

# AI in Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance: Opportunities, Risks, and Real Tools

## Pharmaceutical QA in regulated quality systems

Pharmaceutical quality assurance sits inside a regulated “pharmaceutical quality system” that is expected to ensure products are consistently made and controlled to meet quality requirements, while also enabling continual improvement. This is expressed explicitly in globally used quality-system frameworks such as the International Council for Harmonisation <sup>1</sup> guideline **ICH Q10**, which frames a pharmaceutical quality system around four core elements: **process performance & product quality monitoring, CAPA, change management, and management review.** <sup>2</sup> The same concepts are reflected in the **EU GMP** framework (e.g., EU GMP Chapter 1, “Pharmaceutical Quality System”), which emphasizes senior management responsibility, periodic management review, and the need for self-inspection/quality audit as part of the system. <sup>3</sup>

In practical, day-to-day terms, QA and the quality unit are often responsible for (or deeply involved in) the following activities because they are directly tied to CGMP obligations and inspection-ready evidence:

- **Batch record review and disposition support.** In U.S. CGMP, the quality unit is given the authority to review production records and to ensure errors (if present) are fully investigated, and it has authority to approve or reject materials and products. <sup>4</sup>
- **Deviation governance and documentation discipline.** U.S. CGMP requires written production and process control procedures to be followed and documented at the time of performance; deviations must be recorded and justified. <sup>5</sup>
- **Investigation rigor (including cross-batch assessment) and documented conclusions/follow-up.** U.S. CGMP requires unexplained discrepancies or specification failures to be thoroughly investigated, with the investigation record including conclusions and follow-up. <sup>6</sup>
- **Training compliance and training record readiness.** U.S. CGMP requires continuing CGMP training to assure employees remain familiar with CGMP requirements applicable to them. <sup>7</sup>
- **Supplier quality support and outsourced activity oversight.** ICH Q10 explicitly extends quality system responsibility to the control and review of outsourced activities and purchased materials, and states the pharmaceutical company remains ultimately responsible for ensuring appropriate processes are in place. <sup>8</sup>
- **Audit support and inspection readiness.** FDA makes clear that CGMP records needed to demonstrate compliance are subject to inspection and cannot be replaced by records “outside the quality system” that are not subject to FDA review and inspection. <sup>9</sup>

A key operational reality underneath all of these responsibilities is documentation volume. For example, U.S. CGMP requires batch production and control records for each batch and describes numerous data elements that must be captured to constitute “complete information” about the batch. <sup>10</sup> EU GMP Chapter 4 (“Documentation”) similarly establishes broad expectations for GMP documentation and good documentation practices across the lifecycle of manufacturing and quality activities. <sup>11</sup>

# Pain points that make QA work slower than it should be

Many QA “pain points” are not accidental—they are the predictable result of (a) high documentation demands, (b) the need for traceability and accountability, and (c) the requirement to build defensible decisions that can withstand inspection. In regulated settings, these pain points tend to cluster into a few operational burdens.

First is **repetitive document review and re-review**, driven by the requirement that manufacturing and quality activities be documented contemporaneously, and that records be accurate, complete, and readily retrievable. The record volumes implied by U.S. batch record requirements alone can be significant, especially when multiplied across campaigns, packaging runs, and exception handling. <sup>12</sup>

Second is **slow investigations and “CAPA overload”**, where the investigation burden grows faster than the organization’s ability to investigate well. This is amplified by regulatory expectations that discrepancies and failures be thoroughly investigated, and that investigations extend to potentially associated batches/products. <sup>13</sup>

Third is **limited visibility for trending and recurrence detection**. ICH Q10’s “process performance and product quality monitoring system” is conceptually straightforward, but in practice many organizations struggle to extract cross-event insight because data is locked across systems or written into narrative records that are hard to analyze consistently. <sup>14</sup>

