IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

ICH M11 CeSHarP Implementation and Systems Readiness

> 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 · 2026-09-19 · ich m11 cesharp · ich m11 · structured clinical protocol · clinical protocol template · technical specification · protocol data standards · systems readiness · clinical interoperability · fhir

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/ich-m11-cesharp-implementation-guide

In this article

Executive Summary

ICH M11 Clinical Electronic Structured Harmonised Protocol (CeSHarP) became a final international standard when the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) adopted the guideline and its companion documents on **19 November 2025** (database.ich.org). The package has three connected parts: a principles guideline, a clinical protocol template, and a technical specification (database.ich.org). The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued final guidance on **21 May 2026** (fda.gov), while the European Medicines Agency (EMA) set **11 June 2026** as its Step 5 effective date (ema.europa.eu). Those milestones do not make submission mechanics identical across regions because ICH Step 5 proceeds through each region's own procedures (admin.ich.org).

The practical change is larger than adopting a new Word layout. The template standardizes structure and includes both required and optional components (ema.europa.eu). The technical specification turns protocol content into governed data elements with definitions, conformance, and cardinality. It recognizes **Heading, Data, and Value** entry types and common **one-to-one, one-to-many, and many-to-many** relationships (fda.gov). M11 therefore should be run as an information-model and interoperability program spanning authoring, clinical trial management systems (CTMS), electronic data capture (EDC), electronic trial master files (eTMF), registries, and submissions.

Implementation should establish a canonical owner for every reusable element, preserve protocol and version identity, map template sections to data elements and consumers, and validate transfers at system boundaries. Separate FDA guidance recommends documented data flow from creation to final storage (fda.gov). Amendments need structured scope, reason, change summary, rationale, and links to prior versions, not just redlined files.

As of **19 September 2026**, organizations should not describe a final ICH-endorsed Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) implementation guide as available. The accessible HL7 artifact is **v1.0.0-ballot2** and states that no official version has yet been published (hl7.org). Teams can still build an M11-aligned canonical model now, keep exchange adapters replaceable, and use the readiness score in this report to sequence remediation without pretending that template completion equals end-to-end interoperability.

Introduction and Background

Clinical protocols traditionally serve several jobs at once: scientific plan, operational instruction, ethics and regulatory record, configuration input, and source for registry disclosure. When the same fact is retyped into several documents and systems, format changes alone do not create reliable reuse. **ICH M11 CeSHarP** addresses that underlying problem by pairing a harmonized human-readable template with a machine-oriented technical specification. ICH says the protocol can be electronically exchanged and reused for trial management, review, registries, and standardized data capture (database.ich.org).

The standard applies to interventional trials of medicinal products across all phases and therapeutic areas (database.ich.org). ICH's explainer includes pharmaceuticals, biologics, vaccines, drug-device combinations, and cell or gene therapies (database.ich.org). It is not a method for choosing endpoints or designing a scientifically sound trial. The guideline expressly says the package does not specify protocol-development and maintenance processes (ema.europa.eu).

For clinical-development operations, medical writing, regulatory affairs, data standards, and platform owners, the decision is therefore not whether to copy content into a new template. It is how to govern the same meaning from first authoring through amendment, execution, filing, and exchange. An adjacent consultancy perspective is useful here: IntuitionLabs describes its services as implementation and integration of enterprise systems (intuitionlabs.ai) and separately describes data pipelines, integration, warehousing, and business intelligence (intuitionlabs.ai). That is an advisory and integration role, not an M11 software product.

Key Changes

One standard, three distinct documents

Treating the documents as interchangeable causes weak requirements. The guideline explains intent and design principles, the template controls presentation and authoring conventions, and the technical specification defines data semantics. FDA's final guidance likewise describes the same **three-document** structure.

Table 1 separates the purpose, user, and implementation test for each document.

Document	Primary purpose	Main users	Implementation evidence
Guideline	Defines general protocol design principles and the approach behind the other documents (database.ich.org).	Policy, regulatory, medical writing, process owners	Approved scope statement, interpretation decisions, and regional applicability matrix
Protocol template	Supplies protocol format and structure (database.ich.org).	Authors, reviewers, quality control, publishing	Configured headings, content controls, instructional-text removal, and rendering tests
Technical specification	Lists data elements and technical attributes for exchange.	Data architects, integration teams, vendors, validation teams	Data dictionary, mappings, conformance rules, cardinality tests, and exchange validation

The matrix shows why a document-only project is incomplete. A rendered protocol can match the template while its study phase, sponsor identifier, endpoints, or amendment attributes remain duplicated and inconsistent across systems. Conversely, a clean data model still needs controlled rendering and regional publishing rules.

