Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Nearshoring Vs. Friendshoring: The Cost-efficiency and Resilience Trade-offs in Global Value Chains

Rinkal Raj

rinkalraj@hotmail.com

Indian Institute of Technology Patna https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5730-4843

Research Article

Keywords: Nearshoring, Friendshoring, Global Value Chains, Supply Chain Resilience, Total Cost of Ownership, Foreign Direct Investment, Geopolitical Risk, Trade Policy, Manufacturing Location Strategy

Posted Date: September 11th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-10996463/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

NEARSHORING VS. FRIENDSHORING: THE COST-EFFICIENCY AND RESILIENCE TRADE-OFFS IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS

A Comprehensive Analysis of Financial and Operational Performance Implications for Multinational Corporations

Author: Rinkal Raj
Affiliation: Indian Institute of Technology Patna

Date: 1 September 2026

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement: No external funding statement is reported.

Data Availability Statement: The study uses publicly available secondary data; TCO results and other derived figures are author calculations based on stated assumptions.

ABSTRACT

The architecture of global production is undergoing a fundamental transformation. For three decades, multinational corporations (MNCs) optimized their global value chains (GVCs) around a singular principle: cost minimization through labor arbitrage, with China emerging as the undisputed "world's factory." This model, predicated on stable geopolitics, predictable trade policies, and frictionless logistics, has been profoundly disrupted by a confluence of forces: the US-China trade war, the COVID-19 pandemic, the Russia-Ukraine conflict, rising protectionism, and accelerating climate-related disruptions.

In response, two distinct restructuring strategies have emerged: nearshoring, the relocation of production to geographically proximate countries (Mexico for North America, Central and Eastern Europe for Western Europe), and friendshoring, the relocation to geopolitically aligned nations regardless of distance (India, Vietnam, Thailand). This paper provides a comprehensive empirical analysis of the financial and operational performance implications of these strategies, drawing on trade data from the US Census Bureau and Eurostat, foreign direct investment (FDI) statistics from UNCTAD, industry reports from McKinsey, BCG, and Deloitte, and detailed case studies of firms in the automotive, electronics, pharmaceutical, and apparel sectors.

Our analysis reveals that the choice between nearshoring and friendshoring is not binary but represents a spectrum of strategic trade-offs. Nearshoring delivers superior operational performance through reduced lead times (from 4-6 weeks to 2-5 days for US-Mexico corridors), lower logistics costs (30-50% reduction in freight expenses), and enhanced supply chain agility. However, it incurs higher direct labor costs (Mexican manufacturing wages are approximately 3-4 times higher than Vietnamese) and creates new concentration risks. Friendshoring offers superior geopolitical risk diversification and access to lower-cost labor pools but retains the logistical vulnerabilities inherent in long-distance supply chains.

Using a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) framework, we demonstrate that the "resilience premium" associated with nearshoring is largely offset by reductions in logistics costs, inventory carrying costs, tariff exposure, and risk-mitigation expenses. For a representative electronics manufacturer, nearshoring 30% of production to Mexico reduces TCO by 8-12% compared to a pure offshoring model, despite a 40% increase in direct labor costs. For friendshoring to Vietnam, TCO reduction is more modest (4-6%) but provides superior geopolitical risk diversification.

The paper concludes by proposing a hybrid "barbell" strategy as the optimal model for most MNCs: nearshoring a significant portion of production for core markets to ensure operational resilience and speed-to-market, while simultaneously friendshoring to multiple geopolitically aligned hubs for cost competitiveness and risk diversification. We provide a decision-making framework that maps product characteristics, industry dynamics, and risk profiles to optimal GVC configurations. The findings have significant implications for corporate strategists, supply chain managers, and policymakers navigating the complex terrain of deglobalization.

Keywords: Nearshoring, Friendshoring, Global Value Chains, Supply Chain Resilience, Total Cost of Ownership, Foreign Direct Investment, Geopolitical Risk, Trade Policy, Manufacturing Location Strategy

JEL Classification: F23, F52, L23, M16, O14

ABBREVIATIONS

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BCG	Boston Consulting Group
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
GVC	Global Value Chain
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IP	Intellectual Property
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MNC	Multinational Corporation
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PMI	Purchasing Managers' Index
R&D	Research and Development
ROI	Return on Investment
TCO	Total Cost of Ownership
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USMCA	United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement
WTO	World Trade Organization

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context

The globalization of production over the past four decades represents one of the most significant structural transformations in economic history. Beginning in the 1980s and accelerating dramatically after China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001, multinational corporations (MNCs) systematically disaggregated their value chains, relocating manufacturing to locations offering the lowest unit labor costs. This process, driven by advances in containerization, digital communication technologies, and trade liberalization, created a hyper-efficient but highly concentrated global production system.

China emerged as the epicenter of this transformation. By 2020, China accounted for approximately 28% of global manufacturing output, up from less than 3% in 1990 (World Bank, 2023). The country became the world's largest exporter, with its share of global merchandise exports reaching 15% by 2021 (WTO, 2022). For decades, this concentration was viewed as a triumph of economic efficiency, enabling unprecedented cost reductions and consumer price stability in developed economies.

However, this model was predicated on a set of assumptions that have now been fundamentally invalidated. These assumptions included:

1. Stable geopolitics: The assumption that trade would remain largely insulated from great power competition.
2. Predictable trade policies: The expectation that tariff schedules would remain stable or decline.
3. Frictionless logistics: The belief that global shipping networks would operate reliably without major disruptions.
4. Absence of pandemics: The assumption that health crises would not fundamentally disrupt global production.

The period from 2018 to 2024 systematically dismantled each of these assumptions. The US-China trade war, initiated in 2018, imposed tariffs on hundreds of billions of dollars of bilateral trade. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the fragility of lean, just-in-time supply chains, causing widespread shortages of critical goods ranging from personal protective equipment to semiconductors. The Russia-Ukraine conflict disrupted energy supplies and agricultural exports, while rising protectionism worldwide threatened the multilateral trading system.

The result has been a paradigm shift in corporate strategy and industrial policy. The discourse has moved decisively from efficiency to resilience. A 2023 survey by McKinsey found that 93% of supply chain executives planned to increase the resilience of their supply chains, up from 60% in 2020 (McKinsey, 2023). The question is no longer whether to diversify away from concentrated production in China, but how and where.

Two distinct strategies have emerged to address this challenge:

Nearshoring involves relocating production to countries geographically proximate to the final consumer market. For North American firms, this primarily means Mexico; for European firms, Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries such as Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, and Romania. The primary benefits of nearshoring include reduced transportation costs and lead times, enhanced supply chain visibility and control, cultural and linguistic affinity, and often preferential trade agreements (USMCA for North America, EU single market for CEE).

Friendshoring involves relocating production to countries perceived as geopolitically aligned or "friendly," regardless of geographic proximity. For both the US and EU, this includes countries like India, Vietnam, Thailand, and other Southeast Asian nations. The primary benefit of friendshoring is geopolitical risk mitigation—reducing dependency on any single nation for critical goods, particularly those seen as potential adversaries. Friendshoring also provides access to lower labor costs than nearshoring locations, though often at the expense of longer supply lines.

The distinction between these strategies is not always clear-cut. Many firms pursue hybrid approaches, nearshoring some production while friendshoring others. Moreover, the strategies are not mutually exclusive: Vietnam is both a friendshoring destination (politically aligned with the US against China) and, increasingly, a nearshoring hub for Southeast Asian markets.

1.2. Problem Statement

Despite the growing prominence of nearshoring and friendshoring in corporate discourse and industrial policy, there remains a significant gap in empirical research on the actual financial and operational performance implications of these strategies. Key questions remain unanswered:

1. What are the true costs of transitioning production out of China? The initial capital expenditure, operational disruption, and learning curve costs are substantial but poorly quantified.
2. How do nearshoring and friendshoring compare on Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)? While nearshoring locations like Mexico and CEE have higher labor costs, they offer lower logistics costs and shorter lead times. Friendshoring locations like Vietnam and India offer lower labor costs but retain long-distance logistics.
3. What is the "resilience premium"? How much are firms willing to pay for supply chain resilience, and how should this be quantified in financial terms?
4. Which industries are best suited for nearshoring versus friendshoring? The optimal strategy likely varies by product complexity, value-to-weight ratio, demand volatility, and other factors.
5. What are the long-term implications for global trade patterns? Is this a temporary adjustment or a fundamental restructuring of global production networks?

This paper addresses these questions through a comprehensive analysis of trade data, FDI statistics, industry case studies, and financial performance metrics.

1.3. Research Questions

The central research question guiding this study is:

What are the financial and operational performance trade-offs between nearshoring and friendshoring strategies for firms transitioning production out of traditional manufacturing hubs?

This central question is decomposed into the following sub-questions:

1. How do nearshoring and friendshoring compare on Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), considering direct labor costs, logistics costs, tariff exposure, inventory carrying costs, and risk-mitigation expenses?
2. What are the operational performance implications of each strategy, measured through lead times, delivery reliability, quality control, and supply chain agility?
3. How do different industries (automotive, electronics, pharmaceuticals, apparel) approach the nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision, and what factors explain divergent approaches?
4. What is the "resilience premium"—the additional cost firms are willing to bear for supply chain resilience—and how does it differ between nearshoring and friendshoring?
5. What is the optimal strategy for firms with different characteristics (size, industry, product complexity, risk tolerance), and how should they approach the location decision?

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study contributes to academic knowledge and practical decision-making in several ways:

Academic Contribution: This paper bridges the gap between supply chain management literature and international business strategy, providing empirical evidence on the performance implications of GVC restructuring. It extends the Total Cost of Ownership framework to incorporate geopolitical risk and resilience considerations, providing a more holistic analytical tool.

Practical Contribution: For corporate strategists and supply chain managers, this paper provides a decision-making framework for evaluating nearshoring vs. friendshoring options. The comparative analysis

of costs, risks, and operational performance across different countries and industries offers actionable insights for firms at various stages of GVC restructuring.

Policy Contribution: For policymakers in both developed and developing countries, this paper illuminates the competitive dynamics that will shape global trade patterns in the coming decade. Understanding what drives corporate location decisions is essential for designing effective industrial policies, trade agreements, and investment promotion strategies.

1.5. Scope and Delimitations

This study focuses on manufacturing supply chains, with particular attention to four industries: automotive, electronics, pharmaceuticals, and apparel. These industries were selected because they represent different positions on the spectrum of product complexity, labor intensity, and supply chain sophistication.

The geographic scope encompasses:

- Nearshoring hubs: Mexico (for North America), Central and Eastern Europe (for Western Europe)
- Friendshoring hubs: Vietnam, India (for both North America and Europe)
- Traditional hub: China (as the baseline comparator)

The time period covered is 2018-2024, capturing the US-China trade war, COVID-19 pandemic, and subsequent restructuring.

Key delimitations include:

- Focus on manufacturing rather than services
- Emphasis on large multinational corporations, though SME implications are discussed
- Reliance on publicly available data rather than proprietary firm-level data

1.6. Structure of the Paper

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows:

Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review covering the theoretical foundations of GVCs, the rise of offshoring, supply chain resilience theory, and the emerging literature on nearshoring and friendshoring.

Section 3 outlines the research methodology, including the analytical framework, data sources, and case study selection criteria.

Section 4 presents the data analysis, organized by macroeconomic trends, country-level analysis, industry case studies, and financial/operational performance metrics.

Section 5 synthesizes the findings into a comprehensive framework for decision-making, including TCO calculations and risk assessment.

Section 6 concludes with theoretical contributions, practical implications, policy recommendations, and directions for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section provides a comprehensive review of the academic literature relevant to understanding the nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision. It is organized into seven subsections, moving from theoretical foundations to empirical evidence to the identification of research gaps.

2.1. Theoretical Foundations of Global Value Chains

The concept of Global Value Chains (GVCs) has become central to understanding the organization of global production. GVC theory emerged from the intersection of several intellectual traditions, including world-systems theory (Wallerstein, 1974), commodity chain analysis (Hopkins & Wallerstein, 1986), and the firm-level perspective of transaction cost economics (Williamson, 1985).

Gereffi, Humphrey, and Sturgeon (2005) provided the most influential framework for understanding GVC governance. They identified five types of GVC governance structures—market, modular, relational, captive, and hierarchy—distinguished by the complexity of information exchanged, the codifiability of that information, and the capabilities of suppliers. This framework helps explain why some industries (e.g., electronics) are characterized by modular governance with global outsourcing, while others (e.g., automotive) involve more relational and captive structures with closer buyer-supplier relationships.

The fragmentation of production across borders was driven by what Jones and Kierzkowski (1990) termed "production unbundling"—the separation of production stages that were previously integrated within a single location. This unbundling was enabled by three factors:

1. Technological advances in transportation (containerization, air freight) and communication (internet, digital platforms) that reduced coordination costs.
2. Trade liberalization through multilateral agreements (WTO) and regional trade agreements (NAFTA, EU expansion) that reduced tariff and non-tariff barriers.
3. Labor cost differentials that created powerful incentives for relocating labor-intensive production to developing countries.

Baldwin (2016) extended this analysis through his concept of the "second unbundling," arguing that digital technologies enabled the offshoring of not just manufacturing but also services and knowledge work, fundamentally reshaping the geography of production.

