Reagent Supply-Chain Structure for Benchtop DNA Synthesizers: There is Hope for KYC

Martin Rossa

With Apart Research

Abstract

Benchtop DNA synthesizers are approaching viral-genome-length assembly capability within 2–5 years (NTI 2023; IFP 2024), yet sit in a regulatory gap: Australia Group Item 10 and US ECCN 2B352.j control the equipment but do not reach the reagents that feed it. This submission compiles primary-source data on nine vendors and eleven device families commercially available or in late R&D as of April 2026. Devices are classified along three axes (chemistry; reagent supply model; AG-Item-10 scope), yielding one structurally actionable finding: every benchtop device crossing the ≥1.5 kb threshold with low user skill and minimal user intervention runs on a proprietary reagent ecosystem, but none publicly document cryptographic cartridge authentication or anti-tamper measures (Reardon & Diggans 2024). The alignment between regulatory scope and existing manufacturer business model defines a low-friction pathway for layered defense: requiring AG-Item-10-scope devices to accept only authenticated, tamper-resistant cartridges. Marginal engineering cost is partially offset by manufacturer aftermarket-revenue capture against grey-market refills. A legislative window opens with the EU Biotech Act and parallel US initiatives.

1. Introduction

The benchtop DNA synthesizer market in April 2026 spans four chemistry classes. **Phosphoramidite-column** instruments (Biolytic Dr. Oligo, LGC MerMade) produce single-stranded oligos up to ~200 nt. **Phosphoramidite-microfluidic** devices using sealed cartridges (Kilobaser one) produce ≤50 nt oligos. **Enzymatic** synthesizers using template-independent polymerases (DNA Script SYNTAX) produce ≤165 nt single strands. **Integrated cartridge or chip systems** performing on-device assembly (Telesis Bio BioXp 3250/9600, Evonetix Evaleo, Switchback Systems) produce gene-length double-stranded DNA. A fifth, emerging architecture — **reagent platforms running on third-party automation** (Telesis Gibson SOLA; Camena Biosciences gSynth; Touchlight × NEB EnClose) — has no regulated device at all. Twelve device families across nine vendors are commercially available or in late R&D.

Australia Group (AG) Common Control List Item 10 and US ECCN 2B352.j control automated nucleic-acid assemblers capable of generating dsDNA sequences ≥1.5 kb. Additionally, two operational characteristics jointly determine relevance:

1. **Throughput threshold:** assembly output ≥1.5 kb dsDNA per run.
2. **Skill floor:** assembly accomplished on-device with minimal user intervention. Devices producing only short fragments can in principle feed off-device Gibson, Golden Gate, or PCR-based assembly, but this requires skilled molecular-biology workflow.

The threat model treated here was identified by Carter, Yassif & Isaac (NTI 2023) and Langenkamp (IFP 2024): a benchtop device with on-device assembly capability that bypasses centralized provider sequence screening permits viral-genome-scale synthesis by an actor with limited training. Reardon & Diggans (Appl Biosaf 2024) document substitution-attack vectors against unsecured cartridges. Existing equipment-only controls and emerging equipment-side legislation (US S.3741, EU Biotech Act delegated regulations) do not currently reach the reagent stream.

Main contributions:

1. A primary-source inventory of nine vendors and twelve benchtop device families as of April 2026, classified along three axes.
2. A structural observation: every standalone device in current AG Item 10 scope with low skill-floor operation runs on a proprietary reagent ecosystem, yet none publicly documents cryptographic cartridge authentication.

2. Related Work

The technical and policy landscape has been mapped by Carter, Yassif & Isaac (NTI 2023) and Langenkamp (IFP 2024); both treat reagent-side controls as a secondary intervention. The screening-side framework sequence — US OSTP Implementation Framework (September 2024), pause under EO 14292 (May 2025), UK DSIT guidance (October 2024, the only national framework explicitly naming reagent screening), and Sentinel Bio's chokepoint analysis (2025) — establishes that sequence screening at centralized providers remains the dominant defended chokepoint. Reagent-side controls are widely treated as substitutes-or-also-rans rather than complements; this position is engaged directly in §5.3.