Fourth is **manual cross-checking and reconciliation across disconnected systems** (e.g., QMS ↔ training system ↔ document management ↔ MES/eBR ↔ LIMS), which increases cycle time and introduces avoidable inconsistency. Regulators expect that electronic systems and recordkeeping practices prevent data from being lost or obscured and support documentation-at-time-of-performance; QA often becomes the “human integration layer” when systems do not. <sup>15</sup>

Finally, **audit preparation burden and inspection readiness stress** frequently comes from the need to rapidly assemble coherent record “stories” (what happened, why, who decided what, and what evidence supports the decision), while ensuring all records relied upon to demonstrate compliance are actually within the inspected system of records. <sup>9</sup>

## AI use cases across QA with realistic risk boundaries

AI can support QA work in regulated environments, but the central design constraint is this: **if an AI output becomes part of your GMP record or directly drives a regulated decision, the credibility, traceability, and change-control burden increases sharply**. A practical way to operationalize this is to classify AI use cases as (1) drafting/assistive, (2) triage/priority-setting, or (3) decisioning.

The table below maps common QA activities to realistic AI augmentation patterns, and flags where the “human QA reviewer” must remain clearly in control.

QA activity	What AI can realistically do	Assistive or autonomous	Typical GxP risk level	Where human QA must stay involved
Drafting deviations, CAPAs, change controls	Draft structured narratives, propose investigation questions, convert notes into a consistent template	Assistive	Lower (if treated as draft)	QA must verify facts, correct errors, and approve the final controlled record
Investigation summarization	Summarize long investigations; extract timeline of events from inputs	Assistive	Lower-medium	QA must verify source accuracy and ensure the final summary is traceable to evidence
Trend analysis across deviations/CAPAs	Cluster similar events, detect recurrence patterns, suggest “themes” for management review	Assistive	Medium	QA must validate the trend logic, confirm relevance, and decide CAPA/system actions (ICH Q10 management review) 16
“Recurring issue” detection	Identify repeat failure modes (same equipment, operator, shift, supplier lot) using structured metadata	Assistive	Medium	QA must confirm signal validity (false positives are common in quality data)
Audit/inspection readiness support	Generate evidence-checklists and compile “inspection packets” from controlled systems	Assistive	Lower-medium	QA must confirm completeness and ensure records are within the inspected system of record 9
Audit trail review triage (electronic systems)	Prioritize audit trail entries for review, flag suspicious sequences or unusual admin actions	Assistive	Medium-high	QA must review and document conclusions; regulators expect audit-trail review to support CGMP record review 17

QA activity	What AI can realistically do	Assistive or autonomous	Typical GxP risk level	Where human QA must stay involved
Training content support	Draft training summaries, quizzes, or role-based learning content	Assistive	Lower (if reviewed)	QA/training must confirm accuracy and alignment with approved SOPs; training must satisfy CGMP training expectations <sup>7</sup>
Quality metric visualization and pattern recognition	Build dashboards, detect “drift,” identify leading indicators	Assistive	Medium	QA must interpret and determine actions, consistent with risk-based decision-making (ICH Q9) <sup>18</sup>
Risk ranking support	Suggest event criticality categories or likely impact tiers	Assistive (should remain)	Medium–high	QA must retain final risk classification and justification under a quality risk management approach <sup>18</sup>
Batch disposition decisioning	Recommend release/reject, disposition, or acceptance decisions	Autonomous decisioning (not recommended)	High	QA/QP decision authority remains essential; automated disposition is difficult to defend if model credibility cannot be demonstrated

Several of these use cases align with how regulators are already thinking about AI in the lifecycle. For example, FDA’s discussion paper on AI in drug manufacturing explicitly cites AI’s potential for activities such as monitoring and fault detection, model predictive control, and other analytic applications that can support understanding and control—while also highlighting that adoption must align with the existing regulatory framework. <sup>19</sup>

## Benefits of AI for QA when deployed with the right intent

The most defensible benefit claims in GxP contexts tend to be **time savings and consistency improvements in human-led work**, rather than “AI replacing QA judgment.”