However, the theoretical emphasis on efficiency and cost minimization has been increasingly challenged. Kogut (1985) was among the first to note that GVC configuration involves trade-offs between comparative advantage (efficiency) and other considerations such as risk and flexibility. More recently, scholars have emphasized the importance of "strategic coupling" (Yeung, 2016)—the alignment of firm strategies with regional institutional structures—in explaining why some regions successfully integrate into GVCs while others do not.

2.2. The Rise and Peak of Offshoring

The offshoring of manufacturing production from developed to developing countries, particularly China, represents one of the most significant economic phenomena of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

Historical Trajectory:

The initial wave of offshoring in the 1970s and 1980s focused on labor-intensive industries such as apparel, footwear, and simple electronics assembly. Countries like Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore—the "Asian Tigers"—were primary destinations. These countries eventually upgraded their capabilities and moved up the value chain, creating space for China to emerge as the dominant manufacturing destination in the 1990s and 2000s.

China's accession to the WTO in 2001 was a watershed moment. Within a decade, China became the world's largest exporter and the second-largest economy. Several factors contributed to China's manufacturing dominance:

1. Vast labor pool: China's population of 1.4 billion provided an enormous workforce, with hundreds of millions migrating from rural to urban areas to work in factories.

2. Economies of scale: China's ability to concentrate entire supply chains within its borders—from raw materials to components to final assembly—created unprecedented efficiency.
3. Infrastructure investment: Massive government investment in ports, highways, railways, and industrial parks reduced logistics costs and enhanced productivity.
4. Industrial policy: Strategic government support for target industries, including subsidies, tax incentives, and technology transfer requirements.
5. Currency policy: Maintenance of an undervalued currency (renminbi) that enhanced export competitiveness.

By 2020, China accounted for approximately 28% of global manufacturing output (World Bank, 2023), 15% of global exports (WTO, 2022), and was the largest trading partner for over 120 countries (UNCTAD, 2021).

However, the offshoring model also had significant vulnerabilities that became increasingly apparent:

Concentration Risk: The extreme concentration of production in China created systemic risk. A disruption in China—whether from natural disaster, political instability, or pandemic—could ripple through global supply chains. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated this dramatically, as lockdowns in Chinese cities halted production of goods ranging from iPhones to automobiles.

Quality Control Issues: The geographic separation between design/engineering and manufacturing created challenges for quality control, intellectual property protection, and rapid iteration. Firms had to maintain expensive oversight mechanisms, including regular travel and on-site quality teams.

Rising Labor Costs: China's manufacturing wages rose dramatically, from approximately $1,500/year in 2000 to over $10,000/year by 2020 (Conference Board, 2023). This eroded the labor cost advantage that had been the primary motivation for offshoring.

Geopolitical Tensions: The US-China trade war, initiated in 2018, imposed tariffs on hundreds of billions of dollars of bilateral trade. This dramatically increased the cost of Chinese imports for US firms and created uncertainty about future trade policy.

2.3. Supply Chain Resilience: From Efficiency to Robustness

The concept of supply chain resilience has emerged as a central concern in operations management and international business literature. This represents a significant shift from the earlier emphasis on lean, just-in-time production systems.

Origins of Lean Thinking:

The lean production paradigm, popularized by Womack, Jones, and Roos (1990) in their study of Toyota, emphasized waste elimination, continuous improvement, and just-in-time inventory management. The core principle was to hold minimal inventory, relying on frequent, small-batch deliveries from suppliers. This approach reduced working capital requirements and exposed quality problems quickly.

However, lean systems are inherently vulnerable to disruption. When the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted supply chains, firms operating on lean principles found themselves without buffer inventory to absorb the shock. The semiconductor shortage of 2021-2022, which cost the global automotive industry an estimated $210 billion in lost revenue (AlixPartners, 2022), was exacerbated by lean inventory practices throughout the supply chain.

Defining Resilience:

Christopher and Peck (2004) defined supply chain resilience as "the ability of a system to return to its original state or move to a new, more desirable state after being disturbed." They distinguished between:

1. Robustness: The ability to withstand disruption without significant degradation in performance.

2. Resilience: The ability to recover quickly from disruption.
3. Agility: The ability to respond rapidly to changes in demand or supply.

More recent scholarship has expanded this framework. Pettit, Fiksel, and Croxton (2010) introduced the concept of "supply chain resilience as a strategic capability," arguing that resilience should be proactively developed rather than reactively implemented. Sheffi (2015) emphasized the importance of redundancy (extra capacity, multiple suppliers, safety stock) and flexibility (ability to shift production, reconfigure supply chains) as key resilience strategies.

The Risk Management Perspective:

From a risk management perspective, supply chain disruptions represent a form of operational risk that can have severe financial consequences. Hendricks and Singhal (2005) found that firms experiencing supply chain disruptions experienced abnormal stock returns of -40% over a three-year period, with effects persisting for two years or more. More recently, Baldwin and Freeman (2022) estimated that a major supply chain disruption can reduce a firm's market value by 5-10% within a month.

The COVID-19 pandemic provided a natural experiment that demonstrated the value of resilience. Firms with more diversified supply chains, higher inventory buffers, and more flexible production capabilities recovered significantly faster than those with lean, concentrated supply chains (Miroudot, 2020). This experience has fundamentally changed corporate attitudes toward supply chain risk.

2.4. Nearshoring: Conceptual Framework and Empirical Evidence

Nearshoring—the relocation of production to geographically proximate countries—has emerged as a key strategy for reducing supply chain risk while maintaining cost competitiveness.

Theoretical Rationale:

The case for nearshoring rests on several theoretical foundations:

1. Transaction Cost Economics: Williamson's (1985) framework suggests that firms choose governance structures that minimize transaction costs. Nearshoring reduces transaction costs associated with distance, including communication costs, monitoring costs, and coordination costs.
2. Total Cost of Ownership: The TCO framework (Ellram, 1995) argues that purchase price is only one component of total cost. Nearshoring reduces hidden costs such as logistics, inventory carrying, quality control, and travel.
3. Agility and Responsiveness: Fisher's (1997) distinction between functional and innovative products suggests that products with high demand uncertainty benefit from proximity to markets. Nearshoring enables faster response to demand changes and reduces the risk of obsolescence.

Empirical Evidence on Nearshoring:

Research on nearshoring has grown substantially in recent years. Key findings include:

Labor Cost Dynamics: While nearshoring locations have higher labor costs than China, the gap is narrowing. Mexican manufacturing wages have remained relatively stable at $4-5/hour, while Chinese wages have risen to $6-8/hour (Conference Board, 2023). Similarly, CEE wages, while higher than China, offer productivity advantages due to higher education levels and automation capabilities.

Logistics Advantages: Nearshoring dramatically reduces transportation costs and lead times. For US-Mexico trade, overland freight costs are approximately 75% lower than ocean freight from China, and lead times are reduced from 4-6 weeks to 2-5 days (BCG, 2022). For EU-CEE trade, the advantages are even more pronounced, with same-day trucking possible for much of the region.

Trade Agreement Benefits: Regional trade agreements provide significant tariff advantages. The USMCA eliminates tariffs on most goods traded within North America, while EU membership provides CEE

countries with full access to the single market. This contrasts with the 25% tariffs imposed on many Chinese goods under Section 301 of US trade law.

Case Study Evidence:

Several high-profile nearshoring investments illustrate the trend:

- Tesla announced in 2023 a $5 billion investment in a gigafactory in Monterrey, Mexico, citing proximity to the US market and access to the Mexican automotive supplier ecosystem.
- BMW expanded its plant in San Luis Potosí, Mexico, investing $800 million to produce electric vehicles for the North American market.
- Siemens has expanded manufacturing in the Czech Republic and Poland, citing the need for proximity to European customers and access to skilled engineering talent.

2.5. Friendshoring: Geopolitics and Economic Security

Friendshoring represents a newer concept, introduced into policy discourse by US Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen in 2022. It involves relocating production to countries perceived as geopolitically aligned, regardless of geographic proximity.

Theoretical Foundations:

Friendshoring draws on several intellectual traditions:

1. Geopolitical Risk Theory: The recognition that political and security considerations can create significant economic risks that must be factored into location decisions. This perspective emphasizes the importance of "geo-economic alignment" between production locations and consumer markets.
2. Economic Statecraft: The use of economic tools (trade, investment, sanctions) for geopolitical purposes. Friendshoring aligns corporate strategies with national security interests, creating a "geopolitical moat" around critical supply chains.
3. Diversification Theory: The principle that spreading production across multiple locations reduces exposure to any single country's risks. Friendshoring diversifies beyond China without requiring geographic proximity.

Policy Context:

Friendshoring has been embraced by policymakers in the US and EU as a response to concerns about economic security. Key policy initiatives include:

- US CHIPS and Science Act (2022): Provides $52 billion in subsidies for semiconductor manufacturing in the US and allied countries, explicitly excluding China.
- US Inflation Reduction Act (2022): Offers tax credits for electric vehicles and batteries, with content requirements that favor US and allied-country sourcing.
- EU Chips Act (2023): Aims to double Europe's share of global semiconductor production to 20% by 2030, with funding for manufacturing in member states and "like-minded" partners.
- India-US Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology (iCET) (2023): Promotes collaboration in semiconductor, AI, and defense technology supply chains.

Empirical Evidence:

Research on friendshoring is more limited, given the concept's recent emergence. However, early evidence suggests:

- Trade Diversion: US imports from friendshoring destinations (Vietnam, India, Thailand) have grown substantially since 2018, while Chinese imports have declined. Vietnam's share of US imports doubled from 2018 to 2023 (US Census Bureau, 2024).

- FDI Flows: Foreign direct investment in friendshoring hubs has remained important. Viet Nam received approximately $19 billion in FDI in 2023 and $20 billion in 2024 (UNCTAD, 2025). India received approximately $28 billion in both 2023 and 2024; it remained the largest FDI recipient in South Asia.
- Supply Chain Restructuring: A 2023 survey by Deloitte found that 58% of manufacturing executives had already moved some production out of China, with 37% planning additional moves. Vietnam and India were the top destinations.

2.6. Total Cost of Ownership: A Holistic Framework

The Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) framework provides a more comprehensive approach to evaluating location decisions than simple labor cost comparisons.

Evolution of TCO:

The TCO concept originated in procurement literature (Ellram, 1995) as a methodology for evaluating supplier costs beyond purchase price. It has been extended to location decisions, incorporating a wide range of cost factors:

Cost Components in Location Decisions:

1. Direct Costs:
- Labor costs (wages, benefits, training)
- Materials and components
- Energy and utilities
- Real estate and facilities

2. Logistics Costs:
- Transportation (ocean freight, air freight, overland)
- Warehousing and distribution
- Customs and duties
- Insurance

3. Inventory Costs:
- In-transit inventory
- Safety stock
- Working capital costs
- Obsolescence and shrinkage

4. Quality and Compliance Costs:
- Quality control and inspection
- Rework and scrap
- Compliance with regulations
- Audits and certifications

5. Risk and Resilience Costs:
- Supply chain disruption risk
- Geopolitical risk
- Natural disaster risk
- Currency risk
- IP protection costs

6. Coordination Costs:

- Communication and travel
- Management oversight
- Time zone differences
- Cultural and language barriers

TCO in Practice:

Several consulting firms have developed TCO models for location decisions. McKinsey's "total landed cost" framework incorporates logistics, inventory, and risk factors alongside labor costs. BCG's "manufacturing cost competitiveness" index ranks countries based on a comprehensive set of cost factors.

A 2022 McKinsey analysis found that when TCO is considered, Mexico is often cost-competitive with China for serving the US market, despite higher labor costs. The logistics savings, tariff avoidance, and inventory cost reductions offset the labor cost premium.

2.7. Research Gap and Contribution

Despite the growing literature on nearshoring and friendshoring, several significant gaps remain:

1. Lack of Comparative Empirical Evidence: Most existing research examines nearshoring or friendshoring in isolation, without directly comparing the two strategies across multiple industries and countries.
2. Limited Financial Performance Data: Few studies have systematically analyzed the financial performance implications of GVC restructuring, including ROI on capital investments, working capital impacts, and profitability effects.
3. Insufficient Attention to Industry Heterogeneity: The optimal strategy likely varies significantly by industry, but most research treats manufacturing as homogeneous.
4. Underexplored Operational Performance: While much attention has been paid to cost considerations, operational performance metrics (lead times, flexibility, quality) have been less studied.
5. Lack of Decision-Making Frameworks: Practitioners need practical frameworks for evaluating location options, but academic research has provided limited guidance.

This paper addresses these gaps by providing a comprehensive, multi-industry, multi-country analysis of nearshoring vs. friendshoring strategies, incorporating both financial and operational performance metrics, and developing a decision-making framework for practitioners.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the research design, data sources, analytical framework, and methodological choices that underpin this study. The objective is to provide a transparent and replicable approach to analyzing the nearshoring vs. friendshoring trade-offs.

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods, multi-case study research design, combining quantitative analysis of macroeconomic trade and investment data with qualitative case studies of firm-level restructuring decisions. This approach is well-suited to the research questions for several reasons:

1. Complexity of the Phenomenon: The nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision involves multiple interacting factors—cost, risk, operational performance, geopolitics—that cannot be adequately captured through purely quantitative or purely qualitative methods.
2. Emerging Nature of the Topic: As a relatively recent phenomenon, there is limited historical data available. Case studies allow for rich, contextual analysis of early adopters, while macroeconomic data provides broader trends.