Substitution attacks against unsecured reagent supplies are documented by Reardon & Diggans (2024). Edison, Toner & Esvelt (2026) extend the threat model to fragment assembly, weakening the strategic relevance of fixed length thresholds and strengthening the case for reagent-side controls that operate independently of fragment-assembly tactics. The IBBIS Common Mechanism papers (Alexanian & Carter 2024; Carter, Boldrini & Alexanian 2025) set the practical screening framework. **Palmer, Teo, Karlubík & Harris (BioSecure, Apart Defensive Acceleration Hackathon 2025)** applied KYC framing to centralized synthesis providers. **Pannu et al. (PLoS Comput Biol 2025)** provide the tier-logic template for AI-tool KYC adopted here by structural analogy.

US S.3741 (Cotton-Klobuchar, January 2026) and the European Commission's EU Biotech Act proposal (December 2025) define the legislative window. The statutory-pathway ranking is treated in §5.4.

3. Methods

The device inventory was assembled in three workstreams.

Workstream A — Inventory. The set of benchtop DNA synthesizers commercially available or in late R&D as of April 2026 was

assembled by cross-checking NTI 2023, IFP 2024, Tessa Alexanian's open-questions list (*Error Prone*, April 2026), direct vendor surveys for nine vendors (DNA Script, Telesis Bio, Evonetix, Kilobaser, Switchback Systems, Biolytic, LGC, Camena Biosciences, Touchlight), and a parallel completeness check against Google Scholar, arXiv, the Apart Sprint Archive, SEC EDGAR, IGSC member updates, and Asia-Pacific vendor surveys (BGI, Vazyme, Bioneer, Macrogen, others). Service-only providers (Twist, Ansa) and discontinued or pivoted instruments (Molecular Assemblies FES; Nuclera ePrint, cell-free protein) are excluded with one-line justification (§4.1).

Workstream B — AG Item 10 classification. Each device was scored against ≥1.5 kb dsDNA per run with minimal user intervention. Devices producing only single-stranded oligos or short fragments where reaching ≥1.5 kb dsDNA requires skilled off-device assembly are marked out-of-scope as standalone instruments. The off-device-assembly threat surface is acknowledged separately. Three distinct length thresholds in published frameworks must not be conflated: ≥1.5 kb (AG Item 10 / ECCN equipment scope), ≥200 nt (IGSC-Common-Mechanism sequence-screening trigger), and ≥50 nt (fragment-level screening proposals; Edison-Toner-Esvelt 2026). This work uses ≥1.5 kb operationally.

Workstream C — Reagent supply categorization and authentication status. The "generic reagents" axis distinguishes (a) open-platform devices accepting reagents from multiple suppliers (Biolytic, LGC) from (b) closed devices accepting only manufacturer-supplied reagents. Three sub-types of closed supply appear: sealed cartridges (DNA Script, BioXp 3250/9600, Kilobaser, Switchback [INFERENCE]), proprietary kit modules functionally equivalent to cartridges (Gibson SOLA Modules 1/2), and chip + cartridge combinations (Evonetix Evaleo, where the synthesis substrate is itself a proprietary MEMS-fabricated silicon chip). For the policy question of reagent-stream chokepoints the three sub-types are equivalent. For each closed-supply device, vendor documentation, datasheets, regulatory filings, and published interviews were searched for statements regarding cryptographic cartridge authentication, RFID-based reagent verification, or anti-tamper engineering. The category recorded is "publicly documented" / "not publicly documented", not "present" / "absent".

Triangulation. Each device's data fields were independently compiled in two parallel research streams (Claude and Perplexity) and cross-checked against vendor primary sources. Inline confidence tags: `[INFERENCE]` (logical extension from documented characteristics, not a direct vendor or third-party statement); `[VENDOR-CLAIM]` (vendor performance claim without third-party verification); `[VENDOR-CLAIM-UNVERIFIED]` (vendor claim with no independent reproduction available); `[STALE >18M]` (primary source older than October 2024).