A first category of value is **time reclaimed from administrative drafting**, especially where a QA specialist is converting structured facts (dates, steps, actions, attachments) into standardized narratives. Tools that produce drafts can reduce rework *if* the organization enforces a “human verification gate” before the text

becomes controlled GMP documentation. This fits well with the “human-centric by design” and “clear context of use” themes in FDA’s 2026 Good AI Practice principles. <sup>20</sup>

A second category is **improved consistency across records**, which matters because inconsistency itself is a quality risk: investigations cannot be effectively trended if they are documented inconsistently, and management review is weakened if data is not comparable. ICH Q10 explicitly frames the PQS as enabling effective monitoring and continual improvement; consistency and comparability are foundational to that.

<sup>14</sup>

A third category is **earlier detection of emerging quality signals**, especially in “text-heavy” domains such as complaints, deviations, and audit findings. FDA has explicitly discussed AI’s ability to analyze large volumes of information and enable monitoring and trend detection in manufacturing contexts. <sup>21</sup>

A fourth category is **reduced manual searching and faster evidence assembly** for audits and inspections—particularly when AI is deployed as a controlled retrieval layer over validated, permissioned repositories rather than as a free-form “internet answer engine.” This directly supports the operational requirement to produce CGMP records that are readily retrievable and suitable for inspection. <sup>22</sup>

## Risks and drawbacks that matter specifically in GxP QA contexts

In QA, AI risks are not abstract—they map directly to inspection findings and data integrity failures.

A primary risk is **hallucinations and fabricated references** in generative AI outputs. In QA documentation, a single fabricated claim (“batch was within limits,” “equipment was calibrated,” “SOP allows...”) can corrupt a controlled record if it is not caught. Cross-industry AI risk guidance such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology <sup>23</sup> AI RMF and its Generative AI profile emphasize managing AI risks across the lifecycle, including transparency, validity, reliability, and governance—concepts that translate well into GxP credibility expectations. <sup>24</sup>

A second risk is **weak domain specificity and incorrect pattern detection**, which usually appears as false positives (too many alerts) or false negatives (missing real signals). In quality systems, both are damaging: false positives create investigation overload; false negatives allow recurring issues to persist undetected. Risk-based controls and proportionality (ICH Q9(R1)) are central to managing this, which implies AI outputs should be treated as risk signals—not conclusions—unless credibility evidence is strong. <sup>25</sup>

A third risk is **overconfidence and “automation bias”**, where humans defer to AI outputs even when they are uncertain. FDA’s Good AI Practice principles put “human-centric by design,” “risk-based approach,” and lifecycle management at the center, which implicitly argues against blind reliance on AI outputs in high-impact contexts. <sup>20</sup>

A fourth risk is **confidentiality and data leakage**, particularly if personnel use public/consumer AI tools with regulated content. Enterprise AI offerings often publish strong privacy positions (e.g., customer prompts/responses not used for training by default), but QA must still map **what data** is allowed to leave controlled systems, **how long** it is retained, and **who** can access it. For example, Microsoft states that prompts and responses in Microsoft 365 Copilot are not used to train foundation models, and its Azure-hosted model services state that customer prompts/completions are not used to train the models. <sup>26</sup>

OpenAI’s enterprise privacy statements similarly emphasize that enterprise customer data is not used to train models by default. <sup>27</sup>

A fifth risk is **difficulty demonstrating control over AI-generated conclusions**, especially when models change frequently or are continuously learning. Regulators are converging on the idea that AI must have a defined context of use, credible performance evidence, and lifecycle management (including monitoring and controlled change). <sup>28</sup>

## Regulatory and compliance considerations for AI in QA operations

The compliance lens for AI in QA is not “is AI allowed?” but **“is the workflow controlled, attributable, auditable, validated/credible for its intended use, and governed under change control?”**

### GxP and data integrity expectations that constrain AI design

Data integrity expectations are typically framed through ALCOA/ALCOA+ concepts. For example, the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency <sup>29</sup> guidance defines ALCOA and the “+” attributes as emphasizing complete, consistent, enduring, and available data—principles that apply to both paper and electronic records. <sup>30</sup> The FDA data integrity Q&A similarly emphasizes that CGMP recordkeeping must prevent data from being lost or obscured and must document activities at the time of performance; it also discusses the importance of audit trails as a control in electronic recordkeeping systems. <sup>31</sup>

In plain terms, this means AI deployments in QA should not create “shadow records” that are not controlled, not attributable, or not retrievable for inspection.

