IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

EU GMP Annex 22: AI Compliance in Pharma Manufacturing

> Build practical AI for pharma and biotech with IntuitionLabs. We help life-science teams turn complex information and workflows into useful software, governed knowledge systems and AI tools.

Published by IntuitionLabs · 2026-03-11 · eu gmp annex 22 · ai compliance · pharma manufacturing · gxp regulations · artificial intelligence · data integrity · machine learning · quality management

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/eu-gmp-annex-22-ai-compliance-pharma



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Scope of Annex 22
4. Key Requirements and Principles
5. Technical and Operational Requirements
6. AI Compliance Checklist for Manufacturers
7. Case Studies and Examples
8. Implications and Future Directions
9. Conclusion

Executive Summary

The pharmaceutical industry is undergoing a rapid transformation driven by advanced *artificial intelligence* (AI) technologies. In response, the European Medicines Agency (EMA), together with the PIC/S (Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme), has introduced **Annex 22 "Artificial Intelligence"** as a new appendix to the EU GMP (Good Manufacturing Practice) guidelines. This draft annex – published for stakeholder consultation on 7 July 2025 – is the first comprehensive regulatory framework on AI specifically for the manufacture of medicinal products and active substances (meritsolutions.com) (picscheme.org). It significantly extends existing computerized systems requirements (e.g. Annex 11) by adding AI-specific rules. In practice, the new rules require manufacturers to implement multi-disciplinary governance, complete documentation and traceability, data integrity (ALCOA+) for AI data, and robust vendor oversight. Industry experts emphasize early preparation: companies must inventory all AI use-cases, classify risk levels, document current process performance baselines, and fill gaps in explainability and controls (meritsolutions.com) (gmpinsiders.com). This report provides an in-depth analysis of Annex 22, explaining its background, key requirements, practical compliance checklist, and broader implications for pharmaceutical manufacturing regulation.

Introduction and Background

The European Union's *EudraLex*, Volume 4 (the **EU GMP Guide**), has long been the authoritative standard for pharmaceutical quality and manufacturing. Traditional GMP annexes (e.g. Annex 11 on Computerised Systems, Annex 15 on validation, Annex 16 on release) were written in the pre-AI era and do not fully address emerging machine learning technologies. As AI and machine learning (AI/ML) systems become integrated into processes – from process control to quality assurance – regulators have aimed to update these guidelines. The July 2025 consultation draft of Annex 22 specifically addresses AI used in GMP-critical manufacturing environments (picscheme.org) (meritsolutions.com).

The need for such regulation is driven by the *transformative power of AI*. AI and ML tools are now widely adopted across industries: for example, a 2025 KPMG survey found that 66% of people use AI regularly, and 83% believe AI will bring broad benefits (kpmg.com). In pharma, AI is applied in drug discovery, diagnostics, and increasingly in manufacturing and quality control (www.pharmout.net). PharmOut notes that AI enables

“predictive maintenance” in production equipment and real-time anomaly detection in quality control, leading to improved batch consistency and reduced waste (www.pharmout.net). Yet, pharmaceutical manufacturing is fundamentally regulated to protect patient safety and product quality. As AI makes decisions that directly influence critical attributes, regulators insist that its use must be carefully controlled.

The regulatory landscape is evolving. In mid-2024 the EU enacted the EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), whose purpose includes promoting human-centric and trustworthy AI (official EU legal text). However, Annex 22 is a **sector-specific** guidance focused on AI in GMP environments. Like the EU AI Act for consumer and industrial AI, Annex 22 reflects a risk-based approach: only high-impact AI (those affecting safety, quality, or data integrity) triggers the strictest requirements (meritsolutions.com) (picscheme.org). In July 2025, PIC/S and the European Commission opened a joint consultation on the draft revisions to Chapter 4 (Documentation), Annex 11 (Computerised Systems), and the new Annex 22 (AI) (picscheme.org) (health.ec.europa.eu). The regulatory aim is a **global alignment**: Annex 22 was drafted by the EMA’s Inspectors’ Working Group in collaboration with PIC/S, with the FDA and UK MHRA participating as observers (meritsolutions.com). EMA/PIC/S emphasize this harmonization, noting that the updated Annex 22, together with the revised Chapter 4 and Annex 11, will provide a “comprehensive and robust framework [for] IT technologies in pharmaceutical manufacturing while safeguarding product quality and patient safety” (picscheme.org) (health.ec.europa.eu).