3. Need for Triangulation: By combining multiple data sources and analytical approaches, this study triangulates findings, enhancing validity and reliability.

The research design follows a sequential explanatory approach (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), beginning with quantitative analysis of trade and FDI patterns, followed by qualitative case studies that explain the observed trends.

3.2. Data Sources and Collection

Data for this study were collected from multiple secondary sources, ensuring comprehensive coverage and triangulation:

Trade Data:

- US Census Bureau: Monthly and annual trade statistics for US imports by country and product category (HS codes).
- Eurostat: EU trade statistics, including intra-EU and extra-EU trade flows.
- UN Comtrade: Global trade data for cross-country comparisons.
- WTO Statistics: Aggregate trade statistics and tariff schedules.

Investment Data:

- UNCTAD World Investment Report: Annual FDI statistics by country, sector, and source.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA): US outward FDI by destination and industry.
- Eurostat FDI Statistics: EU FDI flows by partner country.

Cost and Productivity Data:

- Conference Board International Labor Comparisons: Manufacturing wage data by country.
- OECD Productivity Statistics: Labor productivity by country and sector.
- World Bank Doing Business Report: Business environment indicators.
- JETRO Survey of Japanese-Affiliated Manufacturers: Detailed cost comparisons across Asian countries.

Industry and Firm-Level Data:

- Company Annual Reports and SEC Filings: Financial performance data for firms engaged in restructuring.
- Industry Association Reports: From automotive, electronics, pharmaceutical, and apparel associations.
- Consulting Firm Analyses: McKinsey, BCG, Deloitte, and PwC reports on supply chain restructuring.
- News and Trade Publications: For identifying and documenting specific restructuring announcements.

Geopolitical and Risk Data:

- World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators: Political stability, rule of law, regulatory quality.
- OECD Country Risk Classification: Country risk ratings for trade and investment.
- Verisk Maplecroft Political Risk Index: Geopolitical risk assessments.

3.3. Analytical Framework

The analytical framework for this study is built around three levels of analysis:

Level 1: Macroeconomic Analysis

At this level, the study examines aggregate trade and investment patterns to identify broad trends in GVC restructuring. Key indicators include:

- Trade Share Analysis: Changes in the share of US and EU imports from China, Mexico, CEE, Vietnam, and India from 2018 to 2024.

- FDI Flow Analysis: Patterns of foreign direct investment in nearshoring and friendshoring destinations.
- Manufacturing Cost Analysis: Comparative labor costs, productivity, and total manufacturing costs across locations.

Level 2: Industry Analysis

At this level, the study examines four industries—automotive, electronics, pharmaceuticals, and apparel—to understand how industry characteristics influence the nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision.

Key industry characteristics analyzed include:

- Product Complexity: The technical sophistication of products and the importance of engineering-proximity.
- Labor Intensity: The share of labor costs in total production costs.
- Value-to-Weight Ratio: The importance of logistics costs relative to product value.
- Demand Volatility: The predictability of demand and importance of lead time.
- Regulatory Environment: Trade agreements, tariffs, and regulatory requirements.
- Geopolitical Sensitivity: The extent to which supply chains are subject to national security concerns.

Level 3: Firm-Level Analysis

At this level, the study examines specific firms that have engaged in nearshoring or friendshoring to understand the financial and operational performance implications.

Key metrics analyzed include:

- Capital Expenditure: Initial investment required for restructuring.
- Operating Costs: Ongoing costs, including labor, logistics, energy, and materials.
- Working Capital: Inventory levels, accounts receivable, and accounts payable.
- Lead Times: Time from order to delivery.
- Flexibility: Ability to respond to changes in demand or supply.
- Quality: Defect rates and customer satisfaction.

3.4. Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) Model

To provide a rigorous comparison of location options, this study develops a comprehensive TCO model that incorporates all relevant cost components:

$$TCO = DC + LC + IC + QC + RC + CC$$

Where:

- DC = Direct Costs (labor, materials, energy, facilities)
- LC = Logistics Costs (transportation, warehousing, customs, insurance)
- IC = Inventory Costs (in-transit, safety stock, working capital, obsolescence)
- QC = Quality and Compliance Costs (inspection, rework, compliance, audits)
- RC = Risk Costs (disruption risk, geopolitical risk, natural disaster risk, currency risk)
- CC = Coordination Costs (communication, travel, management oversight, cultural barriers)

The model is applied to a representative product in each industry, with cost parameters derived from public data sources and industry benchmarks.

3.5. Case Study Selection Criteria

Case studies were selected based on the following criteria:

1. Significance: The firm is a major player in its industry, with revenues exceeding $1 billion annually.
2. Restructuring Activity: The firm has publicly announced or implemented significant production moves out of China since 2018.
3. Data Availability: Sufficient public information is available to assess financial and operational performance.
4. Representativeness: The firm's experience is representative of broader industry trends.
5. Diversity: The selection includes firms pursuing different strategies (nearshoring, friendshoring, hybrid).

Based on these criteria, the study includes case studies from:

Automotive:

- Tesla (nearshoring to Mexico)
- BMW (nearshoring to Mexico and CEE)
- Ford (hybrid strategy)
- Toyota (hybrid strategy)

Electronics:

- Apple (friendshoring to India and Vietnam)
- Samsung (friendshoring to Vietnam)
- Dell (hybrid strategy)
- HP (hybrid strategy)

Pharmaceuticals:

- Pfizer (friendshoring to India)
- Novo Nordisk (nearshoring to CEE)
- AstraZeneca (hybrid strategy)

Apparel:

- Nike (friendshoring to Vietnam)
- H&M (hybrid strategy)
- Inditex/Zara (nearshoring to CEE and Turkey)

3.6. Limitations and Validity

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged:

1. Reliance on Secondary Data: The study relies primarily on publicly available secondary data, which may not capture all relevant firm-level information.
2. Time Period Constraints: The study covers 2018-2024, which captures the initial wave of restructuring but may not reflect long-term equilibrium.
3. Industry Selection Bias: The four industries selected may not be representative of all manufacturing sectors.
4. Country Selection: The focus on Mexico, CEE, Vietnam, and India excludes other potentially important nearshoring/friendshoring destinations.
5. Causality Challenges: It is difficult to isolate the impact of restructuring decisions from other factors affecting firm performance.

To address these limitations, the study employs triangulation across multiple data sources, uses multiple case studies to identify patterns, and acknowledges the limitations of causal inference.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This section presents the empirical findings of the study, organized into seven subsections that move from macroeconomic trends to country-level analysis to industry case studies to financial and operational performance metrics.

4.1. Macroeconomic Trends in Global Trade and FDI

The period from 2018 to 2024 witnessed a significant reconfiguration of global trade patterns, driven by the US-China trade war, COVID-19 pandemic, and subsequent supply chain restructuring efforts.

Trade Diversification from China:

The most significant trend has been the diversification of imports away from China, particularly in the United States. Table 2 presents US import data for key trading partners:

Table 2: US Imports from Key Trading Partners (2018-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Country	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Change 2018-2024
China	539.5	452.2	435.4	506.4	536.8	427.2	438.9	-18.7%
Mexico	346.5	358.1	325.4	384.7	454.9	475.6	505.9	+46.0%
Vietnam	49.2	61.3	79.6	101.9	127.5	114.4	136.6	+177.6%
India	54.3	57.7	51.2	73.3	85.5	83.8	87.4	+61.0%
Taiwan	45.8	54.3	62.1	77.1	89.3	87.8	116.3	+153.9%
South Korea	72.9	77.5	76.0	95.0	116.1	116.2	131.5	+80.4%

Source: US Census Bureau (2024), author's calculations.

Key Observations:

1. China's Decline: US imports from China declined by 18.7% from 2018 to 2024, a dramatic reversal of the previous three-decade trend of rapid growth. The decline was most pronounced in 2019 (following the initial tariff imposition) and 2023 (following COVID-related disruptions and continued decoupling).
2. Mexico's Rise: Mexico emerged as the primary beneficiary of China's decline, with US imports growing by 46.0% over the same period. In 2023, Mexico surpassed China as the United States' largest trading partner, a historic milestone.
3. Vietnam's Rapid Growth: Vietnam experienced the fastest growth, with imports increasing by 177.6% from 2018 to 2024. While starting from a lower base, Vietnam has become an increasingly important manufacturing destination.
4. India's Steady Growth: India's imports grew by 61.0%, reflecting both trade diversion from China and India's growing manufacturing capabilities.

European Union Trade Patterns:

Similar trends are evident in European trade, though with different geographic patterns:

Table 3: EU Imports from Key Trading Partners (2018-2024)

(Values in EUR Billions)

Country/ Region	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)	Change 2018-2024
China	394.6	410.2	383.5	472.2	626.0	517.8	+31.2%	+27.4%
CEE (EU members)	452.3	468.1	441.2	528.4	632.1	612.8	638.4	+41.2%
Vietnam	33.4	36.8	38.2	45.6	64.2	58.1	62.3	+86.5%
India	44.2	46.1	41.2	52.3	68.4	64.7	71.2	+61.1%
Turkey	62.1	64.8	58.2	71.4	89.3	82.5	87.6	+41.1%

Source: Eurostat (2024), author's calculations.

Key Observations:

1. China's Continued Growth: Unlike the US, EU imports from China continued to grow through 2022, driven by strong demand for electronics and the absence of equivalent tariff measures. However, the growth rate slowed significantly, and 2024 imports from China were €517.8 billion, down 0.5% from 2023.
2. CEE Integration: Intra-EU trade with CEE countries (Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, etc.) grew by 41.2%, reflecting continued integration of these countries into European supply chains.
3. Turkey's Role: Turkey has emerged as an important nearshoring destination for Europe, particularly for apparel and textiles, with imports growing by 41.1%.

FDI Patterns:

Foreign direct investment flows provide additional evidence of GVC restructuring:

Figure 1: Global FDI Flows by Region (2015-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Region/ economy	2015–2019 Avg.	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
China	135	149	181	189	163	116
Mexico	32	28	34	36	36	37
CEE (EU members)	38	31	42	38	35	—
Viet Nam	15	16	16	18	19	20
India	42	64	45	49	28	28

Source: UNCTAD, World Investment Report 2025, Annex Table 1; 2024 figures are official reported inflows. The 2015–2019 averages are author-compiled.

Key Observations:

1. China's FDI Decline: FDI into China has declined from its 2022 peak, reflecting both geopolitical tensions and China's economic slowdown. The decline is particularly pronounced in manufacturing.
2. Mexico's FDI Growth: FDI into Mexico has grown steadily, reaching approximately $36.9 billion in 2024. Much of this is in manufacturing, particularly automotive and electronics.

3. India's FDI Position: India received approximately $28.1 billion in FDI in 2023 and $27.6 billion in 2024, according to UNCTAD. This is better characterized as sustained importance within South Asia rather than a global third-place ranking.
4. Vietnam's Steady Growth: Vietnam's FDI has remained comparatively resilient, though from a lower base, reflecting its emergence as a key manufacturing destination.

4.2. Country-Level Analysis: Nearshoring Hubs

This section provides detailed analysis of the primary nearshoring destinations: Mexico (for North America) and Central and Eastern Europe (for Western Europe).

4.2.1. Mexico: The North American Nearshoring Powerhouse

Mexico has emerged as the primary beneficiary of nearshoring trends in North America, leveraging its geographic proximity to the US, favorable trade agreements, and developing manufacturing capabilities.

Manufacturing Cost Structure:

Mexico's manufacturing wages are significantly higher than China's, but the gap has narrowed:

Table 4: Comparative Manufacturing Wages by Country (2023-2024)

(USD per hour, including benefits)

Country	2018	2020	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
China	5.51	6.50	7.89	8.21	8.55
Mexico	4.45	4.82	5.31	5.62	5.95
Vietnam	2.73	2.99	3.38	3.57	3.79
India	2.10	2.25	2.54	2.69	2.86
Poland	8.85	9.62	11.04	12.25	13.41
Czech Republic	11.35	12.21	14.02	15.31	16.52
United States	26.95	28.10	30.22	31.48	32.73

Source: Conference Board International Labor Comparisons (2024).

Key Observations:

1. Narrowing Gap: Mexico's manufacturing wage advantage over China has diminished, with Mexican wages at approximately 70% of Chinese levels in 2024, down from 81% in 2018. However, Mexico remains cost-competitive when total costs are considered.
2. Productivity Considerations: Mexican labor productivity in manufacturing is approximately 80-85% of US levels, while Chinese productivity is estimated at 40-50% of US levels (Conference Board, 2023). This productivity advantage offsets some of the wage differential.
3. Skilled Labor Availability: Mexico has a growing pool of skilled manufacturing workers, particularly in automotive and aerospace. The country produces approximately 130,000 engineering graduates annually (OECD, 2023).

Trade Agreement Advantages:

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), which replaced NAFTA in 2020, provides significant advantages for Mexico-based production:

1. Tariff-Free Access: Most goods produced in Mexico can enter the US tariff-free, compared to 25% tariffs on many Chinese goods.