### Electronic records, audit trails, and review expectations

If AI is used alongside electronic systems that generate or maintain GMP records, organizations must account for electronic record control expectations (e.g., audit trails, validation, security). FDA’s Part 11 scope guidance explains that Part 11 applies when organizations choose to maintain records or submit information electronically in a way that makes them subject to the regulation. <sup>32</sup> Part 11 itself includes explicit controls for closed systems, including validation and secure computer-generated audit trails for record changes. <sup>33</sup> In the EU, **Annex 11 (Computerised Systems)** explicitly states that audit trails for GMP-relevant changes/deletions must be available in an intelligible form and “regularly reviewed.” <sup>34</sup> And the Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme <sup>35</sup> data integrity guidance provides operational expectations that audit trails should be functional, regularly reviewed based on quality risk management principles, and that audit trail review activity should be documented and investigated when significant variations are found. <sup>36</sup>

These points matter because one of the most plausible near-term AI “wins” is audit trail triage—yet audit trail triage becomes high-risk if QA stops doing a documented review or cannot explain how the AI selected what was “important.”

### Validation/credibility expectations scale with intended use

In regulated environments, credibility expectations increase as AI moves from drafting assistance toward decision influence. FDA’s January 2025 draft guidance on AI for regulatory decision-making proposes a risk-

based credibility assessment approach tied to a clearly defined “context of use.”<sup>37</sup> Even though this guidance is focused on regulatory decision-making submissions, the same structure is highly applicable to QA: define intended use, assess risk, gather evidence proportional to risk, and manage changes over time.

A complementary operational framing comes from ICH Q9(R1): quality risk management activities should be proportionate and should reduce subjectivity through structured approaches. This supports a pragmatic QA posture: use AI first where it reduces administrative work and improves consistency, and only move into higher-impact uses when credibility evidence is strong and governance is mature.<sup>25</sup>

## Internal/private AI versus public AI tools

A practical compliance distinction is:

- **Public/consumer AI use** tends to be higher risk for confidentiality and traceability because prompts/outputs may be retained, and employees may accidentally paste regulated content into uncontrolled environments. OpenAI’s consumer privacy and “data controls” documentation indicates that individual services may use content for training unless users opt out, which is often incompatible with routine use of regulated records unless strong governance is in place.<sup>38</sup>
- **Enterprise AI offerings and private deployments** can reduce risk by providing contractual controls, separation of tenant data, and clearer retention/usage commitments (e.g., the “not used for training by default” positions described by Microsoft and OpenAI for certain enterprise services).<sup>39</sup>

However, enterprise controls are not “automatic compliance.” QA still needs written procedures defining: allowable data classes, approved tools, review requirements, and how outputs become controlled records.

## Future outlook for AI in QA operations

AI is likely to expand in regulated life sciences, but the most common early wins are expected in **documentation-heavy, human-in-the-loop workflows**, not autonomous QA decisions.

Regulatory signals support this direction. In January 2026, U.S. Food and Drug Administration<sup>40</sup> published “Guiding Principles of Good AI Practice in Drug Development,” emphasizing human-centric design, risk-based approach, clear context of use, data governance/documentation, performance assessment, and lifecycle management.<sup>20</sup> On the same date, the European Medicines Agency<sup>41</sup> communicated that FDA and EMA established common principles for AI use across phases including manufacturing and safety monitoring.<sup>42</sup>

From a QA-operations standpoint, these principles imply the following adoption sequence is most likely:

- **First wave (most likely):** drafting, summarization, controlled retrieval, and record standardization in QMS/document/training workflows; these are naturally human-reviewed and align with “human-centric by design.”<sup>43</sup>
- **Second wave:** signal detection and trend monitoring across quality events and manufacturing operations, especially where data is structured and outcomes can be measured.<sup>44</sup>

- **Later wave (highest governance burden):** AI that materially influences batch disposition, release decisions, or regulatory-facing conclusions—because demonstrating credibility, traceability, and stable lifecycle management is more demanding. <sup>45</sup>

## Best AI tools for pharmaceutical QA with a practical comparison

There is no single “best” AI tool for QA; the best fit depends on where your controlled records live (QMS vs document management vs enterprise repositories), and whether you want AI to draft/summarize inside the validated environment or operate externally.

