White paper



Capital strategy

The outsourcing balance sheet

How biotech operating models shape capital efficiency, enterprise value and exit readiness



Executive summary

Most small and mid-sized biotechs do not have the resources to internally build every capability required to advance an asset from development through clinical trials and toward commercialization. That's why partners, such as contract research organizations (CRO's), contract development and manufacturing organizations (CDMO's), specialty laboratories, clinical supply providers and others, become extensions of the biotech company's operating infrastructure. How these partnerships are structured and coordinated can significantly influence development costs, operational efficiency, financial flexibility and a company's ability to advance its programs.

For emerging or growing biotech companies, these outsourcing decisions are high-stakes choices about capital allocation. The operating model and how a company decides to outsource activities reshapes a company's balance sheet, determines how much cash is needed, impacts how quickly milestones are reached and affects the execution risk a program may carry.

Recent biotech funding trends reinforce the importance of disciplined capital allocation. Although total funding for the first nine months of 2026 was higher than during the same period in 2025, the sharp quarterly decline highlights continued volatility in the financing environment. For emerging biotechs, that uncertainty makes careful spending and resource allocation especially important.

How to leverage CRO's and CDMO's to maximize company value is an increasingly critical topic of discussion in the industry. For example, July 2026 One Nucleus event participants discussed aligning outsourcing decisions with investor priorities and the critical path to the next value-inflection milestone, all while balancing internal expertise against the speed, capacity and capital efficiency available externally.

Biotech CFOs, then, must look beyond individual providers and if their rates are competitive, and move to evaluate whether their external operating model either improves or erodes the probability of reaching the next value-inflection point before capital, time or strategic optionality is exhausted.

Outsourcing decisions can also influence how investors and potential business partners evaluate a biotech company. When seeking funding, biotechs must demonstrate that they are using capital efficiently and have the capabilities and external partnerships needed to achieve their development milestones. When pursuing a licensing agreement or acquisition, the quality and management of those partnerships can affect a potential buyer's or partner's confidence in the asset, including whether development activities can continue smoothly and without unnecessary cost or risk.

The following five considerations deserve CFO-level attention:

- **Capital efficiency:** What is the total capital required to reach the next value-creating milestone? Beyond vendor fees, companies must account for internal oversight, technology transfers, potential rework and other expenses that can increase the total investment required.
- **Time to value:** How might the outsourcing model impact development timelines? Delays caused by vendor transitions, technology transfers or limited capacity can increase cash burn and postpone milestones critical to securing additional funding or partnerships.
- **Execution risk:** Where could quality issues, failed transfers or poor coordination between providers lead to costly setbacks? How effectively does the outsourcing model establish accountability and reduce the likelihood of repeating work or missing milestones?

- **Organizational leverage:** How many internal employees, systems and management resources will be needed to coordinate external partners? Could the cost and complexity of managing multiple providers offset some of the anticipated savings from outsourcing?
- **Strategic optionality:** Will the company's outsourcing arrangements support future financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities? Complete development records, clear contractual rights and well-managed partner relationships can simplify due diligence and help potential partners or buyers continue development without unnecessary disruption.

Ultimately, an outsourcing strategy needs to be evaluated against the total cost to milestone, execution risk and how the strategy contributes to overall enterprise value. There is no right or wrong path between assembling a highly diversified network of specialists and a more consolidated, integrated outsourcing model. The appropriate model depends on the asset, development stage, biotech internal capabilities, financing strategy and the intended direction of the company.

The economic case relies on whether the outsourcing model reduces avoidable delays and coordination costs while preserving flexibility should the program need to change course.

Outsourcing has become a capital allocation decision

For growing biotech companies, the traditional build-versus-buy decision has significant implications for how capital is allocated and development activities are managed.

A company may own its intellectual property and scientific strategy while relying on external organizations for much of the infrastructure necessary to turn that science into an asset that can attract investment, support licensing or move toward commercialization.

That infrastructure may include early development, analytical and laboratory services, drug-substance and drug-product development, clinical manufacturing, clinical research, clinical supply, regulatory support and commercial-readiness activities.