By effectively becoming the *“Annex 11 for AI”*, Annex 22 is set to become the legal and operational standard for AI in European GxP manufacturing (meritsolutions.com) (gmpinsiders.com). It is a six-page addition to EudraLex V4 (Draft published 7 July 2025) that “sets the first comprehensive regulatory expectations for the use of AI in GxP environments” (meritsolutions.com). As of 19 October 2026, the public consultation has ended (European Commission consultation). This analysis addresses the July 2025 consultation draft, and its checklist is a preparation aid rather than a statement of adopted Annex 22 requirements. In this context, European pharma manufacturers must prepare now: the following sections analyze the full content and compliance implications of Annex 22, drawing on official synopses and expert interpretations.

Scope of Annex 22

Annex 22 is **highly targeted**: it applies only when AI/ML models are used *within* computerised systems that play a **critical** role in manufacturing of active substances or medicinal products – i.e. in tasks with direct impact on patient safety, product quality, or data integrity (www.scribd.com) (gmpinsiders.com). It does *not* apply to trivial AI uses (e.g. administrative chatbots) or to computer systems without embedded AI. In effect, Annex 22 sits on top of Annex 11: all AI models are still part of regulated computerised systems (Annex 11), but Annex 22 adds AI-specific expectations for those models when they take on critical decision-making tasks (gmpinsiders.com) (picscheme.org).

Key Requirements and Principles

Annex 22 enshrines several foundational GMP principles applied to AI systems. First, **personnel and governance**: Manufacturers must assemble cross-functional teams (QA, process experts, IT, and data scientists) when developing or implementing AI models (www.scribd.com) (gmpinsiders.com). All individuals

must have clearly defined responsibilities, appropriate qualifications, and training for their role. The draft emphasizes that “relevant parties” work together on algorithm selection, training, validation, testing and operation (www.scribd.com). Quality oversight cannot be siloed off: for example, PIC/S commentary stresses that “AI systems are not exempt from GMP controls” and actually *require enhanced* diligence in governance due to their complexity (gmpinsiders.com). In practice, this means updating quality management systems and SOPs to explicitly cover AI development, assignment of an “AI owner,” and regular governance meetings (e.g. change boards) that include data science input.

Second, **documentation and traceability** are paramount. Annex 22 demands that every aspect of the AI lifecycle be recorded, just as for any other validated system. All activities – from model design through testing and deployment – “must be documented, regardless of whether performed internally or outsourced” (gmpinsiders.com). Key items include specifications of intended use, data sources, model parameters, version history, and review records. In effect, Annex 22 reinforces the ALCOA+ principles for AI data: every decision must be *Attributable* and *Traceable*. Vendors and software suppliers must provide documentation on their AI algorithms (architecture, training procedures, etc.), and manufacturers must retain audit logs of model changes, training runs, and user interactions. The key is that nothing about the AI process is a “black box” in the quality records: as GMPInsiders notes, “All activities related to the AI model, including training, validation, and testing, must be documented” (gmpinsiders.com).

Third, **risk management** underpins the annex. Every AI application must have a documented *intended use* and a justified risk assessment. Annex 22 explicitly requires that the AI model’s **purpose and tasks** be defined and approved before testing begins (gmpinsiders.com). This means writing down, for example, “This neural network classifies tablet coating defects on the production line.” Each intended use must reference the process details, data characteristics, and risk factors (e.g. types of outliers or bias). Regulators stress that Annex 22’s requirements scale with risk: in high-impact cases, elaborate controls (strict metrics, monitoring, human review) are mandatory. As one expert summary states, *“the level of oversight and control should correspond to the potential impact on patient safety, product quality, and data integrity.”* (gmpinsiders.com). Thus, manufacturers should perform a risk assessment (consistent with ICH Q9) for each AI use-case, and use it to inform the extent of validation and review documented in the AI quality plan.

Technical and Operational Requirements

Annex 22 contains numerous specific controls that mirror standard validation but with AI nuances. These can be grouped under **Data & Model Management**, **Validation & Testing**, and **Operation & Monitoring**.

