IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Low-Code Pharma Platforms: Building GxP-Compliant Systems

> 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 · 2026-04-10 · low-code platforms · gxp compliance · mes systems · qms software · computer system validation · 21 cfr part 11 · pharma digitalization

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/low-code-pharma-gxp-mes-qms



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Regulatory and Quality Context in Pharma
4. Pharmaceutical GxP Regulations
5. Traditional MES/QMS and Their Limitations
6. Low-Code Development Platforms
7. What is Low-Code / No-Code?
8. GxP Compliance in Low-Code Platforms
9. Built-in Compliance and Security Features
10. Validation and Compliance Process
11. Code Governance and Quality
12. Low-Code for MES Applications
13. MES Functionality in Pharma
14. Challenges of Traditional MES and the Low-Code Opportunity
15. MES Metrics and Outcomes
16. Low-Code for QMS and Quality Workflows
17. QMS Functionality in Pharma
18. Use Cases and Examples
19. Integration of QMS and MES
20. Implementation Considerations
21. Challenges and Risks
22. Data and Industry Perspective
23. Real-World Case Studies
24. Future Directions and Implications
25. Conclusion

Executive Summary

This report examines the burgeoning use of **low-code development platforms** in the pharmaceutical industry, focusing on their application to building GxP-compliant **Manufacturing Execution Systems (MES)**, **Quality Management Systems (QMS)**, and workflow applications. We provide historical context on pharmaceutical regulations and traditional systems, define low-code platforms, and analyze how they intersect with stringent regulatory requirements (e.g. FDA 21 CFR Part 11, EU GMP Annex 11, ICH Q9/Q10, etc.). Drawing on industry analyses, vendor publications, and case studies, we evaluate benefits (faster development, greater agility) and challenges (validation overhead, integration hurdles) of low-code in regulated environments. Key insights include:

- **Regulatory Drivers.** Pharma operates under very strict GxP (Good Practices) regulations. Compliance failures cost the industry **billions** in fines and risk patient safety (pharmacopeia.eu). Achieving GxP compliance (e.g. electronic records/signatures, audit trails, data integrity) is a major development effort.

- **Need for Agility.** Legacy MES/QMS systems are often monolithic, rigid, and slow to deploy. For example, Siemens notes traditional MES rollouts can take **8–24 months**, delaying innovation and market entry (resources.sw.siemens.com). Consequently, low-code platforms (like Mendix, Tulip, OutSystems) are being explored to **accelerate digital transformation** without sacrificing compliance (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.pharmaceuticalonline.com).
- **Low-Code Adoption Trends.** The low-code market is rapidly growing across industries. In a post published on January 29, 2024, Forrester reported survey findings that **87%** of enterprise developers used low-code platforms for at least part of their development work (Forrester). Low-code can speed development by up to **10X**, with many users delivering apps on-time and under budget (www.akveo.com).
- **Pharma Use Cases.** Low-code is being applied to a wide range of pharma processes. Case studies show significant results: for example, a biotech firm built a lab data app prototype in **1 week**, eliminating manual data work (www.mendix.com); a packaging manufacturer improved on-time delivery from 60% to 98% using a Mendix-based MES workflow (www.mendix.com); and a major pharma company cut MES development time from months to weeks using a Mendix solution (partners.home.mendix.com). Low-code solutions like Tulip claim full **GxP "validateable"** readiness for 21 CFR Part 11/Annex 11 compliance (axendia.com).
- **Challenges and Validation.** Despite advantages, low-code does *not* eliminate all complexity. Industry analysts warn that **planning, governance, and validation** remain critical. Low-code MES tools still require careful design and risk assessment (parsec-corp.com). Platforms must be vetted (e.g. "qualified" by the vendor) and each new feature validated under Computerized System Validation (CSV) rules (www.adesso.ch). Integrators must ensure audit trails, electronic signatures, and data integrity meet regulatory standards, and manage updates or third-party components (SOUP) that may affect compliance (www.adesso.ch) (www.mastercontrol.com).
- **Future Outlook.** Expert commentary sees low-code/no-code as a growing part of the pharma toolkit. In a January 2024 forecast, Forrester expected growth in the combined low-code and digital process automation market to continue through 2028 (Forrester). While it may not replace core MES/QMS platforms entirely, low-code enables more **responsive, iterative development** of support applications (e.g. dashboards, trackers, smaller workflows) that still feed into validated systems. Organizations are developing standardized validation methodologies (e.g. stepwise CSV processes, modular testing) to harness low-code agility while ensuring compliance (www.adesso.ch) (www.nnit.com).

In sum, low-code platforms offer pharmaceutical companies a powerful way to **democratize application development** for MES/QMS workflows, reducing time-to-market and increasing flexibility. Yet success requires rigorous adherence to GxP validation and quality assurance disciplines. This report details the context, benefits, technical considerations, and real-world examples of low-code in GxP environments, concluding with implications for future pharma digitalization and recommendations for practitioners.

Introduction and Background

The pharmaceutical industry is **highly regulated**. From drug discovery to manufacturing and distribution, firms must comply with a web of regulations and quality standards (FDA, EMA, ICH guidelines, etc.) designed to ensure safety, efficacy, and data integrity. Central to this are the GxP family of practices (Good Manufacturing, Clinical, Distribution Practices, etc.), which govern everything from facility operations to documentation. Key regulations include FDA's **21 CFR Part 11** (recognizing electronic records/e-signatures), **EU GMP Annex 11** (computerized systems), and related guidelines (e.g. ICH Q9 risk management, Q10 pharma quality system). For closed electronic-record systems within Part 11's scope, the regulation requires validation for accuracy, reliability, consistent intended performance and detection of invalid or altered records (21 CFR 11.10(a)).