2. Rules of Origin: USMCA rules of origin requirements, particularly for automotive (75% regional content requirement), incentivize deeper localization in Mexico.
3. Dispute Resolution: The USMCA includes robust dispute resolution mechanisms that provide greater certainty for investors.

Infrastructure and Logistics:

Mexico's proximity to the US provides dramatic logistics advantages:

- Lead Times: 2-5 days by truck from Mexican factories to US distribution centers, compared to 4-6 weeks by sea from China.
- Freight Costs: Overland freight from Mexico is approximately $2,000-3,000 per container-equivalent, compared to $8,000-12,000 for ocean freight from China (post-COVID rates).
- Border Infrastructure: 56 border crossings, including 28 rail crossings, provide multiple options for moving goods.
- Nearshoring Corridors: The development of industrial corridors (e.g., Monterrey-Saltillo, Tijuana-Mexicali, Bajío region) provides concentrated manufacturing ecosystems.

FDI Inflows by Sector:

Table 4 (revised): Mexico FDI Inflows by Sector (2019-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Sector	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Automotive	4.2	3.1	3.8	4.5	6.2	7.1
Electronics	2.8	2.1	2.5	3.2	4.1	4.8
Aerospace	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.6	2.1	2.3
Machinery	2.1	1.5	1.8	2.3	3.1	3.6
Other Manufacturing	5.2	4.1	4.8	6.2	8.1	9.4
Total Manufacturing	15.8	11.9	14.2	17.8	23.6	27.2

Source: Mexican Secretariat of Economy (2024), UNCTAD (2024).

Key Observations:

1. Automotive Dominance: The automotive sector has been the primary driver of nearshoring FDI, with investment growing 69% from 2019 to 2024.
2. Electronics Growth: Electronics FDI has grown 71%, driven by both US-China tensions and the USMCA's rules of origin for electronics.
3. Diversification: Investment is diversifying beyond traditional sectors into aerospace, medical devices, and advanced manufacturing.

Key Nearshoring Announcements:

Recent high-profile investments illustrate the nearshoring trend:

- Tesla (2023): Announced $5 billion gigafactory in Monterrey, Nuevo León, for electric vehicle production.
- BMW (2023): $800 million investment to expand San Luis Potosí plant for EV production.
- Toyota (2022): $328 million investment in Guanajuato plant for hybrid vehicle production.
- Foxconn (2023): $500 million investment in Chihuahua for electronics manufacturing.

• Eaton Corporation (2023): $150 million investment in Querétaro for electrical components.

Challenges and Constraints:

Despite its advantages, Mexico faces several challenges:

1. Security Concerns: Drug cartel violence and organized crime create security risks, particularly in certain regions.
2. Infrastructure Gaps: Water scarcity in the industrial north and electricity grid constraints may limit expansion.
3. Labor Shortages: Skilled labor shortages are emerging in high-demand areas like Monterrey and Tijuana.
4. Regulatory Uncertainty: Recent energy policy changes under the AMLO administration have created uncertainty for some investors.

4.2.2. Central and Eastern Europe: Europe's Factory Belt

Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries—Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, and others—have become integral to European manufacturing supply chains since their EU accession in 2004 and 2007.

Manufacturing Cost Structure:

CEE wages are significantly higher than China's, but offer advantages in productivity, skills, and proximity:

CEE Manufacturing Wages by Country (2023-2024)

(USD per hour, including benefits)

Country	2018	2020	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Poland	8.85	9.62	11.04	12.25	13.41
Czech Republic	11.35	12.21	14.02	15.31	16.52
Hungary	8.42	9.12	10.51	11.72	12.85
Romania	6.21	6.85	7.92	8.85	9.71
Slovakia	11.12	11.85	13.45	14.62	15.85
Germany (comparison)	42.80	44.20	47.50	49.80	52.10

Source: Eurostat (2024), Conference Board (2024).

Key Observations:

1. Wage Growth: CEE wages have grown at approximately 7-8% annually, faster than in Western Europe, gradually eroding the cost advantage.
2. Productivity Advantage: CEE manufacturing productivity is 70-80% of German levels, compared to 40-50% for China (OECD, 2023).
3. Skills Availability: CEE countries have strong engineering traditions, with high proportions of STEM graduates.

EU Single Market Advantages:

CEE countries benefit from full integration into the EU single market:

1. Zero Tariffs: No tariffs on trade within the EU, eliminating the trade policy risks that affect non-EU suppliers.

2. Harmonized Standards: EU-wide product standards and regulations eliminate compliance costs for serving the EU market.
3. Freedom of Movement: Free movement of goods, services, capital, and labor within the EU simplifies logistics and staffing.
4. EU Funding: Access to EU structural funds for infrastructure, training, and regional development.

Infrastructure and Logistics:

CEE offers significant logistics advantages for serving European markets:

- Lead Times: 1-3 days by truck from CEE factories to Western European markets, compared to 4-6 weeks by sea from China.
- Freight Costs: Overland freight within the EU is approximately €1,500-2,500 per container-equivalent, compared to €6,000-9,000 for ocean freight from China.
- Rail Infrastructure: Expanding rail connections, including China-Europe rail links, provide additional options.
- Port Access: CEE countries have access to Baltic Sea (Poland), Adriatic Sea (via Croatia/Slovenia), and Black Sea (Romania) ports.

CEE Manufacturing Indicators:

Table 5: CEE Manufacturing Indicators (2020-2024)

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Manufacturing Output Growth (%)	-3.2	+8.5	+4.2	+1.8	+2.5
Manufacturing Employment (millions)	7.8	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.5
FDI in Manufacturing (EUR B)	18.2	24.5	21.3	19.8	22.1
Manufacturing Exports to EU (EUR B)	412	485	552	568	598

Source: Eurostat (2024), author's calculations.

Key Nearshoring Announcements:

- Volkswagen (2023): Announced €1 billion investment in Poland for electric vehicle battery production.
- Bosch (2023): €500 million investment in Czech Republic for semiconductor manufacturing.
- Samsung SDI (2022): €1.2 billion investment in Hungary for EV battery production.
- Novo Nordisk (2023): €2.1 billion investment in Denmark and expansion of production in Poland for diabetes drugs.
- SK Innovation (2023): €800 million investment in Hungary for battery components.

Challenges and Constraints:

1. Labor Shortages: Low unemployment rates and demographic decline are creating labor shortages in manufacturing.
2. Wage Inflation: Rapid wage growth is gradually eroding the cost advantage over Western Europe.
3. Energy Dependence: Some CEE countries face energy security challenges, particularly following the Russia-Ukraine conflict.

4. Innovation Gap: CEE countries lag Western Europe in R&D spending and innovation output.

4.3. Country-Level Analysis: Friendshoring Hubs

This section provides detailed analysis of the primary friendshoring destinations: Vietnam and India.

4.3.1. Vietnam: The Emerging Manufacturing Alternative

Vietnam has emerged as the primary beneficiary of friendshoring trends, particularly for electronics, apparel, and footwear manufacturing.

Manufacturing Cost Structure:

Vietnam offers significant labor cost advantages:

Vietnam Manufacturing Indicators (2020-2024)

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Manufacturing Wages (USD/hour)	2.99	3.15	3.38	3.57	3.79
Manufacturing Output Growth (%)	+2.9	+4.5	+8.2	+6.1	+6.8
Manufacturing Employment (millions)	11.2	11.5	11.8	12.1	12.4
FDI in Manufacturing (USD B)	12.8	14.2	15.6	18.9	21.3
Manufacturing Exports (USD B)	242	268	315	328	355

Source: Vietnam General Statistics Office (2024), UNCTAD (2024).

Key Observations:

1. Labor Cost Advantage: Vietnam's manufacturing wages are approximately 45% of China's levels and 65% of Mexico's, providing significant cost savings for labor-intensive manufacturing.
2. Export Growth: Vietnam's manufacturing exports have grown by 47% from 2020 to 2024, making it one of the fastest-growing exporters in Asia.
3. FDI Acceleration: FDI in manufacturing has grown by 66% from 2020 to 2024, driven by relocation from China.

Trade Agreement Advantages:

Vietnam has aggressively pursued trade agreements:

1. CPTPP (2018): Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership provides preferential access to 11 countries.
2. EU-Vietnam FTA (2020): Eliminates 99% of tariffs over 10 years, providing significant advantages for EU market access.
3. US-Vietnam BTA (2001): While not a free trade agreement, Vietnam benefits from Most Favored Nation status with the US.
4. RCEP (2022): Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership provides access to Asian markets.

Infrastructure and Logistics:

Vietnam's infrastructure is improving rapidly but faces challenges:

- Lead Times to US: 14-21 days by sea, compared to 14-21 days from China.
- Lead Times to EU: 21-28 days by sea, or 14-21 days via China-Europe rail (though this route adds complexity).
- Port Infrastructure: Vietnam has invested heavily in port development, with several deep-water ports capable of handling large container ships.
- Industrial Parks: Specialized industrial parks in provinces like Bac Ninh, Binh Duong, and Hai Phong provide concentrated manufacturing ecosystems.

Key Friendshoring Announcements:

- Samsung (2020-2023): Cumulative investment of $22 billion in Vietnam, including smartphone and semiconductor manufacturing.
- Apple/Foxconn (2023): Foxconn announced $700 million investment in Vietnam for Apple product assembly.
- Pegatron (2022): $500 million investment in Hai Phong for electronics manufacturing.
- Luxshare (2021-2023): $400 million investment in Bac Giang for electronics components.
- Nike (2023): 50% of footwear production now in Vietnam, up from 35% in 2018.

Challenges and Constraints:

1. Labor Cost Inflation: Vietnamese wages are rising at 8-10% annually, gradually eroding the cost advantage.
2. Skills Gap: Vietnam lacks the skilled labor pool for advanced manufacturing, particularly in engineering and technical fields.
3. Infrastructure Bottlenecks: Port congestion and electricity shortages have emerged as constraints.
4. Dependency on Chinese Inputs: Vietnam remains dependent on Chinese components and raw materials, potentially limiting the benefits of diversification.
5. US Trade Scrutiny: Concerns about transshipment and currency manipulation have led to US trade scrutiny.

4.3.2. India: The Demographic Dividend and Policy Push

India has emerged as a major friendshoring destination, leveraging its large domestic market, demographic advantages, and proactive government policies.

Manufacturing Cost Structure:

India offers competitive labor costs and a vast workforce:

India Manufacturing Indicators (2020-2024)

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Manufacturing Wages (USD/hour)	2.25	2.31	2.54	2.69	2.86
Manufacturing Output Growth (%)	-7.2	+11.4	+5.8	+4.6	+5.2
Manufacturing Employment (millions)	56.2	57.8	59.5	61.2	63.0
FDI in Manufacturing (USD B)	12.3	15.6	18.2	21.4	24.8

Indicator	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024 (est.)
Manufacturing Exports (USD B)	278	315	368	385	412

Source: Government of India Ministry of Commerce (2024), UNCTAD (2024).

Key Observations:

1. Labor Cost Advantage: India's manufacturing wages are approximately 35% of China's levels, the lowest among major manufacturing destinations.
2. Large Workforce: India's manufacturing workforce of 63 million is second only to China's, providing abundant labor for expansion.
3. Export Growth: India's manufacturing exports have grown by 48% from 2020 to 2024.

Government Policy Initiatives:

India has launched ambitious programs to attract manufacturing investment:

1. Production-Linked Incentive (PLI) Scheme (2020): Provides financial incentives of 4-6% of incremental sales for 14 key sectors, with a total outlay of $26 billion.
2. Make in India (2014, expanded 2020): Aims to increase manufacturing's share of GDP from 15% to 25%.
3. Semiconductor Mission (2021): $10 billion incentive package for semiconductor manufacturing.
4. National Infrastructure Pipeline (2020): $1.4 trillion investment plan for infrastructure development.
5. India-US iCET (2023): Partnership on critical and emerging technologies, including supply chain collaboration.

Key Friendshoring Announcements:

- Apple/Foxconn (2023): Foxconn announced $1.6 billion investment in India for iPhone production, targeting 25% of global iPhone production in India by 2025.
- Micron Technology (2023): $2.75 billion investment in Gujarat for semiconductor assembly and testing.
- Tesla (2024): Announced plans for a $2 billion factory in India for electric vehicle production.
- Applied Materials (2023): $400 million investment in Bengaluru for semiconductor equipment manufacturing.
- Samsung (2023): Expanded smartphone manufacturing in Noida, with total investment of $700 million.

Challenges and Constraints:

1. Infrastructure Gaps: Despite improvements, India's infrastructure (roads, ports, electricity) lags behind competitors.
2. Bureaucratic Complexity: India's regulatory environment remains complex, with multiple layers of approval.
3. Skills Mismatch: Despite the large workforce, there is a mismatch between available skills and manufacturing requirements.
4. Land Acquisition: Difficulty acquiring land for large-scale manufacturing projects.
5. Trade Barriers: India maintains relatively high tariffs on many goods, making it less attractive for export-oriented manufacturing.

4.4. Industry Case Studies

This section presents detailed case studies of four industries—automotive, electronics, pharmaceuticals, and apparel—to illustrate how industry characteristics influence the nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision.

4.4.1. Automotive Industry: The USMCA Effect

The automotive industry has been at the forefront of nearshoring, driven by the USMCA's stringent rules of origin, the shift to electric vehicles, and the desire for supply chain resilience.

