-02 certificate check; WEB-03 trade/export signal; INTERVIEW-01 management call notes. All are fictionalized demonstration references.*

## Disclaimer & Scope Limitations

This report is procurement decision support based on evidence available within the stated scope. It is not a certification, legal opinion, financial audit, product guarantee or guarantee of future supplier performance.

A desktop review cannot substitute for direct observation. Update findings if supplier, site, transaction path, BOM, process, certificate status or project requirements change.

Rachel Consultant provides independent supplier intelligence and procurement assessment. 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**