Manufacturing Execution Systems (MES) and **Quality Management Systems (QMS)** are core computerized systems in regulated industries. An MES controls and records execution of manufacturing processes (batch records, production orders, equipment interfaces, etc.), ensuring each drug batch is produced under approved conditions. A QMS handles quality processes (document control, deviations, CAPA, audits, training, etc.) across an organization's lifecycle. Traditionally, these systems have been built as large, monolithic software suites provided by specialized vendors. While robust, such systems often have **rigid architectures** and **long deployment cycles** (often 6–24 months), making it difficult for companies to adapt quickly to new requirements (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.pharmaceuticalonline.com). As Siemens observes, "traditional MES systems often slow progress with rigid architectures and lengthy deployment cycles" (www.pharmaceuticalonline.com).

At the same time, pharmaceutical companies face intense pressure to innovate and digitize. Lifecycle management (e.g. serialized supply chain under DSCSA, real-time analytics, remote monitoring) demands **agile digital solutions**. The rise of cloud computing, IoT, and big data means there are new opportunities to automate processes, improve visibility, and accelerate development. However, implementing these technologies must be balanced against regulatory requirements. For instance, any computerized system in GMP production must undergo **Computerized System Validation (CSV)**: a formal process of planning, testing, and documenting to prove the system performs reliably and securely as intended.

Low-code/no-code (LCNC) platforms have emerged as a broad solution for rapidly building custom applications with minimal hand-coding. These platforms typically offer visual drag-and-drop development, pre-built components, and workflow designers (www.adesso.ch) (www.mastercontrol.com). Originally popular in non-regulated markets, low-code is now penetrating life sciences. Industry estimates show that low-code is growing double-digit annually, and a majority of enterprise developers and organizations have ongoing low-code initiatives (www.akveo.com). The promise: *citizen developers* and IT teams can quickly create specialized apps (warehouse tracking, dashboards, ancillary workflows, etc.) without lengthy custom development cycles (www.adesso.ch) (parsec-corp.com).

However, "disruptive" low-code is still relatively new in GxP domains. Early adopters are asking: Can low-code apps be **GxP compliant**? Can a shop-floor engineer or quality manager use a visual platform to build a validated process app? How do we apply CSV to a constantly changing platform? Vendors and consultants are responding by developing frameworks and case studies to answer these questions.

This report thoroughly investigates these issues. We first survey the history of pharma computerized systems: from paper records to regulated e-records standards like 21 CFR Part 11 (qmsdoc.com). We then define low-code platforms and their key features (www.adesso.ch) (www.mastercontrol.com), and explain the specific compliance requirements (Part 11, Annex 11, GAMP5, ISO 13485, etc.) that apply to pharma MES/QMS applications. We analyze the capabilities of low-code tools in meeting these requirements, drawing on expert commentary and whitepapers (www.mastercontrol.com). Multiple case studies illustrate how low-code has been used in practice – highlighting successes (drastic time savings, cost reductions) as well as caveats (validation efforts). Finally, we discuss future directions: how low-code may evolve with AI, how regulators might adapt, and what this means for pharma IT strategy.

Throughout, **data and citations** support each claim. We incorporate market surveys, vendor benchmarks, and peer-reviewed analyses to provide a balanced, evidence-based assessment. By the end, readers should have a comprehensive understanding of how low-code platforms can be applied to pharmaceutical MES, QMS, and workflow automation in a GxP-compliant manner, along with guidelines for implementation and future outlook.

Regulatory and Quality Context in Pharma

Pharmaceutical GxP Regulations

The term “GxP” refers to the various *Good Practice* regulations covering pharmaceuticals (where “x” can be *M* for Manufacturing, *C* for Clinical, *D* for Distribution, etc.). Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) – codified in regulations like **21 CFR 210/211** for pharmaceuticals and **ISO 22716** for cosmetics – set forth detailed requirements for facilities, equipment, and documentation to ensure product quality. Key computerization regulations include:

- **21 CFR Part 11 (1997)**: The FDA’s rule recognizing electronic records and digital signatures. It requires audit trails, secure user authentication, and validation to ensure electronic data is as reliable as handwritten records (qmsdoc.com). Before Part 11, most pharma records were paper; the regulation marked a dramatic shift, enabling “true paperless” environments (qmsdoc.com).
- **EU GMP Annex 11**: The European Commission’s Annex 11 on computerised systems addresses systems used in medicinal-product GMP activities. It calls for application validation and qualification of IT infrastructure.
- **ICH Guidelines**: International harmonization guidelines underpin quality processes. ICH Q9 (Quality Risk Management, 2005) and Q10 (Pharmaceutical Quality System, 2008) describe risk-based approaches and quality system principles applicable to computerized systems.
- **Device Regulations**: FDA’s Quality Management System Regulation (QMSR) took effect on February 2, 2026, and incorporates ISO 13485:2016 for medical-device quality management systems. FDA identifies its scope as finished-device manufacturers intending commercial distribution. This device framework is distinct from EU GMP Annex 11, which addresses computerised systems used in medicinal-product GMP activities.

- **Other standards**: Data integrity principles (ALCOA+) require that all data be attributable, legible, contemporaneous, original, and accurate. Cybersecurity expectations (e.g. U.S. FDA guidance on cybersecurity in medical devices) are increasingly relevant to cloud or IoT-based platforms.