---

4. Results

4.1 Inventory of benchtop DNA synthesizers, April 2026

Table 1. (Benchtop) DNA synthesizers, April 2026

Manufacturer	Model	Chemistry	Proprietary reagents[1]	Fragments × max. length per run	AG Item 10[2]	Note
T1: Standalone benchtop, AG Item 10 ✓						
Telesis Bio	BioXp 3250 / 9600	Microfluidic thermal Gibson assembly	✓	BioXp 3250: 32 × 400–7,000 bp synth.; ≤7.2 kb cloning in-machine. BioXp 9600: 96 × 300–1,800 bp synth.; ≤3,600 bp cloning in-machine	✓	
Evonetix	Evaleo	Chip-based phosphoramidite + on-chip assembly	✓	gene-length [VENDOR-CLAIM][3]	✓ [based on VENDOR-CLAIM]	Pre-commercial / pre-order
Switchback Systems	—	Phosphoramidite + microfluidic assembly [INFERENCE][4]	✓ [INFERENCE][4]	gene-length [VENDOR-CLAIM]	✓ [INFERENCE][4]	R&D / pre-commercial
T2: Standalone benchtop, below ≥1.5 kb threshold or generic reagents						
DNA Script	SYNTAX (STX-200)	Enzymatic (TdT)	✓	96 × 120 nt (165 nt with Custom iDNA Hi-Fi)	✗	
Kilobaser	one / one-XT	Phosphoramidite microfluidic	✓	1–4 × ≤50 nt	✗	
Biolytic	Dr. Oligo 12/48/192XLc/768XLc	Phosphoramidite column	✗	12–768 × ≤200 nt	✗	
LGC	MerMade 4/12/48/96E/192E/384	Phosphoramidite column	✗	4–384 × ≤200 nt	✗	
T3: Reagent platform on third-party automation (no regulated device)						
Telesis Bio	Gibson SOLA	Hybrid enzymatic ligation (block assembly)	✓	10^4–10^5 bp aggregate per integrated run[5]	(out of scope as written)[6]	
Camena Biosciences	gSynth	Proprietary enzymatic + algorithm	✓ [INFERENCE][7]	multi-kb [VENDOR-CLAIM]	(out of scope as written)[6]	Service today; partnering page on customer-lab licensing
Touchlight × NEB	EnClose (March 2026)	Reagent kit on standard thermocycler	✓	multi-kb dsDNA [VENDOR-CLAIM]	(out of scope as written)[6]	Reagent + protocol; no proprietary device

Table 1 Footnotes:

[2] Australia Group Common Control List Item 10 / US ECCN 2B352.j: ≥1.5 kb dsDNA assembly capability per run with minimal user intervention.

[3] **[VENDOR-CLAIM] basis (Evonetix Evaleo):** Evonetix marketing materials and pre-order documentation describe gene-length (10^3–10^4 bp) outputs from on-chip synthesis + assembly; no independent third-party benchmark published as of April 2026.

[4] **[INFERENCE] basis (Switchback Systems):** company technology page (returned HTTP 403 in late 2025; archived snapshots reviewed) describes “sealed cartridge-based microfluidic synthesis platform” without reference to third-party-supplied reagents; SEC and patent filings (USPTO IPC C12N15/10, 2023–2025) describe a closed-loop reagent architecture. Inference is that the device is cartridge-locked and AG Item 10-scope; no vendor confirmation in publicly available materials.

[5] **Gibson SOLA throughput basis:** Beckman Coulter Application Note (“Automated Gibson SOLA Enzymatic DNA Synthesis”, 2024) states the platform “can generate 10s to 100s kb of high-quality DNA or mRNA”; per-construct sizes documented as “Gibson SOLA DNA Synthesis kit Module 1, 2.4 kb”; aggregate run output 10^4–10^5 bp inferred from these statements.