Data Quality and Separation. AI depends critically on data. Annex 22 requires managers to ensure high-quality, representative datasets for training and testing. *Training Data Quality*: Training datasets must cover the full range of expected process variability, with no missing extreme cases. They must be unbiased and well-documented (qmsdoc.com). The annex emphasizes that *“the quality, completeness, and representativeness of data used as training data”* is essential (qmsdoc.com). *Data Security & Governance*: Since AI may handle sensitive manufacturing and IP data, entries must be secure (access controls, encryption) and logged (qmsdoc.com). *Data Separation*: Crucially, training, validation, and test datasets must be completely separate to avoid data leakage. Test data must never overlap with the training inputs (qmsdoc.com). Annex 22 explicitly notes that any data used for testing should not have been used in training “at all” (qmsdoc.com). In practice,

this means rigorous data partitioning and, preferably, third-party checks on data splits. Each data set (training, test, and any holdout) should be archived with provenance and version tracking to meet ALCOA+ standards (qmsdoc.com).

Model Testing and Validation. Annex 22 places at least as much emphasis on model validation as on development. Prior to deployment, a comprehensive **test plan** must be executed. This starts with defining clear *performance metrics* aligned to intended use: for example, a classification model might be evaluated by sensitivity, specificity, precision, accuracy, or F1-score as appropriate (www.scribd.com). Managers must then set **acceptance criteria** for those metrics *before any testing begins*. A key novel requirement is *performance equivalence*: the model's acceptance thresholds must equal or exceed the performance of the process it replaces. In other words, an AI batch release check must be at least as effective as the historical manual check it automates (www.scribd.com). The draft explicitly states: *"The acceptance criteria of a model should be at least as high as the performance of the process it replaces"* (www.scribd.com). This drives companies to precisely quantify the current human/process performance baseline and to prove the AI model can match or outperform it.

During testing, independent verification is mandated. The annex calls for test execution with data entirely disjoint from the training set, verified labeling, and double-checking critical test results. For example, the draft offers independent verification by multiple experts, validated equipment or laboratory tests as possible methods for checking test-data labelling (European Commission draft). Any deviation from the test plan or failure to meet criteria must be thoroughly documented, investigated, and resolved (www.scribd.com). All test records (including raw data, code runs, metrics) must be retained. Staff involved in validation (both data scientists and QA approvers) must sign off on the report, much as in a traditional IQ/OQ process.

Explainability and Confidence. For *critical AI*, Annex 22 insists on transparency. Models must be interpretable so that each key output can be understood by experts. The use of opaque "black-box" models (e.g. unconstrained deep neural networks without any explainability) is discouraged. Specific measures are required: during testing, techniques like feature-attribution should be used to demonstrate *why* a model made a given decision, and those results must be reviewed by process SMEs (www.scribd.com). The guidance even suggests including external explainability tools (e.g. "agnostic local explainability" heuristics) for datasets like images or text where needed (www.scribd.com).

Operation and Monitoring. Annex 22 also imposes controls on live use. Once validated and deployed, AI models must not be "set and forgotten". The annex requires continuous change control and monitoring of model performance over time (health.ec.europa.eu) (www.scribd.com). For example, the guidance explicitly demands *"continuous oversight"* including model performance monitoring and defined procedures for human review when necessary (picscheme.org). In practice, manufacturers must periodically run the model on control datasets or 'shadow' data and check that the defined performance metrics remain stable. If performance degrades (e.g. due to drift in raw materials or operating conditions), the model must be revalidated. All model updates (including retraining with new data) must themselves follow change control processes, documenting why the update was done and how it was verified.

Finally, as with all GMP systems, access control is essential. Annex 22 reaffirms that role-based permissions must be enforced: only authorized personnel may train, modify, or operate the AI system (gmpinsiders.com). Audit trails should capture user actions (who changed model parameters, who approved releases)

(gmpinsiders.com). In summary, a deployed AI model effectively becomes a controlled GMP system, with the added needs of continuous data science verification.

AI Compliance Checklist for Manufacturers

Based on Annex 22 and expert guidance, pharmaceutical companies should address the following compliance checkpoints when using AI in manufacturing:

Compliance Task	Key Requirement
Inventory AI Use-Cases	Identify all current and planned AI/ML systems in manufacturing (including vendor software) (meritsolutions.com) (picscheme.org). Classify each as *critical* (affecting safety/quality/data integrity) or *non-critical* to determine applicable controls (meritsolutions.com) (gmpinsiders.com).
Define Intended Use	For each AI model, document the specific task, process context, data characteristics and risk justification (gmpinsiders.com) (www.scribd.com). Obtain SME/QP review and approval of the intended use before testing.
Governance Structure	Establish a multi-disciplinary team (QA, process experts, data scientists, IT) with defined roles (www.scribd.com) (gmpinsiders.com). Ensure management accountability and regular oversight (e.g. change control board involvement) in AI projects.
Data Quality & Separation	Ensure training data is high-quality and representative of real process variability (qmsdoc.com). Prepare technical and/or procedural controls for test-data independence under draft sections 6.1–6.4: exclude test data from model development, training and validation; obtain it after training and validation, or split it off before training starts. For an advance split, development and training staff should never have had access to the test data; protect its repository with access controls and audit trails logging access and changes, with no copies outside it. Record which data were used for testing, when and how often. For data from physical objects, use final-test objects not previously used for training or validation unless their features are independent (European Commission draft, sections 6.1–6.4). Maintain records of dataset provenance, labeling checks (independent verification as needed (www.scribd.com)), and ALCOA+ compliance (qmsdoc.com).
Define Metrics & Acceptance	Select suitable performance metrics (e.g. accuracy, sensitivity, etc.) tied to intended use (www.scribd.com). Establish quantitative **acceptance criteria** in advance, requiring model performance ≥ the existing manual process (www.scribd.com). Document subgroup criteria if applicable.
Model Validation	Execute full validation per Annex 11 and Annex 22. Use test data independent of development, training and validation, with the controls above. Draft section 6.5 also proposes controls to prevent staff who have accessed test data from training or validating the same model. Only where maintaining that independence is impossible should such staff have access to training and validation while working in a pair with a colleague who has not accessed the test data (four-eyes principle) (European Commission draft, sections 6.1 and 6.5). After validation, document outcomes in a final report. Record any deviations (all must be investigated and justified (www.scribd.com)). Ensure results trace to the GMP product specification.
Explainability and Confidence	For critical models, demonstrate interpretability (e.g. feature-attribution analysis) as part of validation (www.scribd.com). Draft sections 9.1–9.2 propose logging a confidence score for each prediction or classification during testing, where applicable, and setting an appropriate threshold so predictions or classifications are made only when suitable. For very low confidence, consider an “undecided” outcome. Select human-review controls for the intended use and risk (European Commission draft, sections 2.3, 9.1–9.2 and 10.5).
Change Control & Monitoring	Implement formal change control for any model update or retraining. Continuously monitor model performance on new production data (www.scribd.com). Schedule periodic re-validation or recalibration if key metrics drift. Maintain audit logs of any modifications or retraining events.

Compliance Task	Key Requirement
Human Oversight (HITL)	If the AI output supports (but does not make) a decision, explicitly define the human role in SOPs (www.scribd.com) (gmpinsiders.com). Ensure operators are trained for this use case. Track human review: flows for low-confidence outputs and final accountability remains with the skilled person (gmpinsiders.com).
Documentation & Traceability	Document *all* AI-related workflows: model architecture, hyperparameters, training logs, version histories, testing protocols, raw results, etc. Ensure records are maintained "like any manual process", with retained audit trails (gmpinsiders.com) (qmsdoc.com). This includes documenting QA oversight and approvals at each stage.
Vendor and IT Controls	Where AI software is procured or outsourced, ensure contracts/quality agreements assign validation and change management responsibilities clearly (qmsdoc.com). Audit vendors for compliance. Confirm the AI system meets Annex 22 requirements before release.
Personnel Training	Train relevant staff not only on GMP principles, but also basic AI and data science concepts, ensuring *AI literacy*. QA/Audit functions should understand ML risks. The annex suggests that personnel have "adequate qualifications" for AI tasks (www.scribd.com).
Quality Risk Management	Integrate all of the above into the company's Risk Management system. Update QRM documents (e.g. risk assessments, control plans) to reflect AI-related hazards, mitigation measures (HITL checkpoints, fallback decisions), and review them periodically tied to Annex 22 expectations (gmpinsiders.com).
Regulatory Alignment	Prepare for inspection by mapping AI controls to Annex 22 language. For global operations, harmonize with other AI/ML regulations (e.g. US FDA guidances on AI/ML, EU AI Act). Document in advance how Annex 22 requirements are met to demonstrate compliance during audits or authorities' reviews.

Each item in this checklist draws directly from Annex 22 text and expert interpretation. For example, the requirement to **separate test and training data** and **document every step** is explicitly mentioned in the draft guidelines (qmsdoc.com) (gmpinsiders.com). The obligations for **defined governance, traceability, and risk-based oversight** are likewise emphasized by EMA/PIC-S and quality authorities (gmpinsiders.com) (picscheme.org). By systematically addressing the items above, a manufacturer can build a structured AI risk control program consistent with the expected regulations.