Template conventions become controlled behavior

The final template distinguishes **universal text**, **conditional universal text**, and **optional text**. Universal content appears in all protocols, conditional content appears when applicable, and optional content may be adapted for a trial (database.ich.org). Bracketed fields identify predefined valid values, while chevrons identify insertion points (database.ich.org).

Heading rules also carry implementation consequences. **Level 1** headings cannot be deleted or modified (fda.gov). Level 2 headings are similarly protected, while optional lower headings provide trial-level flexibility. A template engine should therefore encode these rules, not depend on authors remembering them.

Scope boundaries matter

M11 standardizes representation, not scientific judgment. It does not prescribe trial design, authoring governance, review cycles, or the exact software architecture. The template's main-body and appendix framework preserves formal structure (database.ich.org). Appendix content remains substantive, and lower-level sections may be adapted as needed, but controlled variation should remain traceable.

This boundary supports a practical rule: use M11 conformance to test whether protocol information is represented correctly, then use existing quality and clinical governance to decide whether that information is scientifically and operationally adequate.

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Build a section-to-data-element crosswalk

The central artifact should be a crosswalk that connects narrative location, semantic element, cardinality, system of record, and consumer. It turns the technical specification's definitions, conformance rules, cardinalities, and other attributes into actionable ownership.

Table 2 is an implementation crosswalk. The ownership assignments are a recommended operating model, not mandates from ICH.

Protocol content	Representative element and relationship	Recommended canonical owner	Downstream consumers and controls
Title page and identifiers	Sponsor protocol identifier, original-protocol indicator, version number, version date; version date is one-to-one with version number (fda.gov)	Study-definition repository or governed authoring platform	CTMS, eTMF, submission publishing, registry; uniqueness and referential-integrity checks

Protocol content	Representative element and relationship	Recommended canonical owner	Downstream consumers and controls
Study design and phase	Trial phase uses code list **C217045** (database.ich.org)	Study-design model	Authoring, CTMS, EDC design, registry; terminology-version validation
Objectives and endpoints	Structured objective, endpoint, estimand, and analysis relationships	Study-design model with medical and statistical stewardship	Protocol narrative, statistical analysis planning, EDC, review; semantic and cardinality checks
Schedule and interventions	Repeating visits, activities, arms, cohorts, interventions	Study-design model, with operational synchronization to CTMS and EDC	Site schedule, randomization, data collection; completeness and transformation tests
Eligibility	Criteria and criterion groupings, preserving controlled meaning and display order	Study-definition repository	Authoring, EDC screening, registry; reuse without uncontrolled copy-paste
Current amendment	Identifier, scope, primary and secondary reason, change description, rationale	Protocol lifecycle service	Authoring, regulatory, eTMF, CTMS; conditionality and lineage checks
Prior amendments	Repeatable history for each amendment	Protocol lifecycle service	eTMF and submission history; reverse chronological rendering and immutable history
Appendices and regional content	Stable Level 1 and Level 2 placement plus controlled regional additions	Authoring and regulatory content management	Country packages and submissions; applicable-region rules and reconciliation log

The point is not that one product must own everything. It is that each datum needs exactly one accountable source at a point in its lifecycle, explicit synchronization rules, and a documented way to resolve conflicts. Canonical ownership can change as a study progresses, but a handoff should be an approved state transition rather than an accidental overwrite.

Map every system touchpoint

A practical current-state map should trace content through:

- **Authoring:** structured fields, narrative blocks, controlled headings, and rendering.
- **Study-definition service:** identifiers, design objects, terminology bindings, relationships, and reusable content.
- **CTMS:** countries, sites, milestones, operational status, and protocol versions.
- **EDC:** visit structure, forms, edit checks, eligibility, and endpoint-related collection.
- **eTMF:** approved protocol, superseded versions, amendment evidence, and audit history.
- **Regulatory publishing:** regional package assembly, document rendition, and transmission validation.
- **Registries:** selected protocol facts reused for public registration and results workflows.

This map aligns with broader regulatory expectations. FDA recommends documenting systems such as EDC, CTMS, and interactive-response technology (fda.gov). EMA says data governance should address ownership and responsibility throughout the data lifecycle (ema.europa.eu). Neither statement assigns M11 canonical ownership to a particular application, so sponsors must do that themselves.