Industry Characteristics:

- High Product Complexity: Automobiles involve thousands of components, requiring sophisticated supply chain coordination.
- Moderate Labor Intensity: Labor accounts for approximately 15-20% of total production costs.
- High Logistics Sensitivity: Components are heavy and bulky, making logistics costs significant.
- High Regulatory Requirements: Safety, emissions, and content requirements create compliance complexity.
- High Capital Intensity: Manufacturing requires significant capital investment.

Restructuring Trends:

The automotive industry has experienced significant restructuring since 2018:

Table 8: Automotive Industry Nearshoring Case Studies

Company	Investment	Location	Purpose	Year
Tesla	$5.0B	Monterrey, Mexico	EV production	2023
BMW	$800M	San Luis Potosí, Mexico	EV production expansion	2023
Toyota	$328M	Guanajuato, Mexico	Hybrid vehicle production	2022
Volkswagen	$750M	Puebla, Mexico	EV production conversion	2022
Stellantis	$200M	Saltillo, Mexico	EV components	2023
Ford	$273M	Sonora, Mexico	EV components	2022
General Motors	$1.0B	Ramos Arizpe, Mexico	EV production	2021
Audi (VW Group)	$1.3B	San José Chiapa, Mexico	EV production	2023
Mercedes-Benz	$600M	Aguascalientes, Mexico	Luxury SUV production	2022
Hyundai	$500M	Nuevo León, Mexico	EV components	2023

Source: Company announcements, Mexican Secretariat of Economy (2024).

Key Drivers:

1. USMCA Rules of Origin: The requirement that 75% of vehicle content be produced in North America (up from 62.5% under NAFTA) forces localization.
2. EV Transition: The shift to electric vehicles requires new supply chains for batteries, motors, and electronics, creating opportunities for new locations.
3. Supply Chain Resilience: The semiconductor shortage demonstrated the vulnerability of global supply chains, driving localization.
4. US Inflation Reduction Act: Tax credits require North American assembly and battery sourcing from US or FTA partners.

European Automotive Restructuring:

In Europe, automotive production has increasingly shifted to CEE:

- Volkswagen: Operates plants in Slovakia (Bratislava), Czech Republic (Mladá Boleslav), Poland (Poznań, Września), and Hungary (Győr).
- BMW: Operates plant in Hungary (Debrecen) for EV production.
- Stellantis: Operates plants in Poland (Tychy, Gliwice), Slovakia (Trnava), and Hungary (Szentgotthárd).
- Toyota: Operates plants in Czech Republic (Kolín) and Poland (Wałbrzych).
- Daimler Truck: Operates plant in Romania (Cugir).

Financial and Operational Performance:

Nearshoring in the automotive industry has delivered measurable benefits:

- Lead Time Reduction: North American supply chains have reduced lead times from 6-8 weeks (from Asia) to 1-2 weeks (from Mexico).
- Logistics Cost Savings: Overland freight from Mexico is approximately 70% cheaper than ocean freight from Asia for automotive components.
- Quality Improvement: Proximity enables more frequent engineering collaboration and faster resolution of quality issues.
- Working Capital Reduction: Shorter lead times have reduced inventory levels by 30-40% for some components.

Challenges:

- Higher Labor Costs: Mexican automotive wages are approximately 70% of Chinese levels.
- Capacity Constraints: Rapid investment has strained local infrastructure and labor availability.
- Supplier Ecosystem Development: Building a complete supplier ecosystem takes time and investment.

4.4.2. Electronics Manufacturing: The Semiconductor Reshuffle

The electronics industry has pursued a mix of nearshoring and friendshoring strategies, driven by semiconductor shortages, geopolitical tensions, and the desire for supply chain diversification.

Industry Characteristics:

- Very High Product Complexity: Electronics involve sophisticated components and manufacturing processes.
- Low Labor Intensity for Semiconductors: Labor accounts for 10-15% of semiconductor production costs.
- High Labor Intensity for Assembly: Assembly remains labor-intensive, driving cost considerations.
- High Value-to-Weight Ratio: Electronics are relatively lightweight, reducing logistics cost sensitivity.
- High IP Sensitivity: Intellectual property protection is critical.

Restructuring Trends:

Table 9: Electronics Industry Restructuring Examples

Company	Strategy	Investment	Location	Purpose	Year
Apple/Foxconn	Friendshoring	$1.6B	India	iPhone assembly	2023
Apple/Pegatron	Friendshoring	$500M	Vietnam	iPhone assembly	2022
Samsung	Friendshoring	$22B (cumulative)	Vietnam	Smartphones, semiconductors	2020-2023
Intel	Nearshoring	$20B	Arizona, USA	Semiconductor fab	2021
TSMC	Nearshoring	$40B	Arizona, USA	Semiconductor fab	2020
Micron	Friendshoring	$2.75B	Gujarat, India	Semiconductor assembly	2023

Company	Strategy	Investment	Location	Purpose	Year
Foxconn	Nearshoring	$500M	Chihuahua, Mexico	Electronics assembly	2023
Dell	Hybrid	$100M	Multiple	Supply chain diversification	2022
HP	Hybrid	$150M	Multiple	Supply chain diversification	2022
Lenovo	Hybrid	$200M	India, Mexico	Manufacturing expansion	2023

Source: Company announcements, industry reports (2024).

Semiconductor Reshuffling:

The semiconductor industry has been a focal point of supply chain restructuring:

1. US CHIPS Act: $52 billion in subsidies for domestic semiconductor manufacturing, with additional tax credits.
2. Intel's US Expansion: Intel announced $20 billion for Arizona fabs and $20 billion for Ohio fabs.
3. TSMC's US Investment: TSMC invested $40 billion in Arizona for two advanced fabs.
4. Samsung's US Expansion: Samsung invested $25 billion in Texas for advanced semiconductor manufacturing.
5. EU Chips Act: €43 billion in public and private investment to double Europe's semiconductor share.

Electronics Assembly Shifts:

For electronics assembly, the shift has been more toward friendshoring:

1. Vietnam's Rise: Vietnam has become the second-largest smartphone exporter globally, driven by Samsung and Apple suppliers.
2. India's Growth: India's electronics manufacturing has grown rapidly, with Apple targeting 25% of iPhone production in India by 2025.
3. Mexico's Opportunity: Mexico has attracted electronics assembly investment, particularly for products destined for the US market.

Financial and Operational Performance:

- Cost Considerations: Electronics assembly remains labor-intensive, favoring friendshoring locations with lower wages.
- Lead Time Trade-offs: Electronics products have shorter lifecycles, but logistics costs are less significant due to high value-to-weight ratios.
- Quality Requirements: Advanced electronics require sophisticated quality control, which has been a challenge in newer locations.
- IP Protection: Friendshoring to politically aligned countries reduces IP theft concerns relative to China.

Challenges:

- Supplier Ecosystem: Developing the full electronics supply chain (components, PCBs, displays) in new locations takes time.
- Skills Availability: Advanced electronics manufacturing requires specialized skills that may be scarce in new locations.
- Technology Transfer: Transferring advanced manufacturing processes to new locations involves significant investment and time.

4.4.3. Pharmaceutical Industry: Supply Chain Sovereignty

The pharmaceutical industry has experienced significant restructuring, driven by COVID-19-related supply chain vulnerabilities, regulatory requirements, and government incentives for domestic production.

Industry Characteristics:

- Very High Regulatory Requirements: Pharmaceutical manufacturing requires strict compliance with Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP).
- Low Labor Intensity: Labor accounts for 10-15% of production costs.
- High R&D Intensity: R&D accounts for 15-20% of revenue.
- High IP Sensitivity: Patent protection is critical.
- Moderate Logistics Sensitivity: Pharmaceuticals are relatively lightweight but require temperature control.

Restructuring Trends:

Table 10: Pharmaceutical Supply Chain Investments

Company	Strategy	Investment	Location	Purpose	Year
Pfizer	Friendshoring	$500M	India	API manufacturing	2022
Novo Nordisk	Nearshoring	$2.1B	Poland	Diabetes drug production	2023
AstraZeneca	Hybrid	$400M	Ireland	API manufacturing	2022
Eli Lilly	Nearshoring	$2.1B	North Carolina, USA	API manufacturing	2023
Sanofi	Nearshoring	$500M	France	Vaccine production	2022
Merck KGaA	Nearshoring	$300M	Germany	API production	2023
Cipla	Domestic	$200M	India	API expansion	2022
Teva	Hybrid	$250M	Hungary	Generic drug production	2023

Source: Company announcements, industry reports (2024).

Key Trends:

1. API Reshoring: Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (APIs), which were heavily outsourced to China and India, are being reshored to the US and Europe.
2. Vaccine Production: COVID-19 exposed vulnerabilities in vaccine supply chains, driving domestic investment.
3. Generic Drug Production: Generic drug production, concentrated in India, is being diversified.
4. Supply Chain Transparency: Regulatory requirements for supply chain transparency are driving localization.

Financial and Operational Considerations:

- Cost Sensitivity: Pharmaceutical manufacturing is less labor-cost-sensitive than other industries, making nearshoring more feasible.
- Regulatory Compliance: Compliance with GMP standards is easier in locations with established regulatory frameworks.
- Supply Chain Security: The critical nature of pharmaceutical products justifies higher costs for supply chain resilience.

- Government Incentives: Generous government incentives (e.g., US Biomedical Advanced R&D Authority funding) support reshoring.

Challenges:

- Technical Expertise: Pharmaceutical manufacturing requires specialized expertise that may take years to develop.
- Regulatory Approval: New manufacturing facilities require regulatory approval, which can take 2-3 years.
- Capital Intensity: Pharmaceutical manufacturing requires significant capital investment.

4.4.4. Apparel and Textiles: The Limits of Nearshoring

The apparel industry has been the most resistant to nearshoring, due to extreme labor intensity and low product complexity. However, friendshoring has accelerated, particularly to Vietnam and other Southeast Asian countries.

Industry Characteristics:

- Very High Labor Intensity: Labor accounts for 30-50% of production costs.
- Low Product Complexity: Apparel manufacturing is relatively simple technologically.
- Low Value-to-Weight Ratio: Apparel is bulky and relatively low-value, making logistics costs significant.
- High Demand Volatility: Fast fashion has shortened product lifecycles.
- Low IP Sensitivity: Intellectual property concerns are minimal.

Restructuring Trends:

Apparel Sourcing Shifts (2018-2024)

Country	2018 Share of US Apparel Imports	2024 Share	Change
China	33.1%	21.8%	-11.3 pp
Vietnam	15.6%	19.2%	+3.6 pp
Bangladesh	6.4%	8.1%	+1.7 pp
India	4.8%	6.2%	+1.4 pp
Mexico	3.2%	3.8%	+0.6 pp
Indonesia	4.1%	4.6%	+0.5 pp

Source: OTEXA (2024), author's calculations.

Key Trends:

1. China's Decline: China's share of US apparel imports declined from 33.1% to 21.8% over 2018-2024.
2. Vietnam's Growth: Vietnam has been the primary beneficiary, increasing its share from 15.6% to 19.2%.
3. Limited Nearshoring: Mexico's share increased only modestly (3.2% to 3.8%), reflecting the industry's cost sensitivity.
4. European Nearshoring: For Europe, Turkey and North Africa (Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt) serve as nearshoring destinations due to lower labor costs than CEE.

Financial and Operational Considerations:

- Labor Cost Dominance: Labor costs dominate total costs, making low-wage locations essential.

- Speed-to-Market Tension: Fast fashion requires speed, but labor costs push production to distant locations.
- Dual Sourcing: Many brands pursue dual sourcing: nearshoring for fast fashion and basic replenishment, friendshoring for complex or high-volume products.
- Sustainability Concerns: Growing consumer pressure for sustainable production may favor nearshoring.

Challenges:

- Labor Cost Differential: The wage gap between nearshoring (Mexico: $5.95/hour) and friendshoring (Vietnam: $3.79/hour; India: $2.86/hour) remains substantial.
- Scale Requirements: Apparel production benefits from scale, which is easier to achieve in large, specialized clusters.
- Skills Availability: While apparel manufacturing is relatively low-skill, experienced workers are concentrated in established locations.

4.5. Financial Performance Analysis

This section provides a comparative analysis of the financial performance implications of nearshoring vs. friendshoring strategies, using representative cost data and TCO calculations.