As a result, a biotech company with a relatively small employee base can then be responsible for coordinating a much larger development organization involving potentially hundreds of external professionals.

From a finance perspective, internal headcount alone does not define the operating model. The complete network of internal and external capabilities does. The cost and performance of that network influences cash burn, financing requirements, milestone timing, execution risk, and, ultimately, enterprise value.

For biotech companies that coordinate development through external partners, those relationships are part of their operating infrastructure and should be planned and governed with the same financial discipline as internal capabilities.

Start with the company's next value-creating milestone

Outsourcing strategies should be designed around the development milestones a company's targets are intended to support.

The July 2026 One Nucleus working session brought together approximately 60 industry participants to discuss how CRO and CDMO relationships can maximize the value creation for biotech companies. The discussion emphasized the importance of understanding investor expectations—including whether investors are focused on long-term growth or earlier milestones and an exit—while aligning those expectations with the company's own development strategy and identifying the critical path to the next value-inflection point.

Understanding this dynamic and what investors expect creates a useful starting question for CFOs: What milestone does this round of capital need to help the company reach?

For one company, it may be an investigational new drug (IND) submission. For another, Phase I data or proof of concept. For another, the goal may be to advance an asset far enough to support a licensing agreement or sale. Some are scientific or regulatory milestones, while others may be strategic transactions.

Once that milestone is defined, the company can evaluate whether its outsourcing strategy provides the capabilities, capacity and coordination needed to reach it within the available budget and timeline.



Funding conditions make this planning especially important. This concentration of private capital means that strong sector-wide funding totals offer little assurance about an individual company's ability to secure additional capital. The operating plan therefore needs to work with the capital the company can realistically deploy.

The objective, then, is to establish an external operating model that supports the company's development goals, capital strategy and next value-inflection milestone rather than focusing on building the "best" vendor network in the abstract.

The CFO's key question: what will it cost to reach the next milestone?

Vendor comparisons often begin with the price of a defined service. Biotech finance must consider a broader question: What is the total capital required to reach the next value-creating milestone, accounting for development timelines and execution risk.

A lower-cost provider may create substantial value if it delivers equivalent quality, capacity, expertise and timelines at a lower price. Conversely, the lowest contracted price can become the more expensive choice if it creates additional transfers, rework, delays, internal coordination requirements or capacity constraints.

A CFO must evaluate the entire operating model rather than vendor spend in isolation. This means comparing the total capital required to reach the same milestone, the time needed to get there and the execution risks that could increase costs or jeopardize progress. The goal is to identify the approach that advances the development efficiently while preserving capital for future milestones and strategic opportunities.

The financial cost of development delays

In biotechnology, delay has a cost. Every additional month before an important clinical or regulatory milestone can mean another month of payroll, vendor expenses, program management overhead, as well as facility and infrastructure costs. Delays can also shorten a company's cash runway and postpone financing or partnership opportunities tied to that milestone.

A seemingly modest delay at one vendor interface can ripple through a program. A late manufacturing slot can affect clinical supply and study startup. A technology transfer problem can require additional analytical work. Data incompatibilities can generate rework. Each setback can increase costs and push back the next milestone.

Readiness across manufacturing, clinical supply and study startup therefore needs to be part of the same milestone plan. For CFOs, it's critical to understand what delays will cost the company and consider how much it is worth investing to reduce the risk of delays to stay on schedule.

The financial tradeoffs of outsourcing models

Most biotech outsourcing strategies sit somewhere between two models, each with different implications for costs, internal resources and execution risk.

Model 1: A network of specialized providers

The company selects separate providers based on expertise, price, geography, capacity or activity-specific considerations. Potential advantages include access to best-in-class capabilities, pricing competition, flexibility, reduced dependence on a single organization and the ability to tailor each workstream to the asset's needs.

Its principal challenge is that coordination becomes the biotech's responsibility. Management must align timelines, specifications, data, quality expectations, technology transfers and priorities across independent organizations. This requires internal resources that can increase costs or cause delays when handoffs are not managed effectively.