Convert the gap assessment into requirements

The gap assessment should compare current behavior against four layers:

- **Content:** all applicable M11 sections and instructions are represented.
- **Semantics:** each reusable fact has a definition, format, terminology binding, and owner.
- **Lifecycle:** original, amended, approved, superseded, and regional states are controlled.
- **Exchange:** mappings, validation, acknowledgements, errors, and reconciliation are tested.

Electronic-system validation is related but separate. FDA says validation scope should include trial-specific configurations, transfers, and interfaces (fda.gov). That does not mean M11 itself mandates validation of every platform. It means an M11 change should enter the organization's existing risk-based validation framework.

Amendment and Version-Control Workflow

Amendments expose whether an implementation manages information or merely files. Every version should be uniquely identifiable, and the final template has discrete original-protocol, version-number, and version-date fields (fda.gov). The amendment identifier becomes conditional when an amendment exists (fda.gov).

A controlled workflow should perform these steps:

1. **Freeze the approved baseline.** Preserve the signed or approved rendition, structured payload, terminology versions, and checksums.
2. **Create a successor identity.** Carry forward the sponsor protocol identifier while issuing the appropriate amendment and version attributes.
3. **Declare amendment scope.** M11 provides **globally, locally, or by cohort** values (fda.gov). The implementation should preserve the applicable site, country, region, or cohort identifier.
4. **Classify the reason.** Capture a primary reason and any secondary reasons, selecting the closest governed category.
5. **Record change and rationale.** The current overview lists applicable changes, a brief description, and concise scientific rationale (fda.gov).
6. **Propagate by impact.** Route changes to CTMS configuration, EDC build, registry records, training, eTMF, and regional submissions according to affected elements.
7. **Archive lineage.** Move the earlier overview to prior-amendment history when the next amendment is created. Preserve prior amendments in reverse chronological order.

The eTMF remains essential evidence. EMA expects document identity, version history, search, and retrieval, and says superseded final versions are necessary to reconstruct the trial (ema.europa.eu) (ema.europa.eu). The structured model and filed rendition should remain linked, so a reviewer can establish what changed, why, when, and where it applied.

Controlled Terminology and Interoperability

Govern terminology as versioned reference data

M11 terminology is not a list to paste permanently into an authoring tool. Each data element has an Object Identifier linked to its code list, supporting unambiguous identification across electronic systems (database.ich.org). The technical specification associates M11 terminology with NCI Thesaurus subset **C217023** and assigns concepts NCI C-codes (fda.gov).

The National Cancer Institute's Enterprise Vocabulary Services published an M11 terminology release dated **19 December 2025** (evs.nci.nih.gov). Its published content includes a governed value set for protocol amendment reasons (evs.nci.nih.gov). CDISC states that ICH owns and approves the terminology while CDISC supports public review, publication, and ongoing maintenance (cdisc.org). CDISC also retired its earlier Protocol terminology in March 2026 because M11 terminology superseded it (cdisc.org).

Required operating controls include:

- **Version pinning:** record the terminology release used for each approved protocol version.
- **Impact assessment:** compare new, changed, and retired concepts before upgrading.
- **Mapping governance:** preserve source code, target code, mapping status, approver, and effective dates.
- **Validation:** reject invalid codes and distinguish an unknown value from a missing value.
- **Rendering:** display human-readable labels without losing stable identifiers.

Separate the canonical model from exchange formats

M11 calls for an open, nonproprietary exchange message standard and preserves room for technical innovation and regional use (database.ich.org). That supports a layered architecture:

- **Canonical semantic layer:** stable business concepts and relationships.
- **Authoring and rendering layer:** human-readable protocol sections and controlled narrative.
- **Exchange adapters:** FHIR, JSON, XML, or future regional payloads.
- **Validation layer:** schema, cardinality, terminology, referential integrity, and business rules.
- **Lineage layer:** source, transformation, version, approval, and destination evidence.

CDISC's Unified Study Definitions Model (USDM) offers a relevant reference architecture and explicitly names EDC, CTMS, and trial master file consumers (cdisc.org). Its Study Definition API supports creating, updating, and removing structured content and is intended to support JSON and XML (cdisc.org) (cdisc.org). CDISC says these newer standards do not replace its foundational standards (cdisc.org). USDM can inform architecture, but it should not be presented as identical to the M11 specification.

Treat the FHIR guide as evolving

The accessible HL7 Clinical Study Protocol guide focuses primarily on document-style exchange with only some elements structured (hl7.org) (hl7.org). It centers on **ResearchStudy** and **Composition** resources and demonstrates sponsor-to-regulator exchange (hl7.org) (hl7.org).