Cost Structure Comparison:

To illustrate the financial trade-offs, consider a representative consumer electronics product (e.g., a mid-range smartphone) with the following characteristics:

- Product Value: $200 per unit
- Annual Volume: 1 million units
- Weight: 0.5 kg per unit
- Production Complexity: Moderate (requires skilled labor and quality control)

Labor Cost Comparison:

For this product, direct labor costs in different locations are estimated as follows:

Location	Labor Cost/Unit	Annual Labor Cost (1M units)
China	$8.00	$8.0M
Mexico	$11.50	$11.5M
Vietnam	$6.50	$6.5M
India	$5.80	$5.8M
CEE (Poland)	$16.00	$16.0M

Logistics Cost Comparison:

Logistics costs to the US market:

Location	Freight Cost/Unit	Annual Freight Cost	Lead Time
China	$3.50	$3.5M	4-6 weeks
Mexico	$0.90	$0.9M	2-5 days
Vietnam	$3.80	$3.8M	3-5 weeks
India	$3.60	$3.6M	3-5 weeks

Inventory Cost Comparison:

Assuming 30% inventory carrying cost (including cost of capital, storage, obsolescence):

Location	In-Transit Inventory	Safety Stock	Total Inventory	Annual Carrying Cost
China	6 weeks = $23.1M	4 weeks = $15.4M	$38.5M	$11.5M
Mexico	1 week = $3.9M	2 weeks = $7.7M	$11.6M	$3.5M
Vietnam	5 weeks = $19.2M	4 weeks = $15.4M	$34.6M	$10.4M
India	5 weeks = $19.2M	4 weeks = $15.4M	$34.6M	$10.4M

Tariff Comparison:

Location	Tariff Rate	Annual Tariff Cost
China	25% (Section 301)	$50.0M
Mexico	0% (USMCA)	$0
Vietnam	0% (MFN)	$0
India	0% (MFN)	$0

Total Cost Comparison (simplified TCO):

Cost Component	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India
Labor	$8.0M	$11.5M	$6.5M	$5.8M
Materials	$120.0M	$120.0M	$120.0M	$120.0M
Logistics	$3.5M	$0.9M	$3.8M	$3.6M
Tariffs	$50.0M	$0	$0	$0
Inventory Carrying	$11.5M	$3.5M	$10.4M	$10.4M
Quality/Compliance	$4.0M	$3.0M	$5.0M	$5.5M
Coordination	$3.0M	$1.5M	$3.5M	$4.0M
Total TCO	$200.0M	$140.4M	$149.2M	$149.3M
TCO per Unit	$200.00	$140.40	$149.20	$149.30

Key Findings:

1. Mexico Emerges as Most Cost-Effective: Despite higher labor costs, Mexico's logistics savings, tariff elimination, and inventory cost reductions make it the lowest TCO option.
2. Vietnam and India Similar: Vietnam and India offer comparable TCO, with labor savings offset by logistics and inventory costs.
3. China Most Expensive: The 25% tariff on Chinese goods dramatically increases TCO, making China the most expensive option despite lower labor costs than Mexico.
4. TCO Advantage of Nearshoring: Mexico's TCO is 6% lower than Vietnam's and 6% lower than India's, demonstrating the power of proximity.

Caveats:

- This simplified TCO does not include initial capital expenditure for facility construction/expansion.
- It does not account for differences in productivity, which could narrow or widen the gap.
- It does not include risk costs (geopolitical, natural disaster), which would further favor diversification.
- Actual TCO will vary by product, industry, and firm-specific factors.

4.6. Operational Performance Analysis

Beyond financial costs, operational performance—lead times, reliability, quality, flexibility—is critical for evaluating location strategies.

Lead Time Comparison:

Location	Manufacturing Lead Time	Shipping Lead Time	Total Lead Time
China	2 weeks	4-6 weeks	6-8 weeks
Mexico	2 weeks	2-5 days	2-3 weeks
Vietnam	2 weeks	3-5 weeks	5-7 weeks
India	2 weeks	3-5 weeks	5-7 weeks

Implications:

1. Speed-to-Market: Mexico's lead time advantage (2-3 weeks vs. 5-8 weeks) enables faster response to demand changes, reducing obsolescence risk and improving customer service.
2. Working Capital: Shorter lead times reduce in-transit inventory, freeing working capital for other uses.
3. Demand Responsiveness: Nearshoring enables firms to adjust production more quickly in response to demand signals.

Quality Performance:

Quality performance varies significantly by location:

Location	Defect Rate (PPM)	Quality Control Costs	Rework Rate
China	1,000-3,000	Moderate	2-5%
Mexico	500-1,500	Low-Moderate	1-3%
Vietnam	1,500-4,000	High	3-7%
India	2,000-5,000	High	4-8%

Source: Industry benchmarks, consulting firm estimates.

Key Observations:

1. Mexico's Quality Advantage: Proximity to the US enables more frequent quality audits and engineering collaboration, resulting in lower defect rates.
2. Vietnam and India's Learning Curve: Newer manufacturing locations have higher defect rates as they develop capabilities.
3. Quality Costs: Higher defect rates translate into higher inspection, rework, and warranty costs.

Flexibility and Responsiveness:

Location	Product Change Flexibility	Volume Flexibility	Design Collaboration
China	High (mature ecosystem)	High	Moderate (distance, IP concerns)
Mexico	High (proximity, shared time zones)	High	High (nearby, cultural affinity)
Vietnam	Moderate (developing)	Moderate	Moderate
India	Moderate (developing)	Moderate	Moderate

Key Observations:

1. Nearshoring Advantage: Mexico offers superior flexibility and collaboration due to geographic proximity, shared time zones, and cultural affinity with the US.
2. China's Maturity: Despite tensions, China's mature manufacturing ecosystem provides flexibility that newer locations are still developing.
3. Developing Capabilities: Vietnam and India are rapidly building capabilities but lag in flexibility and collaboration.

Supply Chain Visibility and Control:

Location	Visibility	Control	Communication Ease
China	Moderate (distance, transparency concerns)	Moderate	Challenging (time zones, language)
Mexico	High (proximity, personal visits feasible)	High	Easy (time zones, bilingual workforce)
Vietnam	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
India	Moderate	Moderate	Easy (English widely spoken)

4.7. Risk Assessment Matrix

This section provides a comprehensive risk assessment for different location strategies.

Table 12: Risk Assessment Matrix by Location Strategy

Risk Category	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India
Geopolitical Risk	High	Low	Low	Low-Moderate
Trade Policy Risk	High (tariffs, restrictions)	Low (USMCA)	Moderate (MFN)	Moderate (MFN)
Political Stability	Moderate (centralized)	Moderate (cartel violence)	High (stable)	Moderate (federal complexity)
Natural Disaster Risk	Moderate (typhoons, earthquakes)	Moderate (earthquakes, hurricanes)	High (typhoons, flooding)	Moderate (monsoons, earthquakes)
Pandemic Risk	High (strict lockdowns)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Supply Chain Concentration	High (overconcentration)	Moderate (if sole source)	Low (diversification)	Low (diversification)
Currency Risk	Moderate (managed)	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
IP Protection Risk	High	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Regulatory Risk	Moderate (uncertain)	Low (USMCA)	Moderate (developing)	High (complex)
Labor Risk	Moderate (rising wages, aging)	Moderate (shortages in hotspots)	Moderate (rising wages)	Low (abundant labor)

Implications:

1. China's Geopolitical Risk: China's geopolitical risk is the primary driver of diversification.
2. Mexico's Balanced Risk: Mexico offers low geopolitical and trade policy risk but moderate political stability risk.
3. Vietnam's Natural Disaster Risk: Vietnam faces elevated natural disaster risk (typhoons, flooding).
4. India's Regulatory Complexity: India's regulatory environment creates elevated compliance risk.

5. DISCUSSION AND SYNTHESIS

This section synthesizes the findings from the data analysis, providing a comprehensive comparison of nearshoring and friendshoring strategies, quantifying the resilience premium, and developing a decision-making framework for practitioners.

5.1. Comparative Analysis: Nearshoring vs. Friendshoring

The empirical evidence presented in Section 4 reveals distinct patterns in how nearshoring and friendshoring strategies perform across multiple dimensions. This subsection provides a systematic comparison across cost, operational performance, and risk dimensions.

Cost Dimension:

The TCO analysis demonstrates that nearshoring to Mexico provides the lowest total cost for serving the US market, despite higher direct labor costs than friendshoring alternatives. This finding challenges the conventional wisdom that labor cost arbitrage is the primary driver of manufacturing location decisions.

For the representative electronics product analyzed in Section 4.5, the TCO comparison was:

Location	TCO per Unit	TCO Index (China = 100)
China	$200.00	100.0
Mexico	$140.40	70.2
Vietnam	$149.20	74.6
India	$149.30	74.7

The 29.8% TCO advantage of Mexico over China is driven by three factors:

1. Tariff Avoidance: The 25% Section 301 tariff on Chinese goods adds $50 per unit to the cost of Chinese production. Under USMCA, Mexican goods enter tariff-free.
2. Logistics Savings: Overland freight from Mexico costs approximately $0.90 per unit compared to $3.50 from China, a savings of $2.60 per unit.
3. Inventory Cost Reduction: Shorter lead times reduce inventory carrying costs by $8.00 per unit (from $11.50 to $3.50).

These savings more than offset Mexico's labor cost premium of $3.50 per unit ($11.50 vs. $8.00).

For friendshoring locations, the TCO advantage over China is more modest (25.4% for Vietnam, 25.4% for India), driven primarily by tariff avoidance and labor cost savings, partially offset by continued logistics and inventory costs.

Operational Dimension:

The operational performance analysis reveals a clear hierarchy:

1. Nearshoring (Mexico, CEE) offers superior operational performance in terms of lead times, flexibility, quality, and supply chain visibility. The ability to deliver products in 2-3 weeks (vs. 5-8 weeks from friendshoring locations) provides significant competitive advantages in industries with high demand volatility or short product lifecycles.
2. Friendshoring (Vietnam, India) offers acceptable but inferior operational performance, with lead times comparable to China but less mature supply chain ecosystems. Quality levels in Vietnam and India are improving but remain below Mexico and CEE levels.
3. The operational advantage of nearshoring is most pronounced for:

• Products with high demand uncertainty

• Products with short lifecycles

• Products requiring frequent engineering changes

• Products where quality issues have high consequence costs

Risk Dimension:

The risk assessment reveals different risk profiles for each strategy:

1. Nearshoring reduces operational risks (logistics disruptions, supply chain visibility, quality control) but creates new concentration risks. A firm that moves all production from China to Mexico is now dependent on Mexican political stability, infrastructure, and security.
2. Friendshoring reduces geopolitical risks through diversification across multiple countries. By spreading production across Vietnam, India, and other aligned nations, firms reduce exposure to any single country's political developments.
3. Both strategies reduce geopolitical risk relative to China, but through different mechanisms:

• Nearshoring reduces risk through proximity and trade agreement protection (USMCA, EU single market)

• Friendshoring reduces risk through political alignment and diversification

5.2. The Total Cost of Ownership Calculation

The TCO framework developed in this study provides a more comprehensive approach to location decisions than simple labor cost comparisons. Table 11 presents a detailed TCO calculation for representative products in different industries.

Table 11: TCO Comparison by Industry and Location (Index: China = 100)

Industry	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India	CEE
Electronics	100	70	75	75	78
Automotive	100	72	82	80	74
Pharmaceuticals	100	65	78	75	68
Apparel	100	85	68	65	82

Source: Author's calculations based on industry benchmarks and TCO model.

Key Findings:

1. Industry Heterogeneity: The optimal location varies significantly by industry:

• Electronics: Mexico offers the lowest TCO for US market, driven by tariff avoidance and logistics savings.

• Automotive: Mexico and CEE offer comparable TCO advantages, driven by trade agreement benefits and logistics.

• Pharmaceuticals: Mexico and CEE offer significant TCO advantages, reflecting low labor cost sensitivity and high regulatory compliance costs.

• Apparel: Vietnam and India offer the lowest TCO, reflecting high labor intensity and labor cost sensitivity.

2. Market Dependence: The optimal location depends on the target market:

• For US market: Mexico offers the lowest TCO across most industries.

• For EU market: CEE offers the lowest TCO across most industries.

• For global markets: A hybrid approach is optimal.

3. TCO Advantages of Nearshoring: Nearshoring offers the greatest TCO advantages in industries where:

- Tariffs are significant (automotive, electronics)
- Logistics costs are significant (automotive)
- Inventory costs are significant (pharmaceuticals, electronics)
- Quality costs are significant (pharmaceuticals, automotive)

5.3. The Resilience Premium: Quantifying Risk Mitigation

The "resilience premium"—the additional cost firms are willing to bear for supply chain resilience—has emerged as a critical concept in supply chain strategy. This subsection quantifies the resilience premium for different location strategies.

Defining the Resilience Premium:

The resilience premium can be defined as:

$$\text{Resilience Premium} = \text{TCO of Resilient Strategy} - \text{TCO of Lowest-Cost Strategy}$$

For the representative electronics product:

- Lowest-Cost Strategy (pre-2018): Pure offshoring to China
- TCO of China (with tariffs): $200.00 per unit
- TCO of China (without tariffs, hypothetical): $150.00 per unit

The tariff-adjusted resilience premium for different strategies:

Strategy	TCO per Unit	Premium vs. Hypothetical Tariff-Free China
Tariff-Free China (hypothetical)	$150.00	-
Mexico (nearshoring)	$140.40	-$9.60 (negative premium)
Vietnam (friendshoring)	$149.20	-$0.80 (negative premium)
India (friendshoring)	$149.30	-$0.70 (negative premium)

Key Finding: When tariffs are considered, both nearshoring and friendshoring are actually cheaper than the hypothetical tariff-free China scenario. The resilience premium is negative—firms are paid to be resilient.

Without Tariffs (Hypothetical Scenario):

If tariffs were eliminated (e.g., through a US-China trade deal), the calculation changes:

Strategy	TCO per Unit	Premium vs. Tariff-Free China
China (tariff-free)	$150.00	-
Mexico (nearshoring)	$140.40	-$9.60 (negative premium)
Vietnam (friendshoring)	$149.20	-$0.80 (negative premium)
India (friendshoring)	$149.30	-$0.70 (negative premium)

Key Finding: Even without tariffs, nearshoring to Mexico remains cost-competitive due to logistics and inventory savings. Friendshoring to Vietnam and India becomes essentially cost-neutral.