[6] **AG Item 10 scope as written**: AG Item 10 / ECCN 2B352.j control automated nucleic-acid *assemblers* (i.e., devices). Reagent platforms running on third-party general-purpose automation (Beckman Biomek, Echo One; standard thermocyclers) are not captured because no proprietary regulated device exists. **This is the structural gap motivating reagent-side controls (§5.6).**

[7] **[INFERENCE] basis (Camena gSynth reagent supply):** Camena’s “Partnering” page describes a licensing model placing gSynth chemistry into customer labs; “in-house synthesis” is the marketed differentiator. No third-party reagent supply is described, supporting inference that the reagent stream is proprietary.

Out-of-scope actors:

Actor	Mode	Reason
Ansa Biotechnologies	Cloud + service	No customer-side device; provider-side sequence screening
Twist Bioscience	Centralized provider	No benchtop product
Molecular Assemblies (FES)	Discontinued	November 2024; IP transferred to Maravai/TriLink January 2025
CustomArray B3 (CombiMatrix/GenScript)	Microarray synthesizer	Oligo-pool output 35–70 nt per spot; falls outside NTI / AG Item 10 benchtop synthesizer definition; line largely discontinued

4.2 Structural observation

Every Tier-1 device in current AG Item 10 scope runs on a proprietary reagent ecosystem. All three (Telesis BioXp, Evonetix Evaleo, Switchback Systems) are cartridge-locked, kit-module-locked, or chip-locked by manufacturer business model. **None publicly documents cryptographic cartridge authentication or anti-tamper engineering.** Telesis BioXp materials are explicit on the *absence* of "RFID, hardware ID, [or] cryptographic chip"; Evonetix and Switchback do not address the question in publicly available materials.

Table 2. Cartridge / chip authentication status for AG Item 10-scope devices, April 2026.

Device	Cryptographic auth	RFID / hardware ID	Anti-tamper engineering
Telesis BioXp 3250 / 9600	Vendor explicit on absence	Vendor explicit on absence	Not publicly documented
Evonetix Evaleo	Not publicly documented	Not publicly documented	Not publicly documented
Switchback Systems	Not publicly documented	Not publicly documented	Not publicly documented

The Tier-3 architecture (Gibson SOLA, Camena gSynth, Touchlight EnClose) has no regulated device and therefore falls outside the equipment-control scope as written. Reagent-side authentication is the only available chokepoint for this tier.

4.3 Policy implication

{Future work — see §6.}

---

5. Discussion

5.1 Proposal

{Future work — see §6.}

5.2 Manufacturer-interest argument

Marginal engineering cost of cryptographic cartridge authentication in 2026 is bounded above by the cost of equivalent authentication in adjacent industries (printer-toner authentication, medical-device consumable authentication, agricultural-biologic seed authentication) and is on the order of single-digit dollars per cartridge for the silicon cost of a secure-element chip plus engineering overhead [order-of-magnitude estimate from adjacent industries; precise vendor-specific cost requires manufacturer interview]. The supply-side architecture for proprietary reagent distribution already exists at all Tier-1 manufacturers; no greenfield distribution channel is required. **Aftermarket-revenue capture against grey-market refill suppliers partially offsets the cost** — this is the standard structural argument underlying printer-cartridge authentication, applied here for the first time to benchtop synthesizer reagents.

5.3 Steel-man: Sentinel Bio chokepoint analysis

Sentinel Bio ("Why We're Doubling Down on Synthesis Screening", 2025) evaluated 200+ alternative chokepoints and concluded that none clearly dominates sequence screening at centralized providers. **The position is correct as posed:** as a single-chokepoint comparison, sequence screening dominates, because it operates at the highest centralization (small number of large providers) with the highest signal-to-noise (the sequence itself encodes the threat).

{Future work — see §6.}

5.4 Statutory pathway ranking

{Future work — see §6.}

5.5 Length-threshold strategic context

{Future work — see §6.}

5.6 Reagent-on-third-party-automation: the structural gap

{Future work — see §6.}

5.7 Sunset risk and review clause

{Future work — see §6.}

---

6. Limitations and Future Work

Limitations.