McKinsey's 2022 research on clinical development outsourcing highlights this tradeoff. It found that contracting the best-in-breed clinical providers can offer access to advanced capabilities but requires vendor-management resources and processes that may be beyond the practical capacity of many emerging biotechs. McKinsey also identified an opportunity for CRO's to serve as integrators or "general contractors" of external capabilities.

Model 2: A consolidated or integrated provider

The company relies on a provider for multiple development activities. Potential advantages include fewer organizational interfaces and external handoffs, reduced coordination requirements, continuity of program knowledge, simplified governance, greater capacity visibility and less internal infrastructure required to manage the program. These benefits may help reduce internal costs and avoid delays between development activities.

The corresponding concern is concentration risk. If a significant portion of the development pathway depends on one provider, performance, capacity or contractual problems may affect multiple components of the program. Companies must also consider whether the arrangement provides sufficient flexibility to change providers or adjust development plans as needs evolve.

It's important to acknowledge that the economic value of partnering with an integrated provider only exists if consolidation actually reduces coordination costs, delays and risk across execution. If integration is only visible in the organizational chart and with consolidated invoices, then the outsourcing strategy may need to be reconsidered to achieve greater economic value.

Third-party risk is enterprise-value risk

Critical third-party dependencies can create significant financial and operational risks for biotech companies, particularly when external providers perform activities essential to reaching development milestones. This is why third-party dependencies should be considered an enterprise-risk issue, rather than a procurement-only issue.

Research from RSM, a global accounting and consulting network, identifies third-party risk as one of the factors capable of threatening enterprise stability. It argues that recognizing, managing and monitoring these dependencies can help protect the investment thesis and position a company for a successful exit.

KPMG similarly recommends managing third-party risk throughout the relationship lifecycle, from planning and due diligence to contracting, ongoing monitoring and contingency planning, with particularly rigorous oversight of providers supporting critical activities.

For biotech leadership, outsourcing transfers execution. It does not transfer accountability. The board and management team remain responsible for understanding critical provider dependencies, financial and operational stability, capacity risk, data and intellectual property (IP) ownership, performance monitoring, contractual rights and contingency arrangements. Failures in any of these areas can lead to costly delays, disrupt development programs or complicate future transactions.

That oversight needs to keep pace with the program. Protocol changes, enrollment challenges and reductions in scope can alter costs and resource requirements even without a formal cancellation. CFOs should ensure that operating scope, staffing plans, cash forecasts and vendor contracts remain aligned as the work changes.

Effective third-party oversight helps protect the capital invested in development while reducing risks that could affect future financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities.

Build an operating model that can evolve

The strongest outsourcing strategy is rarely defined by maximizing either consolidation or diversification. It requires deliberate planning and coordination to ensure the company has the capabilities it needs while managing costs, risks and critical dependencies.

A management team should be able to explain which capabilities will remain internal, which will be outsourced, where integration has economic value and where specialized expertise warrants an independent provider. The team should also identify critical dependencies and establish how vendor performance, capacity and continuity risks will be managed, how data and IP rights will be protected and what contingency plans are in place.

This may lead to a hybrid approach: a strategic anchor provider for activities where continuity and integration are economically important, complemented by specialists where differentiated expertise creates greater value.

Importantly, the operating model should evolve as the asset progresses. The Deloitte Center for Health Solution's research on cell and gene therapy operating models describes the long-term implications of early make-versus-buy decisions and notes that changing an operating model later can be difficult, expensive and slow. The research also identifies hybrid approaches combining internal capabilities with external CDMO infrastructure.

For biotech leaders, the financial implications extend beyond immediate development needs. Outsourcing arrangements should provide the capabilities and continuity required today while preserving the flexibility to adjust development plans, scale activities or transition work as the company's strategic objectives change.

How outsourcing affects investment and exit readiness

There is limited published evidence establishing that investors systematically prefer one CRO, CDMO or outsourcing model over another. The more relevant consideration is whether a company's external operating model provides a credible path for converting capital into development progress while managing execution and dependency risks.