It is still a ballot. The guide says detailed submission requirements depend on regional regulator adoption processes (hl7.org). It recommends considering validation by both sender and receiver (hl7.org). Implementers should prototype against it, isolate FHIR mappings behind adapters, and retain regression tests. HL7 validation guidance checks cardinality but cautions that static resource testing alone does not prove conformance (fhir.hl7.org) (fhir.hl7.org).

Regional Rollout Matrix

ICH Step 4 establishes harmonized consensus, while Step 5 is regional implementation. That distinction prevents a global program from mistaking publication for a uniform submission mandate.

Table 3 summarizes verified status as of **19 September 2026**. “Not verified” means no general Step 5 date was established from the fetched official source, not that a region has rejected M11.

Region	Verified status and date	Implementation interpretation
ICH	Final guideline, template, and technical specification adopted **19 November 2025** (database.ich.org).	International Step 4 baseline; regional Step 5 still controls local implementation.
United States	FDA final guidance issued in May 2026; the Federal Register notice was published **22 May 2026** (federalregister.gov).	Final FDA guidance package is available. Confirm current FDA submission-channel and payload instructions before transmission.
European Union	CHMP final adoption **11 December 2025** and Step 5 effective date **11 June 2026** (ema.europa.eu) (ema.europa.eu).	Use the EMA Step 5 documents, while checking procedural guidance for the actual submission pathway.
Australia	TGA was consulting on adoption and listed CeSHarP M11 among **11** guidelines (consultations.tga.gov.au) (consultations.tga.gov.au). TGA notes such adopted guidance is generally not legislatively mandated (consultations.tga.gov.au).	Adoption remained pending at the access date; do not label it final from consultation status alone.
Canada	Health Canada had published the revised technical specification at Step 2 in June 2025 and later encouraged M11 alignment for expanded-access protocols (canada.ca) (canada.ca).	A general national Step 5 date was not verified; apply current program-specific instructions.

Region	Verified status and date	Implementation interpretation
Switzerland	Swissmedic reported that the package entered implementation after Step 4 adoption (swissmedic.ch).	National effective date and mechanics were not verified from the fetched notice.
United Kingdom	MHRA's official page is a directory of guidelines implemented in the UK and was updated **19 May 2026** (gov.uk) (gov.uk).	M11 was not verified in that fetched directory; check for a later update before treating it as implemented.
Japan	PMDA provides the English CeSHarP guideline among its M11 materials (pmda.go.jp).	Availability of Step 4 materials is not evidence of a national Step 5 effective date.

This matrix should be maintained as controlled regulatory intelligence. Each row needs an owner, last review date, official source, applicability decision, submission-channel instruction, and evidence of any regional deviations. The safest global design uses the harmonized core and manages regional overlays explicitly.

Data Analysis and Evidence

M11 implementation has more useful quantitative anchors than adoption percentages. The verified dates, cardinalities, profile requirements, and artifact counts can drive program controls without inventing external maturity benchmarks.

The final package contains **3** interconnected documents. The technical specification defines **3** entry categories and names **3** common cardinality patterns (fda.gov) (fda.gov). The current HL7 ballot profile reports **4 mandatory elements**, including **1 nested mandatory element** (hl7.org). It requires a sponsor-assigned identifier, study title, study phase, M11 research-study extension, and protocol-amendment extension through profile rules (hl7.org) (hl7.org) (hl7.org). These are ballot constraints, not final regional submission requirements.

A disclosed 20-control readiness score

The following is an article-defined management tool, not an ICH benchmark. Score each control **Yes = 1** or **No = 0**, then calculate:

Readiness percentage = Yes responses / 20 × 100

The controls are:

- **1. Scope:** medicinal-product trial types in scope are documented.
- **2. Regional status:** each target region has a current official-source decision.
- **3. Template baseline:** the final adopted template is configured.
- **4. Heading controls:** protected and optional heading behavior is enforced.
- **5. Content conventions:** universal, conditional, optional, and instructional text are handled.
- **6. Data dictionary:** M11 elements and definitions are catalogued.