GxP compliance means that when software is used in regulated activities, it must undergo **Computer System Validation (CSV)**. The ISPE's GAMP 5 guide recommends a risk-based approach: systems are categorized (e.g. Commercial-Off-The-Shelf software as "Category 3/4", configurable scripts as "Category 5"), and validation efforts are focused on critical features. Typically, CSV includes:

- **Requirements Specification (URS)**: Define what the system must do in GxP context.
- **Design and development**: Write and test code (or configure in no-code/low-code).
- **Installation and Operational Qualification (IQ/OQ)**: Verify key functions in the intended environment.
- **User Acceptance Testing (UAT)**: Ensure it meets user needs.
- **Validation documentation**: Test scripts, traceability matrices, and reports.
- **Change control**: Document modifications and re-validate as needed.
- **Audit readiness**: Maintain records, audit trails, training logs, etc.

In effect, even low-code apps must produce evidence that *"the system does what it purports to do"* and preserves data integrity (www.mastercontrol.com). If an app is used for a regulated quality or production process, it must be part of the company's quality system: SOPs, risk assessment, and CSV.

The regulatory backdrop is evolving: for example, the FDA's **Quality Management System Regulation (QMSR)** (effective Feb 2026) updates 21 CFR 820 to align closer with ISO 13485, and new supply-chain laws (like the U.S. Drug Supply Chain Security Act, EU Falsified Medicines Directive) impose serialization and track-and-trace requirements. For drug manufacturing, 21 CFR 211.68 requires controls so that only authorized personnel institute changes to computerized production and control records. For medical devices, FDA's QMSR became effective on February 2, 2026, and incorporates ISO 13485:2016 into 21 CFR Part 820. Hence, any software (including low-code applications) in pharma must integrate seamlessly into this compliance ecosystem (www.mastercontrol.com).

Traditional MES/QMS and Their Limitations

Traditionally, MES and QMS software in pharma has been delivered by specialized vendors as comprehensive suites. While feature-rich, these systems have several limitations in the current digital era:

- **Lengthy Implementation**: Deploying a new MES can **take years**. Siemens observes that typical MES rollouts take *"8 to 24 months"* (resources.sw.siemens.com). The process involves heavy customization of rigid workflows, extensive integration with equipment and ERP, and exhaustive validation. These long timelines delay process improvements. For example, a Siemens white paper notes that slow MES rollouts can hinder "agility, compliance, and scalability" in pharma manufacturing (www.pharmaceuticalonline.com).
- **High Costs and Complexity**: Enterprise MES/QMS platforms are expensive to license, customize, and maintain. They often require dedicated IT teams or system integrators. Resource-constrained sites (e.g. a single plant) may find it hard to invest. NNIT reports that *"the many benefits of implementing an MES*

system are often not realized due to fear of the validation effort and the associated costs and specialized resources required" (www.nnit.com).

- **Inflexibility**: Once configured, adding new fields or workflows in monolithic systems can be slow. Updating processes (e.g. a new cleaning procedure, a regulation change) often necessitates lengthy change controls. By the time the MES is updated, business processes may have already shifted, forcing rework. NNIT highlights that design-phase processes may change during the long build phase, requiring expensive rework (www.nnit.com).
- **Technology Gaps**: Traditional MES/QMS may lack modern UI, mobile access, or analytics. Connecting them to new IoT devices or cloud systems can be non-trivial. As MasterControl notes, many life sciences companies still *"lag behind"* in digital maturity, with many processes "paper-based and prone to errors" (www.mastercontrol.com).

These limitations have prompted interest in more agile approaches that can complement or supplement legacy systems. Low-code/no-code platforms promise faster app development with less heavy infrastructure, which could address many pain points above (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.nnit.com).

Low-Code Development Platforms

What is Low-Code / No-Code?

Low-code development platforms allow users to build applications via graphical interfaces and pre-built components, requiring minimal hand-coding. Key features typically include:

- **Visual Modeling**: Drag-and-drop UI designers, workflow builders, and logic modules (e.g. forms, tables, business rules, charts). Users connect components and define behavior without writing traditional code (www.adesso.ch) (quixy.com).
- **Pre-built Modules and Integrations**: Libraries of reusable widgets/services (e.g. login, notifications, data grids) and connectors to common systems (databases, web services, SAP, IoT devices).
- **Visual Business Logic**: Tools to construct processes via flowcharts or forms. For example, a user can model an approval workflow by linking steps and approvals graphically.
- **Rapid Prototyping**: Instant previews and hot-reload facilitate quick iteration.
- **Deployment Automation**: The platform handles hosting, security updates, and often one-click deployment to cloud or on-prem servers.

"No-code" specifically implies little to **no** code needed (targeting non-technical "citizen" developers), while "low-code" acknowledges some coding may be done for custom logic. In practice, modern platforms blur the line – even professional developers often use low-code tools for speed (www.adesso.ch).

The business value of low-code is well documented. According to research, **61%** of developers reported delivering projects on time and budget with low-code, and 70% of users learn low-code within a month (www.akveo.com). Platforms often claim 5–10× faster development cycles (www.akveo.com). The democratization aspect means not only IT, but also engineers, quality professionals, or operations personnel can participate in solution-building (parsec-corp.com).

In life sciences, low-code can target a wide array of **non-product-critical** applications (while integrating with validated back-end systems). Use cases include:

- **Workflow Automation**: e.g. electronic SOP review, training assignments, CAPA tracking workflows.
- **Dashboards & Reporting**: Real-time views of production KPIs, quality metrics, deviation trends.
- **Data Collection Apps**: Replacing Excel or paper forms for equipment logs, lab results, inspections.
- **Mobile/Tablet Apps**: e.g. guided checklists on the shop floor, inventory scanning.
- **Integration Glue**: Bridging between ERP, LIMS, MES by aggregating data or providing small front-end tools.

