

Multi-Sourcing Strategies for Tariff Mitigation in Datacenter Infrastructure Procurement

Amal Bhatt

1249 Lakeside Dr. Apt 1051, Sunnyvale CA 94085, USA

amal@vt.edu

Received Mar 31, 2026, Revised: Apr 5, 2026, Accepted: Apr 6, 2026, Published Online: Apr 27, 2026

Reviewers: Anonymous Peer Review

Citation: Bhatt, A. (2026). Multi-Sourcing Strategies for Tariff Mitigation in Datacentre Infrastructure Procurement. *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 15(2), 1-11, <https://doi.org/10.59160/ijscm.v15i2.6392>

Abstract— This study develops a comprehensive multi-sourcing framework enabling organizations to mitigate Calendar Year 2025 datacentre infrastructure tariff exposure through strategic supplier diversification across multiple countries of origin. Enterprise server, storage, and networking procurement faces unprecedented cost volatility driven by Section 301 supplemental tariffs imposing 25-27.6 percent duties on China-origin products while alternative origins including USMCA partners, Southeast Asian manufacturing hubs, and emerging Indian production facilities offer zero-tariff treatment. Drawing upon supply chain risk management theory and portfolio optimization methodology, this research proposes a Total Cost of Ownership framework that integrates origin-dependent tariff structures, logistics costs, quality considerations, and risk premiums to enable systematic supplier allocation decisions. This research makes three primary contributions to supply chain management literature. First, it extends portfolio optimization theory to origin-based supplier allocation decisions under trade policy uncertainty. Second, it develops an enhanced TCO framework incorporating origin-dependent tariff structures as primary decision variables. Third, it provides the first systematic examination of India as an emerging datacentre infrastructure manufacturing origin for international procurement. Implementation guidance encompasses a sixteen-week execution program, financial justification models demonstrating 12-18 percent TCO reduction potential, and governance mechanisms for dynamic portfolio management.

Keywords— Multi-sourcing, tariff mitigation, total cost of ownership, datacentre infrastructure, supply chain diversification, China+1 strategy, India manufacturing

1. Introduction

Enterprise datacentre infrastructure procurement has traditionally operated within supplier relationship frameworks emphasizing volume consolidation, technical standardization, and operational efficiency [1]. Organizations developed concentrated supply bases optimizing for unit pricing and administrative

simplicity, with manufacturing origin receiving limited strategic attention. However, the implementation of Section 301 supplemental tariffs—imposing 25-27.6 percent duties on China-origin datacentre equipment—fundamentally challenges this consolidation paradigm [2]. The tariff differential between China and alternative manufacturing origins now represents the single largest cost variable in datacentre infrastructure procurement, exceeding component price variations, logistics costs, and traditional negotiation outcomes. For organizations maintaining historical procurement patterns concentrated with China-origin suppliers, Section 301 tariffs translate directly into 25-27.6 percent cost premiums compared to functionally equivalent products manufactured in preferential trade agreement jurisdictions or most-favoured-nation origins [3]. A datacentre deploying fifty million dollars in annual infrastructure from China-origin sources faces eight to twelve million dollars in avoidable tariff costs—exposure that strategic origin diversification can substantially mitigate.

1.1 Trade Policy Environment

The Calendar Year 2025 trade policy environment presents a multi-tiered tariff landscape creating both challenge and opportunity [4]. Products originating from USMCA partners enter duty-free under preferential trade agreement treatment. Products from Southeast Asian manufacturing hubs including Vietnam, Thailand, and Malaysia benefit from zero duties under most-favored-nation treatment and Information Technology Agreement coverage. Products from India similarly receive favorable tariff treatment while offering strategic diversification beyond established Asian manufacturing corridors. In contrast, products from China face supplemental tariff rates reaching 25 percent for servers and storage equipment and 27.6 percent for networking infrastructure [5].

1.2 Research Objectives

This study examines strategic multi-sourcing approaches enabling organizations to optimize datacentre infrastructure procurement across countries of origin, presenting a methodological framework for constructing supplier portfolios that minimize Total Cost of Ownership while building supply chain resilience [6]. The research addresses three interconnected challenges consisting of understanding tariff structures and manufacturing capabilities across origin categories, developing systematic approaches to portfolio construction balancing cost optimization with operational complexity, and implementing supplier qualification strategies that enable dynamic allocation responsive to trade policy evolution [7].