For companies seeking financing, investors may examine whether outsourcing arrangements provide the expertise, capacity and oversight needed to reach the next value-creating milestone. They may also consider whether the company's development budget accounts for vendor dependencies, potential delays and other risks that could increase capital requirements.

For companies pursuing licensing agreements or acquisitions, those same arrangements can affect transaction readiness. Potential partners or buyers may examine the completeness of development records, ownership and accessibility of data and IP, contractual rights and the ability to continue or transfer development activities without significant disruption or additional costs.

Industry perspectives reinforce the importance of evaluating outsourcing arrangements in the context of a company's broader objectives. Danforth Health, for example, emphasizes aligning CRO selection with a biotech's specific capabilities, resources and development needs. Gerson Lehrman Group (GLG) has also documented research commissioned by a hedge-fund client examining CRO/CDMO selection criteria, supplier switching, associated costs and barriers. Collectively, the evidence suggests that investors have reason to examine the external operating model as part of broader operational diligence.

Ultimately, well-managed outsourcing relationships can help demonstrate that a biotech has a credible plan to use capital effectively, advance its assets and support future strategic opportunities.

When higher outsourcing costs are justified

For a CFO, perhaps the most important distinction is between price and economic value.

Suppose an integrated provider costs more than a network of smaller alternatives. The premium is difficult to justify if both approaches offer essentially equivalent quality, capacity, scalability and timelines.

But if the premium improves milestone delivery, manufacturing scalability, data continuity, capacity certainty, regulatory execution or reduces internal coordination requirements, the calculation changes. Management should identify the expected benefits, estimate their financial impact and provide evidence to support those assumptions.

The incremental vendor expenditure should then be evaluated as an investment intended to reduce risk or accelerate development progress. That discipline should also carry into vendor contracts through clear deliverables, defined responsibilities and payment terms tied to agreed progress, where appropriate.

To evaluate whether additional spending is justified, CFOs should compare it with the potential costs of avoidable delays, rework and internal coordination, as well as the financial benefits of reaching milestones sooner. Those assumptions should be tested against scenarios such as delayed financing or a program setback.



How outsourcing decisions can support an exit strategy

Not every biotech is being built to become a fully integrated commercial company. For many emerging companies, the goal is to reach a value-inflection point after which an asset may be licensed, partnered or sold.

For these companies, outsourcing decisions should account for the requirements of a potential future transaction. The objective is to advance the asset to a stage that supports financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities while deploying capital and organizational resources efficiently.

Deloitte's 2026 life sciences M&A outlook describes investors as increasingly selective and risk-conscious, and identifies a market shift toward de-risked, growth-oriented assets. Deloitte also expects life science companies to favor targeted acquisitions of smaller businesses, complementary capabilities or individual assets, as these transactions can offer faster integration, clearer financial returns and reduced execution risk.

EY-Parthenon's insights on how biopharmas can better integrate pre-commercial acquisitions reaches a complementary conclusion from the buyer's perspective. Its analysis notes that pre-commercial assets have become increasingly important to biopharma pipeline development and that the functional operating model—including vendors and third-party contracts—must be considered during integration planning.

The implication for an emerging biotech is important: the operating model being built today may eventually become part of a buyer's integration plan. Structuring external partnerships with that possibility in mind can help reduce transaction complications while preserving the company's ability to pursue other development and financing opportunities.

What strategic buyers may examine during due diligence

A prospective acquirer is not buying only clinical results. It's also taking on the remaining development risks, costs and responsibilities associated with the asset.

During diligence, a buyer may want to understand the maturity of the chemistry, manufacturing and controls (CMC) package, manufacturing reproducibility and scalability, clinical-supply continuity, data integrity and regulatory history. It may also examine outstanding development activities, projected costs and timelines, provider capabilities and the ease with which the program can continue after the transaction.

A fragmented vendor structure is not inherently problematic. But the seller must be able to demonstrate how the pieces fit together, where responsibilities lie, and how program knowledge, data and critical development activities can be maintained or transferred following a transaction.