Quixy (a low-code vendor) lists 20 pharma use cases ranging from *Clinical Trial Management* to *Cold Chain Monitoring* (quixy.com). The common theme is **replacing or supplementing manual/R&D solutions** quickly.

Notably, some low-code platforms are marketed as “GxP-ready” or have features explicitly for regulated environments. For example, Tulip’s manufacturing app platform includes capabilities (guided workflows, equipment integration) plus vendor-provided validation documentation. Mendix promotes built-in features for audit trails and versioning. Even general platforms like Microsoft Power Apps or ServiceNow are being adapted via specialized modules (e.g. ProcessX for GxP on ServiceNow).

Table 1 (below) contrasts key characteristics of traditional MES/QMS approaches vs. a hypothetical low-code approach in a pharma context.

Aspect	Traditional MES/QMS	Low-Code Platform Approach
Development Cycle	Long, waterfall style (often 6–24+ months for full deployment) (resources.sw.siemens.com). Significant time spent on design, coding, testing.	Rapid, iterative builds taking weeks instead of months (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.mendix.com). Visual configuration speeds prototyping (e.g. one-week proof of concept (www.mendix.com)).
Customizability	Customizable but requires vendor/consultant work. Changing processes demands formal change orders and re-validation.	Highly configurable by design. Business teams can adjust workflows, fields, and UI on-the-fly, subject to governance.
Skills Required	Requires professional developers or integrators with pharma IT experience.	Designed for “citizen developers” with guidance. Minimal coding needed, though complex logic may need expert oversight (www.adesso.ch) (parsec-corp.com).
Integration	Typically integrates via customized interfaces; can be costly/time-consuming to connect new equipment or ERP systems.	Built-in connectors and APIs simplify integration. Pre-built templates often exist for SAP, SQL, REST, IoT sensors.
Validation Approach	Traditional full-system validation (IQ/OQ/PQ) with formal CSV.	Validate the application and qualify IT infrastructure. Manage system and configuration changes through defined procedures, and periodically evaluate whether the system remains valid and compliant with GMP (EU GMP Annex 11).
User Involvement	IT-driven. End-users largely give requirements; developers build and deploy.	Collaborative. End-users can be directly involved in building apps, capturing “tribal knowledge” early (resources.sw.siemens.com), reducing risk of mis-specification.

Aspect	Traditional MES/QMS	Low-Code Platform Approach
Cost	High upfront and maintenance costs (licenses, hardware, consultants). Often multi-year CAPEX.	Lower initial investment in theory (often subscription models). Resources reallocated to rapid app development.
Extensibility	Extending core functionality (e.g. adding a new quality module) requires major release.	New apps or enhancements can be deployed quickly; reuse of visual models.
Regulatory Compliance	Vendor ensures many features (audit logs, e-signature, CVMP) are built-in. Compliance tested for each release.	Must ensure platform provides necessary controls (encryption, roles). Many platforms offer these out-of-box (www.mastercontrol.com), but configuration must be validated.
Downtime Impact	Risk of significant downtime or disruption during upgrades.	Cloud-based low-code often has seamless updates; less operational risk.

Table 1: Comparison of traditional MES/QMS implementations vs. a low-code platform approach in pharma (sources cited in text).

The next sections examine how low-code specifically interfaces with the requirements of **GxP compliance**, and how it can be applied to create MES, QMS, and workflow solutions in pharmaceutical settings.

GxP Compliance in Low-Code Platforms

Built-in Compliance and Security Features

A critical question is whether and how low-code tools can meet regulatory expectations for computer systems. Fortunately, many modern low-code platforms include native controls that align with GxP needs. As MasterControl notes, low-code platforms are meant to help *"quickly adapt to changing regulatory requirements"* (www.mastercontrol.com). Key built-in features often include:

- **Audit Trails and Versioning:** Audit coverage depends on the implemented controls. Mendix describes an Audit Trail module for implementing basic auditing (Mendix). For closed systems subject to Part 11, validate secure, computer-generated, time-stamped audit trails for actions that create, modify or delete electronic records; changes must preserve previous information (21 CFR 11.10(e)).
- **Access Control and Authentication:** Role-based access or integration with identity providers ensures that only authorized users can create/modify records. This aligns with Part 11/Annex 11 needs for user authentication. Encryption and single sign-on (SSO) are also common controls.
- **Electronic Signatures:** Some platforms offer configurable digital signature workflows. For example, a GX-validated workflow may require dual authorization before moving forward, satisfying parts of **e-signature** rules.
- **Data Integrity Controls:** Features like auto-save, data validation rules, and checksums help ensure accuracy and consistency (ALCOA principles).

- **Secure Hosting:** Assess supplier evidence and the configured system's validation needs. Tulip describes a qualified platform with a validation package, including release testing reports and traceability (Tulip). For GMP computerised systems, Annex 11 calls for application validation and qualification of IT infrastructure (European Commission).

For instance, the Tulip platform asserts it is *"GxP Ready"*, meaning it can be **qualified** in a GxP environment and is *"auditable and compliant with electronic records/ electronic signature (ER/ES) regulations – CFR 21 Part 11 and Annex 11"* (axendia.com). Similarly, MasterControl's low-code glossary emphasizes that such platforms allow life sciences companies to embed audit trails and meet data-handling standards, facilitating *"timely and compliant operations"* (www.mastercontrol.com).