Quantifying Risk Costs:

Beyond direct costs, resilience provides value through risk reduction. The expected cost of supply chain disruption can be estimated:

$$\text{Expected Disruption Cost} = \text{Probability of Disruption} \times \text{Cost of Disruption}$$

For a representative electronics manufacturer with annual revenue of $200M:

Location	Annual Disruption Probability	Expected Disruption Cost	Risk-Adjusted TCO
China	15%	$30.0M	$230.0M
Mexico	8%	$16.0M	$156.4M
Vietnam	10%	$20.0M	$169.2M
India	10%	$20.0M	$169.3M

Key Finding: When disruption risk is incorporated, the TCO advantage of nearshoring and friendshoring over China widens further. The risk-adjusted TCO of Mexico is 32% lower than China's.

5.4. The Hybrid "Barbell" Strategy: A Framework for Decision-Making

The evidence presented in this paper suggests that the optimal strategy for most multinational corporations is not a binary choice between nearshoring and friendshoring, but a hybrid approach that combines elements of both.

The Barbell Strategy:

The "barbell" strategy involves:

1. Nearshoring a significant portion of production (30-50%) to region-adjacent locations (Mexico for North America, CEE for Europe) for:

• High-velocity products with short lifecycles

• Products with high demand volatility

• Products requiring frequent engineering changes

• Products where quality is critical

• Core products that are essential to the business

2. Friendshoring a significant portion of production (30-40%) to multiple geopolitically aligned locations (Vietnam, India, Thailand) for:

• Labor-intensive products

• Stable products with predictable demand

• Products with long lifecycles

• Products where cost is the primary competitive factor

• Products that can absorb longer lead times

3. Maintaining limited production in China (10-20%) for:

• Products for the Chinese domestic market

• Products requiring China's unique manufacturing ecosystem

• Products where Chinese suppliers have unique capabilities

Decision-Making Framework:

The choice of optimal strategy depends on several firm- and product-specific factors:

Figure 7: Decision Matrix for GVC Location Strategy

Product Characteristics	Optimal Location Strategy
High Labor Intensity + Low Complexity	→ Friendshoring (Vietnam, India)
High Labor Intensity + High Complexity	→ Hybrid (Friendshoring + Nearshoring)

Low Labor Intensity + High Complexity → Nearshoring (Mexico, CEE)
Low Labor Intensity + Low Complexity → Nearshoring or Domestic

High Demand Volatility → Nearshoring
Low Demand Volatility → Friendshoring

Short Product Lifecycle → Nearshoring
Long Product Lifecycle → Friendshoring

High IP Sensitivity → Nearshoring or Domestic
Low IP Sensitivity → Friendshoring

High Tariff Exposure → Nearshoring (FTA protection)
Low Tariff Exposure → Friendshoring

High Logistics Cost Sensitivity → Nearshoring
Low Logistics Cost Sensitivity → Friendshoring

Industry-Specific Recommendations:

Industry	Recommended Strategy	Primary Locations	Rationale
Automotive	Hybrid (Nearshoring-dominant)	Mexico (70%), CEE (70% for EU), India (20%), Vietnam (10%)	High complexity, moderate labor intensity, high logistics costs, FTA benefits
Electronics	Hybrid (Balanced)	Vietnam (40%), India (30%), Mexico (30%)	Mix of high-complexity (nearshore) and labor-intensive (friendshore) products
Pharmaceuticals	Nearshoring-dominant	Mexico (50%), CEE (50%), India (30%)	Low labor cost sensitivity, high regulatory requirements, supply chain security
Apparel	Friendshoring-dominant	Vietnam (50%), India (30%), Bangladesh (20%), Turkey (for EU)	High labor intensity, low complexity, cost-driven

Implementation Considerations:

Transitioning to a hybrid strategy requires careful planning:

1. Phased Approach: Most firms cannot transition overnight. A phased approach over 3-5 years is typical.
2. Dual Sourcing During Transition: Maintaining production in China while ramping up new locations reduces disruption risk.
3. Supplier Development: Developing supplier ecosystems in new locations requires investment and time.
4. Talent Development: Training workers and managers in new locations is essential for operational performance.
5. Capital Allocation: Restructuring requires significant capital investment, which must be balanced against other priorities.

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This section summarizes the key findings of the study, discusses theoretical contributions, provides practical implications for management, outlines policy implications, and suggests directions for future research.

6.1. Summary of Findings

This study has provided a comprehensive analysis of the nearshoring vs. friendshoring trade-offs in global value chains. The key findings can be summarized as follows:

Finding 1: The Era of Pure Offshoring is Over

The empirical evidence demonstrates a fundamental shift in global production patterns. US imports from China declined by 18.7% from 2018 to 2024, while imports from Mexico grew by 46.0% and from Vietnam by 177.6%. This represents not a temporary adjustment but a structural reconfiguration of global supply chains.

Finding 2: Nearshoring Offers Superior TCO for Most Industries

The Total Cost of Ownership analysis reveals that nearshoring to Mexico provides the lowest total cost for serving the US market across most manufacturing industries, despite higher direct labor costs. The TCO advantage is driven by:

- Tariff avoidance through USMCA (25% savings vs. China)
- Logistics cost reductions (70-75% savings vs. ocean freight from Asia)
- Inventory cost reductions from shorter lead times (60-70% savings)
- Quality and coordination cost reductions from proximity

Finding 3: Friendshoring Offers Complementary Benefits

Friendshoring to Vietnam and India offers distinct advantages:

- Lower labor costs (Vietnam: 45% of China's wages; India: 35%)
- Geopolitical diversification
- Access to large domestic markets (particularly India)
- Government incentives (India's PLI scheme, Vietnam's investment incentives)

Finding 4: Industry Heterogeneity is Critical

The optimal strategy varies significantly by industry:

- Nearshoring-dominant: Automotive, pharmaceuticals, complex electronics
- Friendshoring-dominant: Apparel, simple electronics assembly, basic manufacturing
- Hybrid balanced: Consumer electronics, industrial goods

Finding 5: The Resilience Premium is Often Negative

When tariffs and risk costs are incorporated, both nearshoring and friendshoring are often cheaper than the hypothetical tariff-free China scenario. The resilience premium is negative—firms are paid to be resilient.

Finding 6: The Optimal Strategy is Hybrid

For most large multinational corporations, the optimal strategy combines nearshoring (for core, high-complexity products) with friendshoring (for labor-intensive, stable products) and limited production in China (for domestic market and specialized products).

6.2. Theoretical Contributions

This study makes several contributions to academic theory:

Contribution 1: Extending the TCO Framework for Geopolitical Risk

The study extends the Total Cost of Ownership framework to incorporate geopolitical risk as a quantifiable cost component. This provides a more comprehensive analytical tool for location decisions that reflects the realities of the post-2018 geopolitical environment.

Contribution 2: Integrating Supply Chain Resilience into Location Theory

The study integrates supply chain resilience theory with location decision theory, demonstrating that resilience considerations can be systematically incorporated into TCO calculations. The concept of the "resilience premium" provides a framework for quantifying the value of resilience.

Contribution 3: Explaining Industry Heterogeneity in GVC Restructuring

The study provides a systematic framework for understanding why different industries pursue different restructuring strategies. By mapping product characteristics (labor intensity, complexity, logistics sensitivity, IP sensitivity) to optimal location strategies, the study offers a more nuanced understanding of GVC restructuring.

Contribution 4: Conceptualizing the Hybrid "Barbell" Strategy

The study proposes the "barbell" strategy as a conceptual framework for GVC configuration. This framework moves beyond binary choices to recognize that optimal strategies involve a portfolio approach that balances cost, capability, and risk across multiple locations.

6.3. Practical Implications for Management

The findings have significant implications for corporate strategists, supply chain managers, and executives:

Implication 1: Move Beyond Labor Cost Arbitrage

The days of making location decisions based primarily on labor costs are over. A holistic TCO approach that includes logistics, tariffs, inventory, quality, and risk is essential. Firms that continue to chase the lowest labor costs may find themselves with higher total costs.

Implication 2: Embrace the Hybrid Approach

Most firms should pursue a hybrid strategy that combines nearshoring and friendshoring. The optimal mix depends on product characteristics, market focus, and risk tolerance. A one-size-fits-all approach is unlikely to be optimal.

Implication 3: Invest in Supplier Development

Moving production to new locations requires developing supplier ecosystems. This is a multi-year investment that requires patience and commitment. Firms that simply relocate assembly without developing local suppliers will continue to depend on Chinese inputs.

Implication 4: Prepare for Transition Costs

The transition from concentrated production in China to diversified production across multiple locations involves significant costs:

- Capital expenditure for new facilities
- Training costs for new workers
- Dual-sourcing costs during transition
- Learning curve costs as new locations develop capabilities

Firms should plan for a 3-5 year transition period and budget accordingly.

Implication 5: Build Flexibility into Contracts

Supply chain flexibility has become a strategic imperative. Firms should negotiate contracts that allow for:

- Volume flexibility (ability to shift production between locations)
- Geographic flexibility (ability to add new locations)
- Price flexibility (ability to renegotiate as costs change)

Implication 6: Monitor Geopolitical Developments

The geopolitical environment is fluid. Firms should establish mechanisms for monitoring:

- Trade policy changes (tariffs, trade agreements)
- Political developments in key manufacturing locations
- Regulatory changes affecting supply chains

6.4. Policy Implications

The findings have important implications for policymakers:

Implication 1: Trade Agreements Matter

The USMCA has been a critical driver of nearshoring to Mexico. The tariff-free access it provides makes Mexico cost-competitive despite higher labor costs. Policymakers should recognize the power of trade agreements to shape location decisions.

Implication 2: Industrial Policy Can Accelerate Restructuring

The US CHIPS Act and India's PLI scheme demonstrate that government incentives can accelerate supply chain restructuring. However, these policies must be carefully designed to avoid distortion and ensure long-term competitiveness.

Implication 3: Infrastructure Investment is Critical

The ability of countries to attract manufacturing investment depends on infrastructure quality. Investments in ports, roads, rail, electricity, and digital infrastructure are essential for manufacturing competitiveness.

Implication 4: Skills Development is Essential

Countries seeking to attract manufacturing investment must invest in skills development. The availability of skilled workers—engineers, technicians, managers—is a key factor in location decisions.

Implication 5: Regulatory Certainty Matters

Firms making long-term investment decisions value regulatory certainty. Countries with stable, predictable regulatory environments are more attractive for manufacturing investment.

Implication 6: Sustainability is Emerging as a Factor

Growing consumer and regulatory pressure for sustainable production is influencing location decisions. Countries with access to renewable energy, sustainable materials, and efficient logistics may gain advantage.

6.5. Limitations and Future Research Agenda

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged and addressed in future research:

Limitations:

1. Reliance on Secondary Data: The study relies primarily on publicly available secondary data, which may not capture all relevant firm-level information. Proprietary data from firms would provide richer insights.
2. Time Period Constraints: The study covers 2018-2024, which captures the initial wave of restructuring but may not reflect long-term equilibrium. The full effects of restructuring may take 5-10 years to materialize.
3. Industry Selection Bias: The four industries selected (automotive, electronics, pharmaceuticals, apparel) may not be representative of all manufacturing sectors. Other industries (aerospace, medical devices, machinery) may have different dynamics.
4. Country Selection: The focus on Mexico, CEE, Vietnam, and India excludes other potentially important nearshoring/friendshoring destinations (Turkey, Morocco, Thailand, Indonesia).
5. Causality Challenges: It is difficult to isolate the impact of restructuring decisions from other factors affecting firm performance.

Future Research Agenda:

1. Longitudinal Studies: Track firms over 5-10 years to assess the long-term performance implications of restructuring decisions.
2. Firm-Level Data Analysis: Access proprietary firm-level data to analyze actual costs, performance, and outcomes.
3. Broader Industry Coverage: Extend analysis to additional industries (aerospace, medical devices, machinery, chemicals).
4. Additional Country Analysis: Include additional nearshoring/friendshoring destinations (Turkey, Morocco, Thailand, Indonesia, Costa Rica).
5. Sustainability Dimensions: Analyze the environmental implications of nearshoring vs. friendshoring, including carbon emissions from logistics.
6. Technology Impact: Assess how automation and Industry 4.0 technologies may change the cost calculus for different locations.
7. Geopolitical Scenarios: Develop scenario analysis for different geopolitical futures (US-China decoupling, US-China détente, regional blocks).
8. SME Strategies: Analyze how small and medium-sized enterprises approach the nearshoring vs. friendshoring decision, given their more limited resources.

REFERENCES

Alfaro, L., & Chor, D. (2023). Global Supply Chains: The Looming 'Great Reallocation'. NBER Working Paper Series, No. 31661.

AlixPartners. (2022). 2022 AlixPartners Global Automotive Outlook. AlixPartners.

Antràs, P. (2020). Conceptual aspects of global value chains. World Bank Economic Review, 34(3), 551-574.

Baldwin, R. (2016). The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization. Harvard University Press.

Baldwin, R., & Freeman, R. (2022). Risks and global supply chains: What we know and what we need to know. Annual Review of Economics, 14, 153-180.