Below are three tools that are plausibly usable by QA teams in real, regulated environments today (or in the very near term), with realistic strengths and constraints.

### Veeva AI

Veeva Systems <sup>46</sup> positions Veeva AI as agentic AI in the Vault Platform, with industry-specific agents planned across applications, including quality-oriented agents in 2026; Veeva has published a release timeline indicating quality-related agent availability planned for 2026. <sup>47</sup>

Practical QA fit: strongest when your QMS and controlled documents already live in Vault, because AI can be deployed “closer to the record” under known roles, permissions, and auditability patterns.

### MasterControl GxPAssist AI

MasterControl <sup>48</sup> has released GxPAssist AI capabilities such as document summarization, translation, and exam generation, marketed as purpose-built for regulated industries and intended to streamline documentation-related work. <sup>49</sup>

Practical QA fit: highly aligned to document-heavy workflows (document control and training), where AI outputs should remain drafts until reviewed and approved through standard quality governance.

### TrackWise AI / TrackWise Digital AI capabilities

Sparta Systems <sup>50</sup> (TrackWise) markets AI capabilities in TrackWise Digital and TrackWise AI, including machine learning and NLP for auto-categorization and quality process augmentation across quality data. <sup>51</sup>

Practical QA fit: strong for intake triage (complaints/quality events) and cross-event signal detection where classification and routing can be measured and improved, but higher governance burden if outputs start driving closure or disposition decisions.

## Comparison table

Tool	Best for	Pros	Cons	Level of QA relevance	Key compliance concerns	Implementation difficulty
Veeva AI	QMS workflows inside Vault Quality; quality event assistance in the Vault ecosystem	Strong “inside-the-platform” integration potential; published rollout plan for quality-focused agents in 2026 <sup>52</sup>	Feature maturity depends on rollout; risk of scope creep into decisioning	High if your pharma quality stack is Vault-centric <sup>53</sup>	Governance over what outputs become GMP records; auditability and controlled change as agents evolve	Medium (lower if already on Vault)
MasterControl GxPAssist AI	Document control and training acceleration (summaries, translation, exam support)	Clear “draft aid” use cases; positioned for regulated industries <sup>54</sup>	Hallucination risk still exists; needs strong review discipline	High for documentation-heavy QA teams <sup>55</sup>	Ensuring AI drafts do not become uncontrolled GMP records; control of prompts/ outputs and retention	Medium (lower if already using MasterControl)
TrackWise AI	Intake triage, categorization, and signal detection across quality events/ complaints	Promises structured quality-event augmentation and improved routing/signal detection <sup>56</sup>	Classification errors can create compliance risk if humans over-trust; credibility evidence needed for higher-impact uses	High in organizations that depend on TrackWise for events/CAPA/change <sup>57</sup>	Documenting human oversight; preventing AI-driven closure/ disposition without QA judgment	Medium-high depending on scope and integration

## Final synthesis for responsible QA adoption

AI can meaningfully support QA work **without undermining compliance**, but only when QA teams set intentional boundaries around “what the AI is allowed to do,” “who is accountable,” and “what constitutes the controlled record.”