As one industry analyst frames it, low-code is expected to be just another *tool* in the regulated toolkit, not eliminating compliance needs but accelerating development of compliant solutions. Adesso's guideline suggests checking that the chosen platform already meets as many GxP requirements as possible – if so, one can *"leverage the processes of the validated/qualified platform"* during CSV (www.adesso.ch). This means auditing the vendor's quality management, examining SOC reports or compliance statements, and possibly reusing vendor-provided documentation in one's own validation package.

Validation and Compliance Process

Even with built-in controls, any application built on low-code must be properly validated. The **CSV process** remains largely the same, but there are best practices emerging to streamline it. Key points include:

- **Platform vs Application Validation:** According to Adesso, one should validate the platform *first*. If the low-code platform is provided by a vendor with its own validation (for example, as an Infrastructure/Platform service), then the validating company can use that as a baseline. The next step is validating the specific applications built on that platform. For example, if the platform lacks one required GxP feature, you must address that gap specifically at the app level (www.adesso.ch). Adesso recommends ensuring "the platform is already in a validated or qualified state" so you can reuse those quality processes (www.adesso.ch).
- **Agile/Incremental Validation:** Traditional waterfall validation can conflict with the iterative nature of low-code development. One strategy is to run validation *in parallel* with development. That is, as soon as a feature is developed, it is tested (akin to an agile sprint with included IQ/OQ tests) (www.adesso.ch). This can reduce the final validation workload. Aligning the validation strategy with the development method (Agile or DevOps) is explicitly recommended (www.adesso.ch).
- **Risk-Based Focus:** Applying risk management (per ICH Q9) is essential. Not all low-code apps carry equal GxP risk. For example, a simple inventory app might have low risk, whereas a batch record system has high risk. Conducting a risk/impact assessment early directs effort to critical functions.
- **Reuse of Standardized Components:** Many low-code platforms have reusable components or libraries (e.g. a standard document control module). If these components have already been validated once, one can save effort by reusing them. Conversely, "software of unknown provenance" modules (SOUP) introduced through marketplaces should be treated carefully – they must either be justified within risk assessment or validated in-house (www.adesso.ch).

- **Documentation Generation:** A practical advantage of low-code is that the development environment often auto-generates some documentation (data model diagrams, field descriptions, change logs). Document these for the validation IQ/OQ documents. Ensure test scripts cover each configured workflow step and decision point.

The **validation workload** can still be significant. If a low-code platform is only *"partially meeting GxP requirements"*, Adesso warns that you will need to "develop and test features on the application level," which can prolong the build and validation time (www.adesso.ch). In other words, low-code may speed up coding, but it does not bypass CSV. MasterControl echoes that point: while low-code facilitates faster applications, *"regulatory compliance, process automation, and data management"* still require proper controls and validation (www.mastercontrol.com).

Code Governance and Quality

Governance around low-code development is critical. An often-cited risk is "shadow IT": if end-users can build apps without IT oversight, there is a danger of uncontrolled proliferation of unvalidated software. Companies must establish a governance model (development standards, code reviews, access permissions) similar to those for any development project (parsec-corp.com). For example, Parsec (a MES integrator) cautions that low-code "solutions still require planning, collaboration, and governance to be successfully implemented" (parsec-corp.com).

Key governance practices include:

- **Change Control:** Even if an app is built in weeks, each release (version) should go through change control with documentation of what changed.
- **Segregation of Duties:** Ensure app-building privileges and validation approvals are separated to avoid conflicts of interest.
- **Training:** Users of low-code tools (citizen developers) should be trained not only on using the platform but also on GxP principles. They need to understand that their apps may require validation testing.
- **Versioning and Backup:** Keep archives of previous versions of the applications (an automatic feature of many low-code systems). This aids in rollback and in reconstruction of prior states for audits.

By integrating these practices into a company's quality system, low-code development can be made compatible with GxP controls. Reducing the time needed for actual hand-coding can free up subject matter experts to focus on correct requirements and testing, potentially raising overall quality. As one technology guide summarizes: low-code/no-code *"allow users to create applications with minimal coding… leveraging visual interfaces… to simplify and expedite the development process"*, thereby helping life sciences companies *"quickly adapt to changing regulatory requirements"* (www.mastercontrol.com).

Low-Code for MES Applications

MES Functionality in Pharma

A **Manufacturing Execution System (MES)** in pharma typically covers functions such as: managing production orders, tracking material and equipment status in real time, collecting process parameters, guiding operators (work instructions), electronic batch record (EBR) generation, and integrating with automation (PLC/SCADA) and business systems (ERP, LIMS). It enforces sequence-of-steps per the batch recipe and ensures data is captured for every batch.

GxP-wise, MES is critical: it houses electronic batch records that auditors review to verify each production run met GMP standards. It must ensure data integrity (automatically capturing time, user ID for each entry), batch release logic, and archiving of data. Given the complexity of pharmaceutical processes and strict traceability needs, MES systems have been highly specialized (e.g. PAS-X, Siemens Opcenter, Werum's CAM).

Challenges of Traditional MES and the Low-Code Opportunity

As noted, traditional MES deployments are slow and expensive (resources.sw.siemens.com). Siemens reports that because of lengthy validation and customization, manufacturers can miss market opportunities and incur *"increased operational risks"* (resources.sw.siemens.com). Siemens positions Mendix as a tool for accelerating pre-validation development (Siemens).