Boston Consulting Group. (2022). Harnessing the Tectonic Shifts in Global Manufacturing. BCG.

Buckley, P. J. (2009). The impact of the global factory on economic development. Journal of World Business, 44(2), 131-143.

Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. The International Journal of Logistics Management, 15(2), 1-14.

Conference Board. (2023). International Labor Comparisons. The Conference Board.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Deloitte. (2023). 2023 Supply Chain Resilience Survey. Deloitte Consulting.

Ellram, L. M. (1995). Total cost of ownership: An analysis approach for purchasing. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 25(8), 4-23.

Eurostat. (2024). EU Trade Statistics. European Commission.

Fisher, M. L. (1997). What is the right supply chain for your product? Harvard Business Review, 75(2), 105-116.

Gereffi, G., Humphrey, J., & Sturgeon, T. (2005). The governance of global value chains. Review of International Political Economy, 12(1), 78-104.

Gereffi, G., & Lee, J. (2012). Why the world suddenly cares about global supply chains. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 48(3), 24-32.

Hendricks, K. B., & Singhal, V. R. (2005). An empirical analysis of the effect of supply chain disruptions on long-run stock price performance and equity risk of the firm. Production and Operations Management, 14(1), 35-52.

Hopkins, T. K., & Wallerstein, I. (1986). Commodity chains in the world-economy prior to 1800. Review, 10(1), 157-170.

Jones, R. W., & Kierzkowski, H. (1990). The role of services in production and international trade: A theoretical framework. In R. W. Jones & A. O. Krueger (Eds.), The Political Economy of International Trade (pp. 31-48). Basil Blackwell.

Kogut, B. (1985). Designing global strategies: Comparative and competitive value-added chains. Sloan Management Review, 26(4), 15-28.

McKinsey & Company. (2022). Global Supply Chains: Navigating the New Normal. McKinsey Global Institute.

McKinsey & Company. (2023). The State of Supply Chain Resilience. McKinsey & Company.

Miroudot, S. (2020). Resilience versus robustness in global value chains: Some policy implications. In COVID-19 and Trade Policy: Why Turning Inward Won't Work (pp. 117-130). CEPR Press.

OECD. (2023). OECD Economic Surveys: China 2023. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Pettit, T. J., Fiksel, J., & Croxton, K. L. (2010). Ensuring supply chain resilience: Development of a conceptual framework. Journal of Business Logistics, 31(1), 1-21.

Sheffi, Y. (2015). The Power of Resilience: How the Best Companies Manage the Unexpected. MIT Press.

The Economist. (2021). The promise and perils of nearshoring. The Economist Intelligence Unit.

UNCTAD. (2021). World Investment Report 2021: Investing in Sustainable Recovery. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

UNCTAD. (2024). World Investment Report 2024. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

UNCTAD. (2025). World Investment Report 2025: International Investment in the Digital Economy. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

US Census Bureau. (2024). US International Trade in Goods and Services. US Department of Commerce.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. Academic Press.

Williamson, O. E. (1985). The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting. Free Press.

Womack, J. P., Jones, D. T., & Roos, D. (1990). The Machine That Changed the World: The Story of Lean Production. Free Press.

World Bank. (2023). World Development Indicators. World Bank Group.

WTO. (2022). World Trade Statistical Review 2022. World Trade Organization.

Yeung, H. W. (2016). Strategic Coupling: East Asian Industrial Transformation in the New Global Economy. Cornell University Press.

Yellen, J. (2022). Remarks by Secretary of the Treasury Janet L. Yellen on the Way Forward for the Global Economy. Atlantic Council.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Detailed TCO Calculations

This appendix provides detailed TCO calculations for representative products in each of the four industries analyzed.

A.1. Electronics: Representative Smartphone

Product Characteristics:

- Unit Value: $200
- Annual Volume: 1,000,000 units
- Unit Weight: 0.5 kg
- Labor Content: 15% of value

Cost Component	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India
Direct Labor	$8.00	$11.50	$6.50	$5.80
Materials	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00	$120.00
Logistics	$3.50	$0.90	$3.80	$3.60
Tariffs	$50.00	$0	$0	$0
Inventory Carrying	$11.50	$3.50	$10.40	$10.40
Quality/Compliance	$4.00	$3.00	$5.00	$5.50
Coordination	$3.00	$1.50	$3.50	$4.00
Total TCO per Unit	$200.00	$140.40	$149.20	$149.30

A.2. Automotive: Representative Component (Transmission)

Product Characteristics:

- Unit Value: $1,500
- Annual Volume: 200,000 units
- Unit Weight: 50 kg
- Labor Content: 20% of value

Cost Component	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India	CEE
Direct Labor	$60.00	$85.00	$45.00	$40.00	$105.00
Materials	$900.00	$900.00	$900.00	$900.00	$900.00
Logistics	$45.00	$12.00	$48.00	$46.00	$15.00
Tariffs	$375.00	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inventory Carrying	$90.00	$28.00	$82.00	$80.00	$30.00
Quality/Compliance	$45.00	$30.00	$55.00	$60.00	$35.00
Coordination	$22.00	$10.00	$25.00	$28.00	$12.00
Total TCO per Unit	$1,537.00	$1,065.00	$1,155.00	$1,154.00	$1,097.00

A.3. Pharmaceuticals: Representative Drug (Oral Solid Dose)

Product Characteristics:

• Unit Value: $10 (per bottle of 100 tablets)
• Annual Volume: 10,000,000 bottles
• Unit Weight: 0.2 kg
• Labor Content: 10% of value

Cost Component	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India	CEE
Direct Labor	$0.35	$0.50	$0.28	$0.25	$0.70
Materials	$6.00	$6.00	$6.00	$6.00	$6.00
Logistics	$0.18	$0.05	$0.20	$0.19	$0.06
Tariffs	$2.50	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inventory Carrying	$0.60	$0.18	$0.55	$0.52	$0.20
Quality/Compliance	$0.80	$0.50	$0.90	$0.95	$0.45
Coordination	$0.25	$0.12	$0.28	$0.30	$0.15
Total TCO per Unit	$10.68	$7.35	$8.21	$8.21	$7.56

A.4. Apparel: Representative Garment (T-shirt)

Product Characteristics:

• Unit Value: $10
• Annual Volume: 5,000,000 units
• Unit Weight: 0.3 kg
• Labor Content: 35% of value

Cost Component	China	Mexico	Vietnam	India	Bangladesh
Direct Labor	$1.20	$2.80	$0.95	$0.85	$0.65
Materials	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50	$5.50
Logistics	$0.15	$0.04	$0.16	$0.15	$0.16
Tariffs	$0.75	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inventory Carrying	$0.50	$0.15	$0.45	$0.42	$0.45
Quality/Compliance	$0.25	$0.20	$0.30	$0.35	$0.40
Coordination	$0.20	$0.10	$0.22	$0.25	$0.28
Total TCO per Unit	$8.55	$8.79	$7.58	$7.52	$7.44

Appendix B: Trade Data Tables

B.1. US Imports from China by Product Category (2018-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Product Category	2018	2020	2022	2024 (est.)	Change
Electronics	152.3	128.5	145.2	112.4	-26.2%
Machinery	98.2	82.1	95.3	78.5	-20.1%
Furniture	32.5	25.2	28.4	21.3	-34.5%
Apparel	27.1	22.3	25.1	18.2	-32.8%

Product Category	2018	2020	2022	2024 (est.)	Change
Toys	18.5	15.2	17.3	12.1	-34.6%
Chemicals	15.2	13.5	16.8	14.2	-6.6%
Other	195.7	148.6	208.7	145.1	-25.9%
Total	539.5	435.4	536.8	401.8	-25.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2024). Category-level figures are author-constructed estimates/compilations and should be treated as indicative; country totals should be reconciled to the official Census series before journal submission.

B.2. US Imports from Mexico by Product Category (2018-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Product Category	2018	2020	2022	2024 (est.)	Change
Vehicles	92.3	78.5	105.2	118.4	+28.3%
Auto Parts	58.2	52.1	68.4	74.2	+27.5%
Electronics	45.2	42.3	58.2	65.3	+44.5%
Machinery	38.5	35.2	48.2	55.4	+43.9%
Medical Devices	12.3	11.5	15.2	17.8	+44.7%
Other	100.0	105.8	159.7	167.2	+67.2%
Total	346.5	325.4	454.9	498.3	+43.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2024). Category-level figures are author-constructed estimates/compilations and should be treated as indicative; country totals should be reconciled to the official Census series before journal submission.

B.3. US Imports from Vietnam by Product Category (2018-2024)

(Values in USD Billions)

Product Category	2018	2020	2022	2024 (est.)	Change
Electronics	15.2	28.5	45.2	48.5	+219.1%
Apparel	12.3	13.5	17.2	16.8	+36.6%
Footwear	6.2	7.5	9.8	9.5	+53.2%
Furniture	4.5	6.2	8.5	8.2	+82.2%
Machinery	3.2	5.1	8.2	9.4	+193.8%
Other	7.8	18.8	38.6	35.4	+353.8%
Total	49.2	79.6	127.5	127.8	+159.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (2024). Category-level figures are author-constructed estimates/compilations and should be treated as indicative; country totals should be reconciled to the official Census series before journal submission.

B.4. EU Imports from CEE Countries (2018-2024)

(Values in EUR Billions)

Country	2018	2020	2022	2024 (est.)	Change
Poland	128.5	132.5	165.2	172.4	+34.2%
Czech Republic	105.2	98.5	128.5	135.2	+28.5%
Hungary	75.2	72.5	92.4	98.5	+31.0%
Slovakia	65.2	62.1	78.5	82.3	+26.2%
Romania	48.2	45.2	62.1	68.5	+42.1%
Other CEE	30.0	30.4	105.4	81.5	+171.7%
Total CEE	452.3	441.2	632.1	638.4	+41.2%

Source: Eurostat (2024).

Appendix C: Company Case Study Details

C.1. Tesla's Mexico Nearshoring Strategy

Background:

Tesla announced in March 2023 plans to build a new gigafactory in Monterrey, Nuevo León, Mexico, with an estimated investment of $5 billion. The factory is expected to produce next-generation electric vehicles for the North American market.

Strategic Rationale:

- Market Access: Proximity to the US market, Tesla's largest market
- Supply Chain: Access to Mexico's automotive supplier ecosystem, including Tesla's existing suppliers
- Cost Structure: Competitive labor costs (Mexican automotive wages: $8-10/hour vs. US: $30-35/hour)
- USMCA Compliance: Meeting North American content requirements for EV tax credits under the Inflation Reduction Act

Expected Benefits:

- Lead Time Reduction: From 4-6 weeks (from China for components) to 2-3 days (from Mexico)
- Logistics Savings: 70-75% reduction in freight costs vs. ocean shipping from Asia
- Tariff Avoidance: USMCA tariff-free access vs. 25% tariffs on Chinese goods
- Working Capital Reduction: 50-60% reduction in inventory carrying costs

Challenges:

- Skilled Labor: Competition for skilled workers in Monterrey's industrial corridor
- Water Scarcity: Water availability is a concern in northern Mexico
- Infrastructure: Electricity grid capacity in Nuevo León requires expansion

C.2. Apple's India Friendshoring Strategy

Background:

Apple has been gradually shifting iPhone production from China to India since 2017, with a dramatic acceleration in 2022-2024. By 2024, approximately 14% of iPhones were produced in India, with Apple targeting 25% by 2025.

Strategic Rationale:

- Geopolitical Risk Mitigation: Reducing dependency on China amid US-China tensions
- Market Access: India's large and growing smartphone market (Apple's market share grew from 1% to 6% from 2019-2024)

- Government Incentives: India's PLI scheme provides 4-6% of incremental sales as incentives
- Labor Costs: Indian manufacturing wages are approximately 35% of China's levels

Expected Benefits:

- Risk Reduction: Diversification away from China reduces geopolitical and pandemic risk
- Market Growth: Direct access to India's 1.4 billion population
- Cost Savings: Lower labor costs for assembly operations
- Political Alignment: India is a key US partner in the Indo-Pacific strategy

Challenges:

- Supplier Ecosystem: Developing the full electronics supply chain in India takes time
- Quality Control: Initial quality issues required significant oversight
- Infrastructure: India's logistics infrastructure still lags China's
- Regulatory Complexity: India's regulatory environment remains complex

C.3. Volkswagen's CEE Expansion Strategy

Background:

Volkswagen Group has been expanding production in Central and Eastern Europe for over two decades, with major facilities in Slovakia, Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary. The company has accelerated CEE investment since 2020.

Strategic Rationale:

- Market Access: CEE countries are full EU members, providing tariff-free access to the EU single market
- Cost Structure: CEE wages are 25-30% of German levels
- Skills: Strong engineering tradition and skilled workforce
- Proximity: 1-3 day lead times to Western European markets

Expected Benefits:

- Cost Savings: 60-70% labor cost savings vs. German production
- Flexibility: Ability to shift production between plants in response to demand
- Quality: High-quality production matching German standards
- EU Integration: Full integration into EU supply chains

Challenges:

- Wage Growth: CEE wages are rising at 7-8% annually, gradually eroding cost advantages
- Labor Shortages: Low unemployment creates challenges for workforce expansion
- Energy Costs: Some CEE countries face energy cost challenges