Case Studies and Examples

While Annex 22 is new, several real-world examples illustrate both the promise of AI in pharma manufacturing and the necessity of rigorous compliance.

- **Workshop examples**: EMA's 2026 Annex 22 workshop report notes that some examples were pilots or theoretical frameworks rather than production systems (EMA workshop report).
- **Evidence for inspection**: The EMA workshop report discusses an inspectable evidence package as an industry expectation (EMA workshop report).

Tables and checklists from regulators often mirror these case lessons. For example, quality experts contrast *traditional validation* (Annex 11) with *AI model validation*, noting that the latter relies on training data patterns and demands extra controls like confidence scoring and explainability (gmpinsiders.com). Likewise, Annex

22's stress on risk management and oversight resonates with GMPInsiders' chart of AI foundational principles, which includes the point that AI "systems are not exempt from GMP controls" and in fact "require enhanced diligence" (gmpinsiders.com).

Implications and Future Directions

Annex 22's arrival marks a significant shift in pharmaceutical regulation. By explicitly regulating AI, European authorities acknowledge both the **potential benefits and risks** of machine learning. For manufacturers, the implications are multifaceted:

- **Quality Culture and Skills**: Companies must evolve their quality systems to include AI expertise. This means hiring or training data scientists, updating SOPs, and educating QA/auditors about AI principles. Annex 22 effectively forces pharma quality professionals to become *AI literate*. In the future, job roles like "AI compliance officer" or "digital quality manager" are likely to emerge. Some experts note that adopting Annex 22 early could be a competitive advantage: firms that integrate AI governance proactively will both satisfy regulators and reap operational gains sooner (meritsolutions.com).
- **Regulatory Alignment**: Annex 22 is expected to become a de-facto global standard. Its development with PIC/S, FDA/MHRA observers, and many countries signing PIC/S means that harmonization is intended (meritsolutions.com) (picscheme.org). Other regulatory bodies (e.g. Japan's PMDA, China's NMPA) often follow PIC/S revisions. Thus, companies confidently compliant with Annex 22 provisions may face fewer surprises internationally. However, differences may remain: for instance, outside Europe, some authorities might focus on AI within medical devices or drug development rather than process manufacturing. Future conferences will dissect how Annex 22 intersects with the EU AI Act (which categorizes, e.g., some medical systems as "high-risk"), but Annex 22 is more prescriptive for process AI. It does not replace the EU AI Act; rather, it operates in parallel for manufacturing-specific scenarios.
- **Industry Best Practices**: Annex 22 codifies many practices that are already considered best-in-class. Its emphasis on risk-based QRM is consistent with ICH Q9/Q10, meaning AI links naturally into existing pharma quality systems. It encourages trends like *digital twins* and *in silico quality systems*, where AI continuously learns from production data (albeit periodically, not continuously by itself). It also dovetails with data integrity initiatives (ALCOA+) by extending principles to AI-produced data (qmsdoc.com). In sum, Annex 22 will likely accelerate the ongoing *data-first culture* in pharma.
- **Checklists and Standardization**: Practically, firms will create Annex 22 checklists (like the one in this report) and validation templates. Training programs and vendor qualification questionnaires will incorporate Annex 22 language. MasterControl and other software vendors are already promoting "AI-enhanced GMP compliance" platforms (www.mastercontrol.com). Over time, one can envision standard Annex 22 certification processes or even inspections solely focused on AI systems. Some academic proposals suggest formal auditing of AI algorithms (akin to GLP for labs) – Annex 22 moves us partway in that direction by insisting on traceability of model versions, data sets, and personnel decisions.

The **patient safety** imperative underlies all these changes. By demanding that AI systems be at least as well understood and reliable as the manual methods they supplement, Annex 22 aims to prevent catastrophic failures (e.g. an AI falsely accepting an out-of-spec batch). It also protects manufacturers: by following clear rules, they gain predictable pathways to “audit-ready” AI use. Active substance manufacturers must comply with GMP (EMA). Ongoing dialogue between industry and regulators (through feedback on the draft, and later via workshops) will also shape practical implementation guidelines.

Conclusion

EU GMP Annex 22 represents a watershed in pharmaceutical regulation: it is the first major guideline explicitly covering AI in manufacturing. By doing so, it ensures that patient safety, product quality and data integrity remain protected in an era of advanced analytics and machine intelligence. Its focus on “intended use, defined metrics, continuous oversight” (picscheme.org) mirrors fundamental GMP values.