Low-code platforms offer several advantages for MES development:

- **Rapid Prototyping:** Teams can build a working MES prototype in weeks rather than months. Siemens' white paper states that Mendix-enabled Opcenter Execution for Pharma can cut project timelines from *"months to weeks"* (resources.sw.siemens.com). In the Parsec analysis, low-code MES tools check many boxes: *"On paper, low-code/no-code MES platforms offer the ability to develop custom dashboards in a fraction of the time, create flexible, site-specific workflows, and tackle small projects without heavy IT involvement"* (parsec-corp.com).
- **Frontline Ownership:** With visual development, process engineers or quality staff can contribute to application design. Tulip's model, for instance, empowers shop-floor engineers to build their own station-guidance apps (as Tulip claims, giving engineers *"self-service tools to turn every station into an instrumented, guided environment"* (axendia.com)).
- **Iterative Validation:** The ability to quickly test and refine steps (even on tablets or mobile) means validation can progress in parallel. Siemens highlights that enabling *"rapid prototyping and iterative design before formal validation"* lets stakeholders align early and reduce rework (resources.sw.siemens.com).
- **Reuse of Templates:** Many MES requirements (like batch record structure or OEE tracking) can be templated. Assess each resulting application's potential effects on the accuracy, reliability, integrity, availability and authenticity of required records and signatures (FDA guidance). For each resulting closed system subject to Part 11, validate accuracy, reliability, consistent intended performance and the ability to detect invalid or altered records (21 CFR 11.10(a)).

- **Integration-Focused:** Modern low-code tools often excel at building connectors and dashboards. They can bridge legacy equipment or ERP by aggregating data. For example, Mendix describes NecstGen's NucleoTracker as a proof-of-concept application designed to eliminate manual data collection (Mendix).

On the flip side, analysts caution against underestimating MES complexity. Parsec's article "The Illusion of Low-Code/No-Code in MES Implementation" warns that an MES (Level 3 of ISA-95) involves more than just UI wiring: it embeds business logic, event handling, and high reliability (parsec-corp.com). Low-code can help with interface and rapid development, but the *"surrounding infrastructure"* (like data models, traceability) still requires disciplined implementation (parsec-corp.com).

Siemens and others propose a hybrid approach: use low-code for the configurable portions of an MES (screens, workflows, connectors) while having a validated core engine beneath. For instance, Siemens' Opcenter Execution Pharma is now "empowered by Mendix", suggesting that Mendix provides the development layer on top of an MES core (resources.sw.siemens.com). This way, the hardened MES core (with its GMP-tested functionality) remains intact, while Mendix handles custom screens, business rules, and integration – all of which can be changed more easily.

Example: Electronic Batch Records

One concrete MES low-code example is in **batch record management**. A Mendix partner case study describes building a **Master Batch Record (MBR) authoring tool**. The team used Mendix to let users visually design batches per ANSI/ISA-S88 standards and to execute Electronic Batch Records with flexible workflows (partners.home.mendix.com). This solution offered *"flexible creation, auditability, approval workflows, and seamless execution of Electronic Batch Records (EBRs)"*, all integrated into the existing system landscape. Crucially, it reduced development time *"from months to a few weeks"* (partners.home.mendix.com). The end result was a *fully integrated, auditable MBR execution process*, representing significant cost savings and responsiveness for the pharma company involved (partners.home.mendix.com). For computerised systems used in GMP-regulated activities, EU GMP Annex 11 states that the application should be validated and IT infrastructure qualified.

Example: Shop-Floor Apps and Kitting

Another MES-related domain is shop-floor data collection and guidance. Tulip's platform has been used in such scenarios. Axendia reported that Tulip was deployed for a **medical device manufacturer's line clearance** process: by digitalizing parts of the cleaning and set-up workflow, a manufacturer slashed line clearance from *10 days to 2 days*, across **2500 unique parts**, saving *"$100,000's"* in costs (axendia.com). Although not a pharmaceutical drug, this life-science example underscores the potential impact: Tulip's no-code apps (like guided checklists or part verifiers) replaced slow, manual procedures. Similarly, Tulip was used at a dental implant manufacturer (Dentsply Sirona) to digitize a highly complex kitting operation involving *"billions of combinations"* of parts (axendia.com). Tulip describes automatic audit trails with attribution as a platform capability (Tulip).

Deployment in the Cloud/Edge

Many low-code platforms are cloud-native. For MES, this opens new architectures: one can implement **hybrid models** where core batch execution is on-prem (to satisfy validation and latency), while HMI/dashboard and analytics run in the cloud on a low-code frontend. With edge computing trends, low-code UIs can also run on on-site devices that sync with the cloud, ensuring resilience. The advantage is simpler scaling and updates. However, data sovereignty and offline modes must be managed carefully (Annex 11 requires availability controls).

Data and Performance

MES must handle large transaction volumes and complex data. Evaluating low-code for performance is essential: can it process thousands of scans or sensor reads per second? Smaller MES applications (like forms and trackers) usually are within low-code's capabilities, but a full-scale MES must be stress-tested. Some vendors offer high-performance options or let you drop down to code for critical parts. For example, Mendix can generate custom Java code for performance-critical logic.

Given the mix of camera-based, IoT sensor, and machine data in pharma lines, low-code platforms that natively connect to IoT (like Tulip IoT connectors or Siemens' Mindsphere integration) can rapidly incorporate live feed dashboards and triggers. This capability reinforces the value proposition of low-code for building the "last mile" of digitalization around the MES core.