2. Literature Review

2.1 Supply Chain Risk Management Foundations

Supply chain risk management scholarship provides theoretical foundation for understanding diversification benefits in procurement strategy. Ivanov and Dolgui [8] examine supply chain viability under disruption conditions, 'maintain operational continuity during extended disruption periods. Hosseini, Ivanov, and Dolgui [9] develop ripple effect analysis methodologies demonstrating how disruptions propagate through interconnected supply networks, supporting the case for origin diversification as risk mitigation strategy. Katsaliaki, Galetsi, and Kumar [10] examine supply chain disruptions in the context of global crises, finding that organizations with diversified supplier bases demonstrate superior resilience outcomes.

Recent scholarship has specifically addressed trade policy as supply chain risk factor. Sharma, Kumar, and Singh [11] analyse the impact of trade policy uncertainty on global supply chain configuration decisions, establishing frameworks for incorporating policy risk into sourcing strategy. Rahman and Subramanian [12] examine supply chain resilience strategies in emerging market contexts, providing insights applicable to origin diversification toward developing manufacturing economies including India.

2.2 Portfolio Theory and Multi-Sourcing Strategy

The application of portfolio theory to supplier selection has received substantial attention in recent supply chain literature. Sawik [13]

develops integrated supplier selection and order allocation models under disruption risks, demonstrating that portfolio approaches reduce variance in total procurement costs. Torabi, Baghersad, and Mansouri [14] extend resilient supplier selection frameworks incorporating both proactive and reactive strategies. Kaur and Singh [15] analyze multi-sourcing strategies for sustainable supply chain management, establishing that diversification across origins provides both cost optimization and sustainability benefits. Pratap, Kumar, and Saurabh [16] examine supply chain risk assessment incorporating country-level factors, providing frameworks for origin-based allocation decisions.

2.3 Total Cost of Ownership Methodology

Total Cost of Ownership methodology has evolved substantially to address contemporary global sourcing challenges. Wetzstein, Hartmann, Benton Jr., and Hohenstein [17] provide systematic assessment of supplier selection literature, establishing that TCO approaches incorporating comprehensive cost elements outperform unit price-based selection methods. Kumar, Singh, and Modgil [18] analyze the role of total cost of ownership in sustainable supply chain decisions, finding that TCO frameworks effectively balance cost optimization with strategic sourcing objectives. Chen, Zhao, and Wang [19] examine total cost modeling for global sourcing under tariff uncertainty, establishing frameworks for incorporating duty costs and policy volatility into sourcing decisions.

2.4 Trade Policy and Supply Chain Configuration

Recent scholarship has extensively examined supply chain responses to trade policy changes. Fajgelbaum, Goldberg, Kennedy, and Khandelwal [20] document welfare effects of tariff implementations, finding that costs are largely borne by importing firms and consumers. Handfield, Graham, and Burns [21] examine supply chain reconfiguration in response to trade policy shifts, finding that organizations implementing proactive diversification strategies achieve superior cost and resilience outcomes. Baldwin and Freeman [22] synthesize current understanding of global supply chain risks, identifying trade policy volatility as persistent challenge requiring strategic response capabilities.

2.5 India Manufacturing Emergence

Literature examining India's electronics manufacturing capabilities has expanded substantially with government policy initiatives. Raj, Sharma, and Singh [23] examine supply chain transformation in Indian manufacturing contexts, documenting capability development trajectories relevant to procurement diversification strategies. Sharma and Bhat [24] analyze electronics manufacturing ecosystem development in India, providing frameworks for understanding capability maturation timelines. Jain, Sharma, and Srivastava [25] examine India's manufacturing sector transformation, documenting government policy impacts on capability development.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This research employs a multi-method approach combining quantitative tariff analysis, TCO modeling, and framework development. The methodology integrates analysis of publicly available trade policy data with cost modeling techniques established in procurement literature [26]. The framework development proceeded through four stages: tariff structure analysis establishing origin-dependent duty rates; TCO model specification incorporating all cost elements varying by manufacturing origin; portfolio optimization applying financial theory to origin allocation decisions; and implementation framework development drawing upon supply chain transformation literature [27].

3.2 Tariff Structure Analysis

The tariff analysis examines CY2025 effective duty rates across datacenter infrastructure categories by country of origin. Table 1 presents effective tariff rates for enterprise servers classified under HTS 8471.50.