The safest tasks to augment with AI in QA are those where AI acts as a **drafting and organization layer** and the final controlled output remains **human-verified and approved** through standard quality governance. Concretely, these include drafting deviation/CAPA narratives from verified facts; summarizing investigations for management review; controlled retrieval and evidence packet compilation; and training content scaffolding—provided the organization treats AI output as a draft and enforces review/signature controls consistent with CGMP training and documentation expectations. <sup>58</sup>

Tasks that still require heavy human review (or should not be delegated to AI) are those where the AI output would directly influence regulated decisions, such as batch disposition, specification acceptance, or closing an investigation without robust, documented rationale. These map to higher risk under quality risk management principles (ICH Q9(R1)) and to FDA's emphasis on context of use, credibility evidence, and lifecycle management for AI models. <sup>59</sup>

A responsible adoption approach for QA teams is therefore:

- Start with **human-in-the-loop drafting and summarization** where outputs are clearly labeled as drafts and only become GMP records after review/approval. <sup>60</sup>
- Add **triage and trend-support** next, but require documented verification steps and define acceptable false-positive tolerance to avoid investigation overload. <sup>61</sup>
- Treat any move toward **decision influence** (risk ranking that drives closure, automated conclusions, disposition recommendations) as a major escalation requiring stronger credibility evidence, monitoring, and controlled changes over time. <sup>62</sup>
- Prefer **private/enterprise AI deployments** with explicit data governance commitments over uncontrolled public tools, and formalize acceptable-use rules so regulated records are not inadvertently disclosed or turned into uncontrolled “shadow records.” <sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <sup>28</sup> <sup>37</sup> <sup>45</sup> <sup>46</sup> <sup>50</sup> <sup>62</sup> Considerations for the Use of Artificial Intelligence To ...

[https://www.fda.gov/media/184830/download?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/media/184830/download?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>2</sup> <sup>14</sup> <sup>16</sup> <sup>48</sup> Pharmaceutical Quality System Q10

[https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q10%20Guideline.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q10%20Guideline.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>3</sup> GMP Guide Chapter 1 Q10 implementation final

[https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/vol4-chap1\\_2013-01\\_en\\_0.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/vol4-chap1_2013-01_en_0.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>4</sup> 21 CFR 211.22 -- Responsibilities of quality control unit.

[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-B/section-211.22?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-B/section-211.22?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>5</sup> 21 CFR 211.100 -- Written procedures; deviations.

[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-F/section-211.100?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-F/section-211.100?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>6</sup> <sup>13</sup> 21 CFR 211.192 -- Production record review.

[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-J/section-211.192?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-J/section-211.192?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>7</sup> <sup>58</sup> 21 CFR 211.25 -- Personnel qualifications.

[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-B/section-211.25?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-B/section-211.25?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>8</sup> <sup>23</sup> ICH guideline Q10 on pharmaceutical quality system - Step 5

[https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/international-conference-harmonisation-technical-requirements-registration-pharmaceuticals-human-guideline-q10-pharmaceutical-quality-system-step-5\\_en.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/international-conference-harmonisation-technical-requirements-registration-pharmaceuticals-human-guideline-q10-pharmaceutical-quality-system-step-5_en.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