The ideal result is transaction readiness without unnecessary vendor lock-in. Contracts should address appropriate rights relating to data ownership and access, intellectual property, technology transfer, manufacturing information, regulatory records, termination and transition support. Companies should also understand whether assignment or change-of-control provisions could complicate a future transaction.

A strong vendor relationship should be an asset in diligence, not a dependency that makes the program difficult or costly to transfer.

A practical CFO framework for outsourcing decisions

Before approving a major development outsourcing strategy, finance and senior leadership should evaluate the proposed operating model across six dimensions. Each should be assessed against the company's next development milestone, available capital and longer-term strategic objectives.

1. **Total cost to milestone, adjusted for risk:** Model total external spend, internal management costs, potential rework, technology transfers, contingencies and the financial impact of potential delays. Estimate how much cash will remain at the next milestone and test the impact of delayed financing or unexpected development costs.
2. **Time to value:** Identify critical dependencies and vendor handoffs that could affect development timelines. Estimate the financial impact of three, six and 12-month delays, including additional cash burn and the potential postponement of financing or transaction opportunities.
3. **Execution resilience:** Evaluate provider stability, capacity, quality, regulatory experience, geographic reach and contingency options. Verify that the proposed delivery team has the expertise and capacity needed to support the program.
4. **Organizational leverage:** Determine the internal headcount, expertise and management resources required to oversee the proposed outsourcing model. Account for those requirements when comparing the total costs of different approaches.
5. **Dependency and transferability:** Identify critical third-party relationships and evaluate what happens if the provider must be replaced or development activities need to be transferred. Estimate the time, cost and operational disruption involved, and confirm that contracts support necessary access to data, intellectual property and development records.
6. **Strategic optionality:** Assess whether the outsourcing model can support different future outcomes, including additional financing, partnering, licensing or acquisition, as well as continued independent development and commercialization. Consider what changes would be required under each scenario and the potential financial implications.

Together, these considerations provide a basis for comparing outsourcing strategies on their ability to use capital efficiently, support development progress and preserve future strategic opportunities.



From outsourcing infrastructure to value-creation infrastructure

The preceding framework applies across outsourcing models. However, it points toward an important consideration for biotechs with limited capital and internal resources.

When a company depends heavily on external partners and needs to reach critical financing or transaction milestones, the integration of work itself can become economically valuable.

McKinsey's research supports the underlying operating-model logic. It recommends that CRO's serving emerging biotechs strengthen their role as integrators of specialized solutions, improve speed and quality, and evolve toward end-to-end strategic partnerships rather than limiting their role to isolated services.

An integrated outsourcing model may bring together capabilities across drug development, manufacturing, clinical research and clinical supply. However, breadth alone does not solve a CFO's problem. The potential value comes from how those capabilities are coordinated through shared program governance, aligned schedules, clear accountability and continuity across development activities.

For a lean biotech, this can change the role of the outsourcing provider. Rather than purchasing a portfolio of independent services, the company gains access to a coordinated external development infrastructure that can support its financial and strategic objectives.

The financial case for integration

The financial case for integration rests on three factors that senior leaders already manage closely:

Time: Reducing gaps and coordination challenges between development activities may shorten the path to important milestones. For a capital-constrained biotech, reaching those milestones sooner can help preserve cash, accelerate clinical validation and support earlier financing, partnering or transaction opportunities.

Capital efficiency: A company that advances an asset farther with a given amount of capital may create a stronger proposition for existing and future investors. The question is therefore not whether an integrated provider offers the lowest service price, but whether the model reduces total costs and internal resource requirements while supporting development progress.

Execution risk: Each handoff between organizations can introduce opportunities for information loss, technical incompatibility, scheduling conflicts, rework and delay. An integrated model designed to manage those interfaces may reduce operational risk through coordinated planning, communication and accountability.

The financial case is strongest when these benefits can be demonstrated for the specific development program and outweigh any additional costs or dependencies associated with integration.