Table 1. CY2025 Server Tariff Rates by Country of Origin

Country of Origin	Base MFN Rate	Supplemental Rate	CY2025 Effective Rate
United States	0%	N/A	0%
Mexico (USMCA)	0%	0%	0%

Canada (USMCA)	0%	0%	0%
Vietnam	0%	0%	0%
Thailand	0%	0%	0%
Malaysia	0%	0%	0%
India	0%	0%	0%
China	0%	25%	25%

Datacenter networking equipment classified under HTS 8517.62 and 8517.69 faces the highest supplemental tariff rates, with China-origin products subject to 27.6 percent duties while alternative origins maintain zero percent treatment [4]. For illustrative purposes, a server with declared customs value of twenty-eight thousand dollars generates seven thousand dollars in tariff cost from China origin versus zero from alternative origins.

Table 2. CY2025 Tariff Volatility Assessment by Origin

Origin Category	Current Rate	Estimated Volatility	Risk Assessment
USMCA	0%	<1% annually	Very Low
Southeast Asia	0%	3-5% annually	Low
India	0%	3-5% annually	Low
China	25-27.6%	15-25% annually	Very High

3.3 Total Cost of Ownership Model Specification

The TCO framework incorporates all cost elements varying by manufacturing origin. Unit purchase prices vary systematically by origin, with China typically offering lowest unit costs followed by Southeast Asian origins, India, and USMCA origins commanding modest premiums. Tariff costs apply origin-specific rates to declared customs values, creating the primary cost differential driving portfolio optimization. Logistics costs vary by geographic distance, with USMCA origins offering advantages for North American deployment. Quality premiums reflect origin-specific yield rates, with emerging origins warranting modest adjustments

during capability maturation. Risk premiums incorporate policy volatility assessments, with China commanding highest premiums reflecting tariff uncertainty [17].

Table 3. TCO Model Components by Origin Category

Component	USMCA	Southeast Asia	India	China
Unit Price Index	108	103-104	106	100
Tariff Rate	0%	0%	0%	25-27.6%
Logistics Cost	\$300	\$400-475	\$500-550	\$400
Quality Premium	0.5%	0.5%	1.5%	0%
Risk Premium	2%	4%	5%	10%
Management Cost	\$50/unit	\$75/unit	\$100/unit	\$75/unit

Note: Unit Price Index normalized with China = 100.

3.4 Portfolio Optimization Approach

The optimization approach applies portfolio theory concepts to origin allocation decisions, minimizing risk-adjusted TCO subject to operational constraints [13]. Tariff rate changes across origins exhibit low or negative correlation since trade policy affecting China does not similarly impact USMCA partners, Southeast Asian nations, or India. By maintaining qualified suppliers across multiple origin categories, organizations create portfolios whose aggregate tariff exposure demonstrates lower variance than single-origin strategies.

Table 4. Origin Category Classification Framework

Category	Origins	Tariff Treatment	Manufacturing Maturity	Strategic Role
A - Preferential	US, Mexico, Canada	0% (FTA)	High	Stable anchor allocation
B - MFN Established	Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia	0% (ITA)	High	Primary diversification
C - MFN Emerging	India	0% (MFN)	Developing	Strategic development
D - Supplemental	China	25-27.6%	High	Qualification maintenance

Table 5. Target Portfolio Allocation by Origin Category

Origin Category	Target Allocation	Strategic Rationale
USMCA (Mexico primary)	25-35%	Stable anchor; logistics advantage
Vietnam	15-25%	Mature capability; zero tariff
Thailand/Malaysia	10-15%	Diversification depth
India	10-20%	Strategic development; zero tariff
China	5-15%	Qualification maintenance only

3.5 Implementation Framework

The implementation framework specifies a sixteen-week execution program encompassing four phases as outlined in Table 6.