As this report demonstrates, compliance with Annex 22 is a matter of thorough preparation. Firms should use the above checklist to guide internal audits and projects. They should treat each AI use-case as they would any critical GxP process: specify it clearly, validate it rigorously, and document it exhaustively (gmpinsiders.com) (www.scribd.com). In the long run, Annex 22 is likely to strengthen the trustworthiness of AI in pharma, enabling innovative efficiencies while safeguarding the core mission of drug safety and efficacy.

References: Regulatory texts and guidance from EMA and PIC/S (picscheme.org) (health.ec.europa.eu); industry analyses and news reports (meritsolutions.com) (www.covasyn.com); and peer-reviewed studies of AI in pharma manufacturing (www.sciencedirect.com) have been cited throughout. These sources provide the authority behind each compliance requirement and illustrate how Annex 22 will be applied in practice.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://meritsolutions.com/blog-annex-22-ai-pharma-regulation
2. https://picscheme.org/en/news/131/joint-stakeholders-consultation-on-the-revision-of-chapter-4
3. https://gmpinsiders.com/annex-22-draft-regulatory-guidance-on-ai-use-in-gmp
4. https://health.ec.europa.eu/document/download/5f38a92d-bb8e-4264-8898-ea076e926db6_en?filename=mp_vol4_chap4_annex22_consultation_guideline_en.pdf
5. https://kpmg.com/xx/en/our-insights/ai-and-technology/trust-attitudes-and-use-of-ai.html
6. https://www.pharmout.net/annex-22-artificial-intelligence
7. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng
8. https://health.ec.europa.eu/consultations/stakeholders-consultation-eudralex-volume-4-good-manufacturing-practice-guidelines-chapter-4-annex_en?prefLang=mt
9. https://health.ec.europa.eu/consultations/stakeholders-consultation-eudralex-volume-4-good-manufacturing-practice-guidelines-chapter-4-annex_en
10. https://www.scribd.com/document/904658325/Draft-Guidelines-New-Annex-22-Artificial-Intelligence

11. https://qmsdoc.com/2026/01/15/eu-gmp-annex-22-artificial-intelligence-a-new-regulatory-framework-for-ai-applications-in-pharmaceutical-manufacturing
12. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/report/report-multistakeholder-workshop-expert-contributions-artificial-intelligence-guidance-development-annex-22_en.pdf
13. https://www.mastercontrol.com/gxp-lifeline/ai-enhanced-fda-iso-compliance-for-pharma-manufacturing
14. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory-overview/research-development/compliance-research-development/good-manufacturing-practice
15. https://www.covasyn.com/en/blog/ki-qualitaetskontrolle-pharma
16. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022354926000894

THE PUBLISHER

About IntuitionLabs

IntuitionLabs is an AI consulting, custom software development and data engineering firm serving pharmaceutical, biotechnology, medical-device and other life-science organizations. We work with clinical, regulatory, medical-affairs, commercial, quality and IT teams to connect technology decisions with the work people need to accomplish.

AI consulting and adoption

Our AI enablement services cover readiness assessments, use-case selection, governance and policies, team workshops, adoption measurement and ongoing advisory support. We help organizations structure the information layer behind AI: source material, context, permissions and maintained knowledge that make generated answers useful and reviewable. Private LLM inference and hosted AI options support teams evaluating how to operate AI with appropriate control over their data and infrastructure.

Software, data and life-science workflows

IntuitionLabs develops custom software for pharma and biotech, integrates enterprise systems, and builds data engineering and business intelligence solutions. Areas of focus include AI agents, regulatory research, medical writing, medical affairs, CMC information, competitive intelligence and clinical-document workflows. Our eTMF intelligence work includes cross-system reconciliation and inspection-readiness support.

Enterprise platforms and regulated delivery

We provide Veeva services, application support, managed services, integrations and custom applications, alongside enterprise content work involving platforms such as Egnyte. For regulated workflows, our services include GxP enablement, computer-system validation and software development addressing 21 CFR Part 11 requirements. The applicable controls, validation responsibilities and acceptance criteria are defined for each engagement.

Work with IntuitionLabs

Explore AI enablement, pharma and biotech software development, data engineering and BI, and Veeva services. Contact IntuitionLabs to discuss your workflow, information sources and implementation needs.

IntuitionLabs publishes educational research to help life-science teams make informed technology decisions. Coverage of a product or organization does not imply a client relationship, endorsement or partnership.

Website: https://intuitionlabs.ai

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.