Quantifying the potential value: the eNPV perspective

Expected net present value (eNPV) provides a useful way to assess how development costs, timelines and risks can affect the potential financial value of a drug development program. By accounting for the timing of future cash flows and the probability of reaching commercialization, eNPV can help companies evaluate the economic implications of different operating approaches.

A 2025 modeling study conducted by the Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development examined the potential financial benefits of integrating CDMO and CRO services across oncology drug development programs, including monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) and small molecules. In one scenario involving Phase III development of a monoclonal antibody, full integration increased modeled eNPV by approximately $62.9 million per investigational oncology indication, expressed in 2023 dollars. The analysis also examined earlier development stages and combinations of phases, with results varying according to the stage and scope of integration.

That finding is strategically important because it reframes the outsourcing conversation. The question moves from “How much do these services cost?” to “How might the operating model affect the risk-adjusted economic value of the asset?”

The research was supported in part by Thermo Fisher Scientific, which also provided operational data used in the modeling. The analysis drew on one provider’s oncology experience and industry benchmarks and did not assume that integration improved clinical success probabilities. Instead, its estimated financial benefits were driven primarily by shorter development timelines.

These results represent modeled scenarios rather than observed increases in asset value. While the study provides a useful framework for evaluating the economics of integration, individual biotechs must assess potential benefits against their own development timelines, costs, risks and operating requirements.

Accelerator™ Drug Development and Biotech

For biotechs preparing for a transaction

The integrated outsourcing model may be especially relevant for companies whose strategic objective is to advance an asset toward financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities rather than building a fully integrated commercial organization.

In this model, the biotech retains ownership of its science, intellectual property, strategic decisions and capital allocation. An integrated external partner coordinates development, chemistry, manufacturing and controls (CMC), clinical manufacturing, clinical supply and clinical research activities toward an agreed milestone.

The biotech does not need to own all the infrastructure required to create value. It needs reliable access to that infrastructure, along with the ability to maintain oversight and control over critical development decisions.

Thermo Fisher Scientific’s Accelerator™ Drug Development is designed to coordinate these capabilities through an integrated approach. For a biotech preparing for a transaction, the relevant consideration is whether that coordination supports the development of an asset that a potential buyer or licensing partner can evaluate, continue developing or transfer without unnecessary disruption.

For biotechs building toward commercialization

For a biotech intending to retain and commercialize its assets, the planning horizon extends beyond the next financing or transaction milestone. The operating model must also account for process scale-up, validation, regulatory readiness and continuity of commercial supply.

An integrated approach may support that path by providing continuity across development stages, provided the partner has the necessary expertise, capabilities and capacity.

In either scenario, management needs clear ownership of quality, data and development decisions, along with workable transition rights if the company’s strategy or operating requirements change.



When provider scale creates financial value

A large, established provider should not be selected simply because of its size. A smaller CRO may be the better choice when its specialized expertise, attention and delivery model are particularly well suited to the company's development needs. Fit is always more important than a CRO's size.

One Nucleus likewise recommends evaluating expertise and capability fit, business viability, project complexity, cost, speed, organizational size, attention and the quality of the working relationship when selecting providers.

However, provider scale can become financially relevant when it translates into capacity availability, continuity across development stages, manufacturing scalability, geographic reach, established quality systems and specialized expertise. These capabilities may help reduce operational disruptions, support faster transitions and provide greater continuity as the asset advances.

If a smaller or lower-cost provider can deliver equivalent outcomes with comparable execution risk, it may be the more economical choice. But when a larger provider's capabilities or integrated services can demonstrably improve development timelines, reduce costs or manage critical risks, additional expenditure may be justified.

The financial value of scale depends on what those capabilities deliver for the specific asset, not the size of the provider itself.

The strategic standard: continuity without lock-in

A strong outsourcing relationship should support a biotech's development objectives without creating dependencies that could limit future financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities.

The ideal operating model provides enough coordination and continuity to advance development efficiently while preserving the ability to adjust or transfer activities when necessary.

That requires clear governance, well-defined responsibilities, access to critical data and intellectual property, appropriate contractual rights and the capacity to support future stages of development.