Table 6. Implementation Program Structure

Phase	Timeframe	Key Activities	Deliverables
Assessment & Planning	Weeks 1-4	Current state analysis; gap assessment; business case	Tariff exposure quantification; portfolio targets
Qualification & Negotiation	Weeks 5-10	Supplier qualification; commercial negotiation	Qualified supplier list; origin-enabled contracts
Portfolio Transition	Weeks 11-14	Volume migration; process establishment	Diversified allocation; operational workflows
Dynamic Management	Weeks 15-16+	Governance establishment; continuous improvement	Monthly review cadence; adaptation protocols

The assessment phase maps existing suppliers to manufacturing origins, calculates current tariff exposure, and develops business cases modeling TCO under current and optimized portfolios [28]. The qualification phase executes priority qualifications for USMCA and Southeast Asian alternatives while initiating India supplier development relationships. Commercial negotiation establishes origin specification provisions, tariff adjustment mechanisms, and substitution rights preserving procurement leverage across origins [29]. The transition phase executes phased migration from China concentration to diversified allocation while monitoring quality and delivery performance. The dynamic management phase establishes governance mechanisms including monthly portfolio review, quarterly reallocation assessment, and tariff policy monitoring protocols [30].

4. Results and Analysis

4.1 TCO Comparison by Origin

Application of the TCO model to representative datacenter infrastructure demonstrates substantial cost advantages for alternative origins despite higher

unit prices. Table 7 presents detailed TCO calculation for a representative server unit with twenty-six-thousand-dollar China-origin base price.

Table 7. TCO Calculation by Origin (Representative Server Unit)

Component	Mexico	Vietnam	India	China
Unit Price	\$28,080	\$26,780	\$27,560	\$26,000
Tariff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,500
Logistics	\$300	\$450	\$550	\$400
Compliance	\$75	\$100	\$125	\$150
Quality Premium	\$140	\$134	\$414	\$0
Risk Premium	\$562	\$1,071	\$1,378	\$2,600
Management	\$50	\$75	\$100	\$75
Total TCO	\$29,207	\$28,610	\$30,127	\$35,725
TCO Index	81.8	80.1	84.3	100.0

Vietnam achieves the lowest TCO index at 80.1 representing 19.9 percent advantage over China-origin procurement despite unit prices only 3 percent lower. Mexico achieves TCO index of 81.8 representing 18.2 percent advantage despite unit prices 8 percent higher than China, demonstrating that tariff elimination and risk premium reduction more than offset unit cost premiums. India achieves TCO index of 84.3 representing 15.7 percent advantage despite higher quality premiums reflecting capability development status.

4.2 Portfolio-Level Analysis

Portfolio-level analysis demonstrates aggregate savings potential from origin diversification. Table 8 presents comparative analysis between China-concentrated and optimized portfolio scenarios for an organization with seventy-five million dollar annual infrastructure spend.

Table 8. Portfolio-Level TCO Comparison (\$M)

Cost Element	China-Concentrated (65%)	Optimized Portfolio	Difference
Base Procurement	\$75.00	\$78.00	+\$3.00
Tariff Cost	\$12.19	\$2.25	-\$9.94
Risk Premium	\$6.00	\$2.40	-\$3.60
Management Overhead	\$0.00	\$0.55	+\$0.55
Total TCO	\$93.19	\$79.65	-\$13.54
TCO Reduction	—	—	14.5%

Optimized portfolio allocation: 30% Mexico, 25% Vietnam, 18% Thailand, 15% India, 12% China

Scenario analysis examines portfolio performance across alternative tariff trajectories as presented in Table 9. The optimized portfolio outperforms across all scenarios examined, with greatest advantage under adverse tariff developments while maintaining meaningful benefit even under favorable scenarios.

Table 9. Portfolio TCO by Tariff Scenario (\$M)

Scenario	China-Concentrated	Optimized Portfolio	Advantage
Base Case (25% China tariff)	\$93.19	\$79.65	14.5%
China Escalation (45% tariff)	\$107.69	\$81.57	24.3%

China Reduction (10% tariff)	\$82.44	\$78.42	4.9%
Tariff Expansion (new origins affected)	\$93.19	\$85.32	8.5%

4.3 India Strategic Assessment

India's datacenter infrastructure manufacturing capabilities have expanded substantially under Production Linked Incentive scheme support [31]. Major OEMs including Dell and HPE have established server assembly operations, while contract manufacturers including Flex and Jabil maintain India facilities capable of enterprise equipment production.

Table 10. India Manufacturing Capability Assessment

Product Category	Capability Status	Maturity Level
Server Assembly	Established	High
Storage Systems	Growing	Medium
Networking Equipment	Emerging	Low-Medium
Components	Developing	Low

Given emerging capability status, India allocation warrants graduated development approach as presented in Table 11.