- **Stale primary sources.** The NTI 2023 device population has not been republished in 2024–2026; some entries rely on vendor websites that have shifted (Switchback Systems' technology page returned HTTP 403 in late 2025).
- **Cartridge-authentication status is "not publicly documented", not "absent".** Manufacturer interviews under non-disclosure could reveal undisclosed authentication features.
- **Asia-Pacific supply chain not systematically covered.** Chinese benchtop OEM activity (BGI, Vazyme, Tsingke and others) is a known gap; coverage extension is a priority for any regulatory adoption to avoid creating a forum-shopped grey-market refill source.
- **Cost estimates are order-of-magnitude.** The per-cartridge marginal cost claim in §5.2 is bounded by adjacent-industry data; vendor-specific costs require direct manufacturer interview.
- **No empirical validation.** A hardware teardown of an AG Item 10-scope cartridge ecosystem under bench pressure would substantially strengthen or refute the substitution-attack threat model.

Potential Future Work.

1. *Implications for regulatory/policy efforts.*

2. *Manufacturer interview pilot* with the four Tier-1 vendors and the three Tier-3 vendors under appropriate confidentiality.
3. *Hardware teardown study* of one cartridge ecosystem to validate or falsify substitution-attack feasibility (best venue: SecureBio or Sentinel Bio).
4. *NIST sandbox pilot under S.3741* if technology-sandbox provisions are enacted intact.
5. *Asia-Pacific OEM survey* to close the geographic coverage gap before forum-shopping develops.
6. *Living inventory* as versioned CSV with PR mechanism (analogous to IGSC member list).

---

7. Conclusion

The benchtop DNA synthesizer market in April 2026 contains three Tier-1 devices currently in AG Item 10 scope (Telesis BioXp 3250/9600, Evonetix Evaleo, Switchback Systems [INFERENCE]) and a growing Tier-3 reagent-on-automation architecture (Gibson SOLA, Camena gSynth, Touchlight EnClose) that has no regulated device at all. All Tier-1 devices operate proprietary reagent ecosystems; none publicly documents cryptographic cartridge authentication or anti-tamper engineering. A cartridge-and-reagent authentication mandate attached to AG Item 10 scope under EU Biotech Act delegated regulations or US Commerce rulemaking under S.3741 is a low-friction layered defense pathway: it codifies an architecture manufacturers already operate, adds cryptographic authentication on top, and partially offsets manufacturer cost via aftermarket-revenue capture. Tier 3 makes the reagent-side approach not optional but architecturally required, since equipment-only mandates cannot reach it. The mandate is complementary to, not a substitute for, sequence screening at centralized providers. A 5-year sunset-review clause is recommended.

Appendix A — Limitations and Dual-Use Considerations

This work compiles publicly available device-level information (vendor names, model names, public throughput specifications, public reagent-supply categorization, public documentation of authentication features). **No sequence-specific, agent-specific, or protocol-specific content is produced.** The aggregation level is device class and reagent supply model. No new technical capability is described.

Dual-use risk assessment:

- *Information about the device population and reagent ecosystems* is available in public sources (vendor websites; NTI 2023; IFP 2024; Alexanian, *Error Prone* 2026) and is not net-new in any operationally meaningful sense.
- *The structural observation* (Tier-1 devices are uniformly cartridge-locked but lack documented cryptographic authentication) is itself a regulatory motivation, not an operational guide. A motivated actor seeking to substitute reagents on an unsecured cartridge already has the capability described by Reardon & Diggans (2024).
- *The proposed mandate text* does not prescribe specific cryptographic protocols; technical-standard development is left to the implementing authority (NIST under Commerce; CEN/CENELEC under the EU Biotech Act). No information enabling mandate evasion is provided.
- *Sunset-risk discussion* (§5.7) references published academic demonstrations of open-source enzymatic chemistry by canonical citation only; no protocol or kit-construction information is provided.

The submission is addressed to defenders (IBBIS, EU Biotech Act / S.3741 drafters, screening-framework implementers) and structured to inform regulatory decision-making, not to enable evasion.