- **7. Conformance:** required and conditional logic has executable rules.
- **8. Cardinality:** repeat and relationship constraints are testable.
- **9. Terminology:** current code lists, OIDs, and release versions are governed.
- **10. Identifier model:** sponsor, regulator, protocol, amendment, and version identities are resolved.
- **11. Canonical ownership:** every reusable element has an accountable system and steward.
- **12. Lineage:** source, transformation, approval, and destination are traceable.
- **13. Authoring:** structured data and narrative rendering remain synchronized.
- **14. CTMS:** protocol versions and operational records reconcile.
- **15. EDC:** design handoffs and change impacts are controlled.
- **16. eTMF:** approved and superseded renditions are linked to structured versions.
- **17. Registry reuse:** reusable disclosure fields have governed mappings.
- **18. Amendment workflow:** scope, reason, rationale, and prior-version links are structured.
- **19. Exchange validation:** schema, terminology, cardinality, and acknowledgement tests exist.
- **20. Regression and change control:** template, specification, terminology, and adapters can be upgraded safely.

Interpret the score as a work queue, not proof of compliance. **0 to 35** indicates foundation work, **40 to 70** indicates controlled pilots are plausible, and **75 to 100** indicates broader rollout can be considered after risk review. Those bands are editorial heuristics. They are deliberately not external benchmarks.

For evidence, attach one artifact to every Yes. Examples include an approved mapping, test result, standard operating procedure, configuration record, terminology-release log, or regional applicability decision. A Yes without evidence should revert to No. This prevents a numerically attractive score from masking unimplemented controls.

Implications and Future Directions

The immediate opportunity is controlled reuse. CDISC says USDM work targets content reuse and multiple document templates (cdisc.org), and M11 itself anticipates registry publication and standardized data capture (database.ich.org). The value case should therefore measure duplicate-entry reduction, reconciliation exceptions, amendment propagation time, and successful first-pass validation. It should not depend on an unverified industry productivity percentage.

Architecture should remain deliberately adaptable. The M11 template and technical specification are versioned documents under change control (fda.gov). HL7's ballot distinguishes sealed document bundles from linked-resource storage and identifies amendment versioning as an architectural concern (hl7.org) (hl7.org). A canonical model with adapter boundaries is more resilient than embedding ballot-specific structures into every source application.

Vendor evaluation should ask for demonstrations using sponsor-owned examples, not slideware. Essential questions include:

- **Coverage:** Which final M11 template and technical-specification version is implemented?
- **Traceability:** Can a rendered sentence be traced to source elements and terminology versions?
- **Round trip:** What survives export, import, amendment, and re-export without manual reconstruction?
- **Rules:** Are conformance and cardinality executable, configurable, and reported separately?
- **Terminology:** How are new releases assessed, approved, deployed, and rolled back?
- **Regionalization:** Are regional differences overlays, forks, or manual document variants?
- **Validation:** Can the system produce requirements, test evidence, audit trails, and interface reconciliation?
- **Portability:** Are sponsor data and mappings exportable in documented, nonproprietary formats?
- **Roadmap:** How will the vendor handle changes between the current HL7 ballot and a future official release?

The program should begin with one representative protocol, one amendment, and the smallest useful set of connected systems. Success means the same governed facts move through authoring, operational setup, filing, and exchange with known transformations and evidence, not that every platform was replaced.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What is ICH M11 CeSHarP? CeSHarP explained

It is a harmonized package for representing interventional medicinal-product protocols. The guideline explains principles, the template standardizes format and structure, and the technical specification defines conformance, cardinality, and other attributes for interoperable exchange (ema.europa.eu).

What is the ICH M11 implementation timeline?

The implementation timeline moves from international Step 4 consensus to separate regional Step 5 action, followed by sponsor gap assessment, a controlled pilot, and risk-based rollout. The regional matrix above is the current baseline. Teams should maintain it as regulatory intelligence because publication of final ICH documents does not by itself establish identical dates or submission mechanics in every region.

Is the ICH M11 clinical protocol template mandatory everywhere?

No global answer can be inferred from Step 4 alone. Step 5 follows regional procedures. Regional status and submission mechanics must be assessed separately. FDA also characterizes its guidance as nonbinding (federalregister.gov). Sponsors should check the current instruction for each submission.

What does the ICH M11 technical specification add?

It adds the semantic and structural layer: data-element definitions, entry types, terminology references, conformance, cardinality, reuse, and repeating behavior. M11 defines repeating as another instance for new content (fda.gov).

How should an organization implement ICH M11 CeSHarP?

Start with scope and regional applicability, build a template-section-to-data-element crosswalk, assign canonical ownership, govern terminology and identifiers, map system interfaces, implement amendment lineage, and test rendering plus exchange. Pilot one protocol and one amendment before scaling. Keep FHIR mappings modular while the implementation guide remains a ballot.