Table 11. India Allocation Progression Framework

Phase	Timeframe	Allocation	Approach
Initial	CY25 Q1-Q2	5-10%	Qualification establishment
Development	CY25 Q3-Q4	10-15%	Volume building

Expansion	CY26	15-20%	Performance-based increase
Maturity	CY27+	20-25%	Full portfolio integration

4.4 Financial Justification

Multi-sourcing investment financial analysis demonstrates compelling return profiles. Table 12 presents implementation investment and ongoing cost estimates.

Table 12. Implementation Investment Analysis

Investment Category	Low Estimate	High Estimate
Supplier Qualification	\$800,000	\$1,200,000
Process Development	\$200,000	\$350,000
Systems Enhancement	\$250,000	\$400,000
India Development Support	\$150,000	\$300,000
Total Implementation	\$1,400,000	\$2,250,000
Annual Portfolio Management	\$250,000	\$400,000
Annual Compliance Costs	\$50,000	\$100,000
Total Annual Ongoing	\$300,000	\$500,000

Table 13. Financial Return Analysis

Metric	Low Estimate	High Estimate
Annual Tariff Cost Reduction	\$8,000,000	\$12,000,000
Annual Risk Premium Reduction	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000

Total Annual Benefit	\$10,000,000	\$16,000,000
Payback Period	2 months	3 months
Annual ROI	400%	700%
5-Year NPV (8% discount)	\$38,000,000	\$62,000,000

These returns substantially exceed typical procurement improvement initiatives, warranting priority resource allocation and executive sponsorship [32].

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This research makes three primary contributions to supply chain management literature. First, it extends portfolio optimization theory to origin-based supplier allocation decisions under trade policy uncertainty. While portfolio approaches to supplier selection have been established in procurement literature [13], application to tariff-driven origin diversification represents novel extension addressing contemporary policy challenges. The finding that origin-diversified portfolios outperform concentrated portfolios across all examined tariff scenarios validates theoretical predictions from portfolio theory regarding diversification benefits under correlated risk structures.

Second, the enhanced TCO framework incorporating origin-dependent tariff structures advances cost analysis methodology for global sourcing decisions. Prior TCO research has addressed logistics, quality, and administrative cost variations across global sources [17], but explicit treatment of tariff differentials as primary decision variables with associated volatility considerations extends analytical capability. The finding that tariff-inclusive TCO analysis reverses unit price-based sourcing preferences validates theoretical predictions while providing actionable procurement guidance.

Third, the systematic examination of India as emerging datacenter infrastructure manufacturing origin addresses significant gap in strategic sourcing literature. The graduated allocation framework provides template for incorporating developing origins into diversified supplier portfolios, balancing capability development investment with risk management requirements [33].

5.2 Managerial Implications

For procurement practitioners, this research provides actionable guidance across multiple dimensions. The origin strategy framework enables systematic portfolio construction replacing ad hoc supplier selection with optimized allocation methodology grounded in TCO analysis and portfolio theory. The China management guidance addresses transitioning from historical concentration while maintaining qualification and relationship optionality enabling policy change response. The India development approach provides structured methodology for building supplier relationships positioning organizations for capability maturation benefits over multi-year horizons [34].

For technology executives, the research highlights supply chain configuration as strategic lever affecting competitive positioning. The twelve to eighteen percent TCO differential between China-concentrated and diversified portfolios translates to meaningful competitive positioning over multi-year infrastructure investment cycles. Furthermore, demonstrating proactive supply chain risk management signals operational sophistication valued in customer and partner evaluations [35].

5.3 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. The tariff rate assumptions utilize CY2025 structures subject to policy change; framework utility depends on continued tariff differentials across origins. The cost estimation employs representative values that may differ from organization-specific structures; practitioners should calibrate models to actual procurement data. The India trajectory assumptions presume continued capability development supported by

government incentives; slower-than-projected maturation would affect optimal allocation levels [36].

Future research directions include longitudinal validation of portfolio performance across procurement cycles, extension to other product categories facing differentiated tariff treatment, and comparative analysis of multi-sourcing implementation across industry segments [37].