References

- Alexanian, T. (2026). “Ideas for AI x Bio Hackathon Projects.” *Error Prone* (Substack), April.
- Alexanian, T., Carter, S. (2024). [IBBIS Common Mechanism]. International Biosecurity and Biosafety Initiative for Science.
- Australia Group. *Common Control List, Item 10*. https://www.australiagroup.net/
- Beckman Coulter (2024). “Automated Gibson SOLA Enzymatic DNA Synthesis on Biomek / Echo One.” Application Note.
- Camena Biosciences (2026). “gSynth Platform.” Company website. https://camenabio.com/
- Carter, S., Boldrini, B., Alexanian, T. (2025). [IBBIS Common Mechanism update].
- Carter, S., Yassif, J., Isaac, C. (2023). “Benchtop DNA Synthesis Devices: Capabilities, Biosecurity Implications, and Governance.” Nuclear Threat Initiative.
- Codexis (2025). [TdT engineering paper]. *Nucleic Acids Research*.
- Edison, A., Toner, K., Esvelt, K. (2026). “Fragment regulation closes a loophole in DNA synthesis screening.” *Nature Communications*.
- European Commission (2025). EU Biotech Act, Commission Proposal, December 2025.
- Langenkamp, M. (2024). “Securing Benchtop DNA Synthesizers.” Institute for Progress.
- Lee, H. H. et al. (2019). [Enzymatic DNA synthesis]. *Nature Communications*.
- Mathews, A. S. et al. (2017). [TdT polymerase synthesis]. *ACS Synth Biol*.
- New England Biolabs × Touchlight (2026). “EnClose: enzymatic dsDNA in a sealed kit.” Product launch, March.
- Palluk, S. et al. (2018). “De novo DNA synthesis using polymerase-nucleotide conjugates.” *Nature Biotechnology*.
- Palmer, J., Teo, A., Karlubík, M., Harris, J. (2025). “BioSecure: A KYC framework for centralized DNA synthesis providers.” Apart Defensive Acceleration Hackathon.
- Pannu, A. et al. (2025). “Tier-based KYC for AI-tool access in dual-use research.” *PLoS Computational Biology*.
- Reardon, K., Diggans, J. (2024). “Reagent-substitution attack vectors against benchtop DNA synthesizer cartridge supply.” *Applied Biosafety*. PMC11447128.
- S.3741, 119th US Congress (Cotton-Klobuchar). “Securing Domestic Synthesis Act.” Introduced January 2026.
- Sentinel Bio (2025). “Why We’re Doubling Down on Synthesis Screening.” Company blog.
- Telesis Bio (2025). “Licensing Agreement with Regeneron — Gibson SOLA Platform.” Press release, May.

- Telesis Bio. *BioXp 3250 / 9600 product specifications.* https://telesisbio.com/products/bioxp-system/
- Telesis Bio. *Gibson SOLA Platform FAQs.* https://telesisbio.com/gibson-sola-platform/faqs/
- UK DSIT (2024). “Voluntary screening framework for nucleic acid synthesis providers.” October.
- US OSTP (2024). “Implementation Framework for the Screening of Synthetic Nucleic Acids.” September. Pause: Executive Order 14292, May 2025.

[Complete vendor-specific Perplexity research source files are referenced in the project archive (footnote map per device available on request).]

LLM Usage Statement

This submission was prepared using Anthropic’s Claude (Claude Opus 4.7 in multiple sessions) and Perplexity (Pro tier with deep-research mode) for: (a) primary-source compilation across nine vendors and twelve device families; (b) cross-checking and triangulation of vendor claims against third-party sources via parallel research streams; (c) iterative drafting under extensive human author guidance; (d) inventory completeness verification against Google Scholar, arXiv, the Apart Sprint Archive, SEC EDGAR, and Asia-Pacific vendor directories.

Claims in the results section were largely verified by the human author, but by no means exhaustively, due to time limits. **Other parts of this submission were quickly screened by the human author, but no time was remaining for substantial editing.** Key conclusions were largely provided by the human author.

Research conducted at the AIxBio Hackathon, April 2026.