- 9 22 29 **Current Good Manufacturing Practice Requirements**  
[https://www.fda.gov/drugs/guidances-drugs/questions-and-answers-current-good-manufacturing-practice-requirements-records-and-reports?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/guidances-drugs/questions-and-answers-current-good-manufacturing-practice-requirements-records-and-reports?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 10 12 **21 CFR 211.188 -- Batch production and control records.**  
[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-J/section-211.188?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-J/section-211.188?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 11 **Chapter 4: Documentation - Language selection | Public Health**  
[https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/chapter4\\_01-2011\\_en\\_0.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/chapter4_01-2011_en_0.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 15 17 31 **Data Integrity and Compliance With Drug CGMP**  
[https://www.fda.gov/media/119267/download?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/media/119267/download?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 18 25 35 59 **quality risk management q9(r1)**  
[https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH\\_Q9%28R1%29\\_Guideline\\_Step4\\_2022\\_1219.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_Q9%28R1%29_Guideline_Step4_2022_1219.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 19 21 44 61 **Artificial Intelligence in Drug Manufacturing**  
[https://www.fda.gov/media/165743/download?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/media/165743/download?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 20 40 43 60 **Guiding Principles of Good AI Practice in Drug Development**  
[https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/artificial-intelligence-drug-development/guiding-principles-good-ai-practice-drug-development?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/artificial-intelligence-drug-development/guiding-principles-good-ai-practice-drug-development?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 24 41 **Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI ...**  
[https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/nist.ai.100-1.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 26 39 63 **Data, Privacy, and Security for Microsoft 365 Copilot**  
[https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/copilot/microsoft-365/microsoft-365-copilot-privacy?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/copilot/microsoft-365/microsoft-365-copilot-privacy?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 27 **Enterprise privacy at OpenAI**  
[https://openai.com/enterprise-privacy/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://openai.com/enterprise-privacy/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 30 **MHRA GXP Data Integrity Guidance and Definitions**  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5aa2b9ede5274a3e391e37f3/MHRA\\_GxP\\_data\\_integrity\\_guide\\_March\\_edited\\_Final.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5aa2b9ede5274a3e391e37f3/MHRA_GxP_data_integrity_guide_March_edited_Final.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 32 **Part 11, Electronic Records; Electronic Signatures - Scope ...**  
[https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/part-11-electronic-records-electronic-signatures-scope-and-application?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/part-11-electronic-records-electronic-signatures-scope-and-application?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 33 **21 CFR 11.10 -- Controls for closed systems.**  
[https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-11/subpart-B/section-11.10?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-11/subpart-B/section-11.10?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 34 **Annex 11: Computerised Systems**  
[https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/annex11\\_01-2011\\_en\\_0.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/annex11_01-2011_en_0.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 36 **Guidance on Data Integrity**  
[https://picscheme.org/users\\_uploads/news\\_news\\_documents/PI\\_041\\_1\\_Draft\\_3\\_Guidance\\_on\\_Data\\_Integrity.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://picscheme.org/users_uploads/news_news_documents/PI_041_1_Draft_3_Guidance_on_Data_Integrity.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 38 **How your data is used to improve model performance**  
[https://help.openai.com/en/articles/5722486-how-your-data-is-used-to-improve-model-performance?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://help.openai.com/en/articles/5722486-how-your-data-is-used-to-improve-model-performance?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
- 42 **EMA and FDA set common principles for AI in medicine ...**  
[https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-fda-set-common-principles-ai-medicine-development-0?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-fda-set-common-principles-ai-medicine-development-0?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

47 52 **Veeva AI Agents to Be Released Across All ...**

[https://www.veeva.com/resources/veeva-ai-agents-to-be-released-across-all-veeva-applications/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.veeva.com/resources/veeva-ai-agents-to-be-released-across-all-veeva-applications/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

49 **MasterControl Announces General Availability of AI- ...**

[https://www.mastercontrol.com/news/mastercontrol-announces-general-availability-of-ai-powered-document-summarizer/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.mastercontrol.com/news/mastercontrol-announces-general-availability-of-ai-powered-document-summarizer/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

51 56 **TrackWise Digital AI Capabilities - Sparta Systems**

[https://info.spartasystems.com/video-TrackWiseDigital-AIcapabilities.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://info.spartasystems.com/video-TrackWiseDigital-AIcapabilities.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

53 **Veeva AI | Agentic AI in Vault Platform & AI Agents in Veeva ...**

[https://www.veeva.com/products/veeva-ai/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.veeva.com/products/veeva-ai/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

54 **MasterControl Announces General Availability of AI ...**

[https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/mastercontrol-announces-general-availability-of-ai-powered-document-summarizer-302377361.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/mastercontrol-announces-general-availability-of-ai-powered-document-summarizer-302377361.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

55 **AI-Powered Document Summarizer for Life Sciences**

[https://www.mastercontrol.com/resource-center/documents/ai-document-summarizer-quality-management-automation/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.mastercontrol.com/resource-center/documents/ai-document-summarizer-quality-management-automation/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

57 **TrackWise Digital Quality Management Software**

[https://www.spartasystems.com/trackwise/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.spartasystems.com/trackwise/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)