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

The convergence of Section 301 supplemental tariffs, established alternative manufacturing capabilities, and India's emergence as strategic origin creates compelling opportunity for datacenter infrastructure procurement optimization. Organizations maintaining China-concentrated supply bases face 25-27.6 percent tariff burdens translating to millions of dollars in avoidable annual costs. The multi-sourcing framework developed in this research provides systematic methodology for constructing origin-diversified supplier portfolios minimizing risk-adjusted Total Cost of Ownership while building supply chain resilience.

The TCO analysis demonstrates that alternative origins achieve fifteen to twenty percent cost advantage over China despite higher unit prices. Portfolio-level analysis indicates organizations with seventy-five million dollar annual infrastructure procurement can achieve thirteen to fourteen million dollar annual savings through optimized origin allocation representing 14.5 percent TCO improvement. Scenario analysis confirms portfolio advantages across tariff trajectories, with greatest benefits under adverse developments while maintaining meaningful advantage even under favorable scenarios.

6.2 Practical Recommendations

Organizations should assess current origin concentration and quantify tariff exposure, calculating cost disadvantage compared to optimized portfolio structures. Target portfolio construction should allocate across USMCA origins at twenty-five to thirty-five percent with

Mexico as primary anchor, Southeast Asian origins at twenty-five to forty percent distributed across Vietnam, Thailand, and Malaysia, Indian origins at ten to twenty percent with graduated development approach, and China origins at five to fifteen percent for qualification maintenance only.

India supplier qualification should be initiated immediately, establishing relationships positioned for capability maturation over twenty-four to thirty-six month horizons. Contract negotiations should establish origin-enabling provisions including explicit specification rights, tariff adjustment mechanisms, and substitution flexibility. Governance mechanisms should be established for dynamic portfolio management including monthly monitoring, quarterly reallocation assessment, and tariff policy response protocols [38].

6.3 Concluding Remarks

Organizations implementing these recommendations position themselves to achieve twelve to eighteen percent TCO reduction while building supply chain resilience across geographic regions. The strategic value extends beyond immediate financial benefits, developing institutional capabilities strengthening competitive positioning as global trade policy continues evolving. The multi-sourcing framework transforms tariff exposure from unmanaged cost to optimized portfolio element, enabling organizations to navigate trade complexity while maintaining infrastructure investment momentum supporting digital transformation and business growth objectives.

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback and suggestions that improved the quality of this manuscript

References

- [1] S. Chopra, P. Meindl, *Supply Chain Management: Strategy, Planning, and Operation*, 7th ed., Pearson, 2019.
- [2] United States Trade Representative, "Section 301 Tariff Actions," USTR, [https://ustr.gov/issue-](https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/enforcement/section-301-investigations)

[areas/enforcement/section-301-investigations](https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/enforcement/section-301-investigations), Last access: 15-01-2025.

- [3] M. Amiti, S. J. Redding, D. E. Weinstein, "The impact of the 2018 tariffs on prices and welfare," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 187-210, 2019.
- [4] United States International Trade Commission, *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (2024)*, USITC Publication 5765, 2024.
- [5] C. P. Bown, "The US-China trade war and Phase One agreement," *Journal of Policy Modeling*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 805-843, 2021.
- [6] A. Mukherjee, S. K. Srivastava, "Global sourcing risk management approaches: A systematic literature review," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 142-158, 2022.
- [7] N. Hasani, S. Khadem, P. Akhavan, "Procurement strategies for supply chain resilience: A systematic review," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 45-67, 2023.
- [8] D. Ivanov, A. Dolgui, "Viability of intertwined supply networks: Extending the supply chain resilience angles towards survivability," *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 58, No. 10, pp. 2904-2915, 2020.
- [9] S. Hosseini, D. Ivanov, A. Dolgui, "Review of quantitative methods for supply chain resilience analysis," *Transportation Research Part E*, Vol. 125, pp. 285-307, 2019.
- [10] K. Katsaliaki, P. Galetsi, S. Kumar, "Supply chain disruptions and resilience: A major review and future research agenda," *Annals of Operations Research*, Vol. 319, pp. 965-1002, 2022.
- [11] R. Sharma, A. Kumar, R. K. Singh, "Impact of trade policy uncertainty on supply chain configuration," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 112-128, 2023.
- [12] T. Rahman, N. Subramanian, "Supply chain resilience initiatives and strategies: A comprehensive review," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 78-95, 2022.
- [13] T. Sawik, "On the risk-averse optimization of service level in a supply chain under disruption risks," *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 98-113, 2016.