Which systems need M11 readiness?

At minimum, assess structured authoring, the study-definition layer, CTMS, EDC, eTMF, regulatory publishing, registry interfaces, and integration services. The required change differs by system. Some consume identifiers and milestones, some configure trial execution, and some preserve approved records. EMA notes that the approved protocol implicitly defines part of a trial system's configuration specification (ema.europa.eu).

Is there a final ICH M11 FHIR technical implementation guide?

No final official version was verified as of 19 September 2026. The accessible HL7 guide was a ballot based on FHIR R6 (hl7.org). An ICH work plan had scheduled collaboration with M2 on publication for September 2026 (database.ich.org), but a scheduled milestone is not proof of final publication.

Conclusion

The correct implementation frame for **ICH M11 CeSHarP** is an information lifecycle, not a template replacement. The final guideline, template, and technical specification create a harmonized baseline for protocol structure and semantics. Each region's status and submission mechanics must remain independently governed decisions.

The practical roadmap is clear: establish scope, configure the final template, crosswalk sections to data elements, assign canonical ownership, govern identifiers and terminology, map every system interface, structure amendment lineage, and validate transformations. Authoring, CTMS, EDC, eTMF, registry, and submission platforms do not need to become one system, but they do need explicit contracts about which facts they own, consume, and change.

Organizations can begin this work without waiting for a final FHIR guide. The durable investment is the semantic model, lifecycle controls, evidence, and modular exchange architecture. A pilot should prove that one approved protocol and one amendment can move through connected workflows without uncontrolled re-entry, while preserving human-readable quality and machine-testable meaning. That outcome is a stronger measure of M11 readiness than a visually compliant document alone.

Source links

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

1. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_Step4_M11_Final_Guideline_2025_1119.pdf
2. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH%20M11%20Explainer_May2026.pdf
3. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/guidances-drugs/newly-added-guidance-documents
4. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/regulatory-procedural-guideline/ich-m11-guideline-clinical-electronic-structured-harmonised-protocol-cesharp-step-5_en.pdf
5. https://admin.ich.org/node/332
6. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-m11-guideline-clinical-study-protocol-template-technical-specifications-scientific-guideline
7. https://www.fda.gov/media/192648/download
8. https://www.fda.gov/media/166215/download
9. https://hl7.org/fhir/uv/clinical-study-protocol/2026May/en/index.html
10. https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/clinical-trial-protocol-guide
11. https://intuitionlabs.ai/
12. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/m11-clinical-electronic-structured-harmonised-protocol
13. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_Step4_M11_Final_Template_2025_1119.pdf
14. https://www.fda.gov/media/192647/download
15. https://www.ema.europa.eu/bg/media/57985
16. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-content-management-and-archiving-clinical-trial-master-file-paper-andor-electronic_en.pdf
17. https://evs.nci.nih.gov/ftp1/ICH/M11/ICH%20M11%20Terminology.html
18. https://www.cdisc.org/ja/node/9716
19. https://www.cdisc.org/standards/terminology/controlled-terminology
20. https://www.cdisc.org/ddf
21. https://hl7.org/fhir/uv/clinical-study-protocol/2026May/en/use-cases.html
22. https://fhir.hl7.org/fhir/validation.html
23. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/05/22/2026-10295/m11-clinical-electronic-structured-harmonised-protocol-cesharp-international-council-for
24. https://consultations.tga.gov.au/tga/international-scientific-guidelines-r01-2026/
25. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/biologics-radio-pharmaceuticals-genetic-therapies/what-new-biologics-radiopharmaceuticals-genetic-therapies-health-canada.html
26. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/drug-products/applications-submissions/guidance-documents/clinical-trials/expanded-access/information-sponsors-health-care-providers.html
27. https://www.swissmedic.ch/swissmedic/en/home/news/mitteilungen/tagung-ich-singapur.html
28. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/international-council-for-harmonisation-of-technical-requirements-for-pharmaceuticals-for-human-use-guidelines
29. https://www.pmda.go.jp/int-activities/int-harmony/ich/0095.html

30. https://hl7.org/fhir/uv/clinical-study-protocol/2026May/en/StructureDefinition-m11-research-study-profile.html
31. https://www.fda.gov/media/164112/download
32. https://hl7.org/fhir/uv/clinical-study-protocol/2026May/en/bundles.html
33. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH52_M11_EWG_WorkPlan_2026_0320.pdf

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