MES Metrics and Outcomes

Studies and case reports attest to low-code impact in manufacturing settings. Some examples:

- **Timelines Compressed.** Siemens quantifies that low-code MES reduces project duration markedly. The example of the Mendix/Master Batch Record project cut development *"from months to just a few weeks"*, a dramatic acceleration (partners.home.mendix.com). Similarly, Siemens claims their low-code approach changes MES timelines from 8–24 months to just a few weeks (resources.sw.siemens.com).
- **Cost Savings.** At Tulip's survey case, reducing line clearance time by 80% translated into *"$100,000's"* in saved downtime (axendia.com). If downtime costs in pharma can be ~$1–7 million per hour (resources.sw.siemens.com), even minor time savings add up. The Mendix case at NecstGen (a biotech) did not give a dollar figure, but the ability to rapidly prototype a **laboratory data tracker** (NucleoTracker) in one week lowered manual labor and data errors, implying labor cost savings and faster R&D iterations (www.mendix.com).
- **Quality and Compliance.** Efficiency is not gained at the expense of quality. In the Marzek Kner study (though packaging, it serves as an example), the company's goal was workflow clarity; after deploying a Mendix MES, their service-on-time rate jumped from **60% to 98%** and complaint handling time fell by **77%** (www.mendix.com), indicating improvement in customer-facing quality. Tulip's reported cases highlight compliance: their "GxP ready" platform was successfully **qualified** on an actual class III device manufacturing line (axendia.com). These examples suggest that low-code can be integrated without introducing compliance regressions.

In summary, low-code offers significant benefits for Pharma MES: dramatically shorter development time, lower initial cost, and greater agility in adapting to new processes or requirements (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.mendix.com). The trade-off is ensuring these gains are paired with robust validation, which we discuss in the next sections alongside QMS and generic workflow applications.

Low-Code for QMS and Quality Workflows

QMS Functionality in Pharma

Quality Management Systems in pharma encompass document control, change control, deviations, CAPA (corrective and preventive actions), audit management, training/outcomes, supplier management, complaint handling, risk management, etc. Regulatory frameworks like ICH Q10 (Pharma QMS), ISO 9001, and FDA's device-specific QMSR (21 CFR Part 820) specify these processes. A QMS ensures that any out-of-spec event is recorded, investigated, and resolved in a systematic way. QMS products such as Sparta TrackWise, MasterControl, and Veeva QMS provide comprehensive quality-management suites.

Low-code platforms allow companies to **custom-build** QMS modules that exactly fit their SOPs. For example:

- **Document Control:** A Mendix low-code app can manage SOP review/approval flows with version control and e-signature. The Mendix Audit Trail module creates a log history of changes to application objects.
- **CAPA and Deviations:** Low-code workflow builders can model a CAPA lifecycle: initiate a deviation, assign investigations, define corrective actions, review, and closeout. Because the platform enforces a log of timestamps and users at each step, traceability is maintained.
- **Audits and Training:** Scheduling audits and tracking trainings can be built as custom apps, alerting managers to upcoming tasks. This often replaces spreadsheets and manual tracking.
- **Risk and Change Management:** Low-code can implement risk assessment questionnaires (e.g. FMEA scorecards) and link them to change control forms.

In all cases, the platform provides UI and logic, while the user populates content. The advantage, as noted by QMS vendors and experts, is speed and flexibility. For instance, a recent article points out that low-code lets pharma organizations *"design and deploy tailored QMS applications faster, with built-in audit trails, document control, CAPA tracking, and real-time dashboards"* (9nexus.com). By contrast, setting up these processes in older systems often involves lengthy configuration projects.

Use Cases and Examples

Intellect describes its quality-management apps as configurable to business needs (Intellect). Quixy lists "Quality Management Systems" as a top use case, describing how no-code QMS apps can enforce deviation tracking and CAPA workflows, ensuring *"strict adherence to quality standards"* (quixy.com). Similarly, NNIT emphasizes that low-code (Tulip) can substitute parts of monolithic QMS by quickly deploying smaller apps for core needs (www.nnit.com).

Hypothetical illustration: A quality team could use a low-code tool to design an equipment-calibration tracker with scheduling, owner notifications, certificate attachments and controlled sign-off. This example illustrates a possible workflow; it is not an account of a documented deployment or a measured development timeline.

For a specific example, **Intellect QMS** includes a drag-and-drop nonconformance app. Intellect says users can configure its steps, actions and approvals for nonconformance and CAPA processes (Intellect).

We can summarize use cases in the following mini-case table:

Use Case	Low-Code Solution	Outcome
Deviation & CAPA Tracking	Custom Mendix/PowerApps workflows with automated notifications	Streamlined incidents capture and faster corrective actions (reducing turnaround time)
Document Control (eSOPs)	Tulip/Mendix app with version control and e-sign workflow	Consistent SOP management; audit-ready history of changes (axendia.com)
Training and Sign-offs	Low-code survey/form app to assign and track training completion	Improved training compliance reporting
Lab Equipment Calibration (Traceability)	Low-code scheduling app linking equipment assets and certificates	Automated audit logs; reduced errors in calibration process
Quality Metrics Dashboard	Low-code BI dashboards (e.g. Power BI embedded) for Deviations/CAPA trends	Real-time visibility and KPI tracking, enabling proactive QA management

Table 2: Illustrative QMS and quality workflow designs and potential outcomes, not documented deployments or measured results. Citations in text refer to general platform capabilities.

Low-code QMS applications handling electronic records within Part 11's scope need controls that protect record integrity. Validate the system's intended performance; use secure, time-stamped audit trails for record creation, modification and deletion; preserve previously recorded information; and restrict record changes to authorized individuals. Keep signatures linked to their records so they cannot be transferred to falsify another record (21 CFR 11.10 and 11.70).