- [14] S. A. Torabi, M. Baghersad, S. A. Mansouri, "Resilient supplier selection and order allocation under operational and disruption risks," *Transportation Research Part E*, Vol. 79, pp. 22-48, 2015.
- [15] H. Kaur, S. P. Singh, "Multi-sourcing strategies for sustainable supply chain management," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 156-172, 2021.
- [16] S. Pratap, A. Kumar, K. Saurabh, "Supply chain risk assessment framework incorporating country-level factors," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 34-52, 2022.
- [17] A. Wetzstein, E. Hartmann, W. C. Benton Jr., N. O. Hohenstein, "A systematic assessment of supplier selection literature," *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 182, pp. 304-323, 2016.
- [18] A. Kumar, R. K. Singh, S. Modgil, "Role of total cost of ownership in sustainable supply chain decisions," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 89-108, 2024.
- [19] L. Chen, M. Zhao, H. Wang, "Total cost modeling for global sourcing decisions under tariff uncertainty," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 167-185, 2023.
- [20] P. D. Fajgelbaum, P. K. Goldberg, P. J. Kennedy, A. K. Khandelwal, "The return to protectionism," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 135, No. 1, pp. 1-55, 2020.
- [21] R. B. Handfield, G. Graham, L. Burns, "Coronavirus, tariffs, trade wars and supply chain evolutionary design," *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 40, No. 10, pp. 1649-1660, 2020.
- [22] R. Baldwin, R. Freeman, "Risks and global supply chains: What we know and what we need to know," *Annual Review of Economics*, Vol. 14, pp. 153-180, 2022.
- [23] R. Raj, A. Sharma, R. K. Singh, "Supply chain transformation in Indian manufacturing: Challenges and opportunities," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 78-95, 2023.
- [24] M. Sharma, S. Bhat, "Electronics manufacturing ecosystem development in India," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 112-128, 2021.
- [25] V. Jain, A. Sharma, L. Srivastava, "India's manufacturing sector transformation under Make in India initiative," *International Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 11, No. 6, pp. 45-62, 2022.
- [26] R. M. Monczka, R. B. Handfield, L. C. Giunipero, J. L. Patterson, *Purchasing and Supply Chain Management*, 7th ed., Cengage Learning, 2020.
- [27] D. Ivanov, A. Dolgui, B. Sokolov, "Supply chain resilience: Conceptual framework and research agenda," *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 59, No. 12, pp. 3537-3544, 2021.
- [28] McKinsey Global Institute, "Risk, Resilience, and Rebalancing in Global Value Chains," McKinsey & Company, 2024.
- [29] Boston Consulting Group, "The Nearshoring Imperative: Supply Chain Restructuring in the Americas," BCG, 2024.
- [30] A. Gunasekaran, C. Patel, R. E. McGaughey, "A framework for supply chain performance measurement," *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 333-347, 2004.
- [31] NASSCOM, "IT Hardware Manufacturing in India: Progress and Opportunities," Industry Report, 2024.
- [32] Kearney, "Reshoring Index: Trade War Impact on Manufacturing Location Decisions," Kearney Global Business Policy Council, 2024.
- [33] A. Kumar, V. Mani, V. Jain, "Supplier development practices in emerging economies: Empirical evidence from India," *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 58, No. 24, pp. 7561-7583, 2020.
- [34] S. Luthra, K. Govindan, D. Kannan, S. K. Mangla, C. P. Garg, "An integrated framework for sustainable supplier selection and evaluation in supply chains," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 140, pp. 1686-1698, 2017.
- [35] W. C. Shih, "Global supply chains in a post-pandemic world," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 98, No. 5, pp. 82-89, 2020.
- [36] K. Govindan, M. Fattahi, E. Keyvanshokoo, "Supply chain network design under uncertainty: A comprehensive review,"

European Journal of Operational Research,
Vol. 263, No. 1, pp. 108-141, 2017.

- [37] D. Ivanov, "Supply chain viability and disruption management: A conceptual framework," International Journal of Production Research, Vol. 60, No. 6, pp. 2126-2146, 2022.
- [38] World Economic Forum, "Global Risks Report 2024: Navigating Geopolitical and Supply Chain Challenges," WEF, 2024.