The goal is an external operating model that combines coordinated delivery with financial discipline, operational control and the flexibility to adapt as the company's needs evolve.

For emerging biotechs, these considerations extend beyond day-to-day development. An outsourcing strategy that helps preserve capital, manage execution risk and maintain strategic flexibility can become an important component of the company's broader value-creation and exit-readiness strategy.

Conclusion: put outsourcing on the capital-allocation agenda

For biotech companies, outsourcing is more than a make-versus-buy or procurement decision. It influences how capital is deployed, how efficiently development milestones are reached and how well-positioned the company and its assets are for future financing, licensing or acquisition opportunities. It therefore deserves a place in strategic planning and capital-allocation discussions.

In an uneven funding environment, leadership must connect vendor commitments to the cash available and the milestones that capital is intended to fund. The appropriate outsourcing model will vary by company, asset and development stage, and may evolve over time. Whether a biotech relies on specialized providers, an integrated partner or a hybrid approach, the priority is to manage total costs and execution risk while preserving the flexibility to pursue future opportunities.

The CFO's responsibility is to determine which operating model offers the strongest risk-adjusted path from today's capital base to the next value-creating milestone. The case should be made in the program plan and the economics: what the model costs, how it affects development timelines and risks, and whether it supports the company's longer-term financial and strategic objectives.

The question for the next leadership meeting is straightforward: Does our outsourcing model give us a credible, funded path to the milestone that matters, with enough flexibility for what comes next?

References and further reading

Danforth Health / Danforth Advisors. Mastering CRO Selection in 2026: A Biotech's Strategy for Lower Risk and Better Outcomes. https://www.danforthhealth.com/news-insights/cro-selection-strategy-biotech-2026/

DiMasi, J. A., Dirks, A. and Getz, K. A. The Net Financial Benefits of Single Vendor Integrated CDMO and CRO Drug Development Services. Tufts CSDD preprint, posted 7 May 2025, especially Tables 3–4 and limitations. Thermo Fisher Scientific partly funded the work and supplied operational data. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6531199/v1

Deloitte. Life Sciences M&A Trends: Looking Back at 2025 and Ahead to 2026. https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/Industries/life-sciences-health-care/articles/mergers-and-acquisitions-trends-survey-life-sciences.html

Deloitte Center for Health Solutions. Cell and Gene Therapies: Delivering Scientific Innovation Requires Operating Model Innovation. https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/life-sciences/operating-models-for-gene-cell-therapy-manufacturing-process.html

EY-Parthenon. How Biopharmas Can Better Integrate Pre-Commercial Acquisitions. https://www.ey.com/en_us/insights/strategy/pre-commercial-acquisition-integration-in-biopharma

GLG. Trend Study: Pharmaceutical Outsourcing Services for CRO's and CDMO's. https://glginsights.com/case-studies/cro-cdmo-outsourcing-trends-4/

KPMG. Parties & Providers. https://kpmg.com/us/en/articles/2024/parties-providers.html

McKinsey & Company. 9 June 2022. CRO's and Biotech Companies: Fine-Tuning the Partnership. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/life-sciences/our-insights/cros-and-biotech-companies-fine-tuning-the-partnership

One Nucleus. Challenges and Opportunities at the Biotech-CRO-CDMO Interface: A Write-Up of the One Nucleus 8 July 2026 Working Dinner. https://onenucleus.com/challenges-and-opportunities-biotech-cro-cdmo-interface-write-one-nucleus-8-july-2026-working

RSM US. Enterprise Continuity Risk in PE-Backed Firms. https://rsmus.com/insights/industries/private-equity/safeguarding-value-creation.html

Thermo Fisher SCIENTIFIC

Find an outsourcing solution that fits your program today and provides flexibility for what comes next. Connect with an expert to discuss your development goals, upcoming milestones and evolving needs.

Explore your options

Learn more at **ppd.com**

ppd

© 2026 Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. All rights reserved. All trademarks are the property of Thermo Fisher Scientific and its subsidiaries unless otherwise specified. 11.2026