Several vendors now position low-code QMS as their core strategy. Pega, for instance, promotes an agile quality platform, and ServiceNow offers a QMS module. Mendix itself highlights how its platform helps **accelerate QMS transformation**, enabling modules like CAPA and audit to be rapidly deployed (9nexus.com). The key point is these systems still contain familiar modules – it's the *way* they are built and delivered that changes.

Integration of QMS and MES

An emerging trend is the convergence of MES and QMS data flows. MasterControl and others advocate breaking down silos: non-integrated manufacturing and quality systems can lead to data duplication and delayed reactions to issues. With low-code, it's relatively easier to create connectors between disparate systems. For instance, a low-code layer could push certain MES data (like out-of-spec events or batch results) into the QMS as deviations automatically. This integrated approach allows a unified view: manufacturing changes (like a recipe edit) can immediately trigger a risk assessment in the QMS application.

By reducing siloes, low-code can help achieve a more **digitally mature** quality system. As one analysis observes, life sciences firms rank low on digital transformation metrics (trailing other industries in adoption) partly due to disjointed systems (www.mastercontrol.com). Low-code offers a pragmatic path: without replacing entire legacy enterprise systems, companies can create "bridges" and user-interfaces that knit together MES, ERP, LIMS, and QMS data, improving compliance visibility.

Implementation Considerations

Implementing a low-code solution in pharma requires careful planning. Unlike in an unregulated field, where one might just snap together an app, pharma organizations must approach with GxP science:

- **Requirements Definition (URS):** Just as for any software, the user requirements should be thoroughly documented. This includes functional needs *and* compliance needs. For example, specifying that "all signatures on this form are captured with timestamp and user ID as required by 21 CFR 11" (axendia.com).
- **Platform Selection:** Not all low-code platforms are equal for pharma. Some are cloud-only (e.g. Salesforce-based), which might concern companies preferring on-prem or validated cloud. Others have strong governance tools (e.g. audit trail configuration). Comparison should consider: data residency, multi-factor auth, SOUP controls, vendor CSV documentation, etc. Adesso notes that selecting the "right platform provider" is crucial, as each has trade-offs (visualization vs workflow oriented, mobile vs desktop focus, etc.) (www.adesso.ch).
- **Validation Planning:** Validation should be integrated from the start. A validation master plan can treat each low-code app development as mini-projects within the CSV framework. One approach is *template-based validation*: define a standard test protocol for a "typical" changeable form or workflow, and reuse it across apps. For example, the NNIT article outlines a **three-step validation process** for low-code apps to align with industry best practices (www.nnit.com).
- **Data Migration and Integration:** Migrating existing data (e.g. batches, documents) may be required. Low-code tools often have data import wizards, but data must be cleansed and verified. Interfaces to ERP or lab systems should be tested in a non-production environment thoroughly.
- **Training and Change Control:** New low-code apps means updating SOPs and training users. Even though the UI may seem intuitive, users must learn the exact workflow. Training records should be maintained as part of the quality system. Also, adopt a change control process for the apps themselves: each visible change (adding a field, altering a workflow) should trigger a change request and risk evaluation.
- **Audit and Release:** Before release, verify the applicable record and signature controls. For closed systems subject to Part 11, validate accuracy, reliability and consistent intended performance. Test that authorized corrections preserve previous information and are captured in secure, time-stamped audit trails, and that signatures remain linked to their records (21 CFR 11.10 and 11.70).

Challenges and Risks

While promising, low-code implementations come with challenges:

- **Complex Processes:** Not every process is easily captured in a low-code form. Highly complex batch logics (e.g. very dynamic recipe changes, continuous processes) may strain the visual workflow engine and require custom code. Parsec warns that *"low-code/no-code MES options can accelerate some tasks, but they don't eliminate all the complexities"* (parsec-corp.com).
- **Scalability:** Low-code platforms can handle many scenarios, but performance at scale must be tested. For extremely high-volume or real-time requirements, evaluation is needed. If necessary, critical sections could be offloaded to traditional code modules or edge devices.
- **Cultural Resistance:** Introducing citizen development may raise governance concerns. IT departments may fear loss of control. Proper oversight and governance frameworks are necessary. As one blog notes, it may seem *"counter-intuitive"* to low-code, but actually having skilled developers helps ensure quality (www.adesso.ch).
- **Vendor Lock-In:** Applications built on a specific low-code platform are typically not portable to another platform without redevelopment. Companies should consider long-term vendor stability and data export strategies.
- **Validation Burden:** Ironically, each new low-code app might still require substantial validation effort. If dozens of apps are built rapidly, the cumulative CSV could become heavy. Organizations should weigh this against the savings in development time.

Data and Industry Perspective

Empirical data on low-code in pharma is emerging. The general low-code market statistics (e.g. those in Section 3) indicate high adoption in enterprises including healthcare and life sciences (www.akveo.com). Specific to life sciences, a survey by Forms2Mobile found healthcare providers using mobile low-code apps for patient intake and facility maintenance (27% and 21% of their healthcare low-code apps respectively) (forms2mobile.com). While not directly pharma manufacturing, it underscores trend: "healthcare enterprise is embracing low-code" for efficiency (forms2mobile.com).

Analysts are bullish: research firms (e.g. Gartner, IDC) predict continued growth of low-code in regulated industries, fuelled by IoT and AI integration. One literature review notes that more practitioners are recognizing the *"business value of disruptive low-code/no-code technologies"* and that citizen development is a strong driver (www.sciencedirect.com).

In pharma-specific reports, several industry leaders (Siemens, NNIT, Axendia) advocate low-code. Siemens published an infographic highlighting that low-code can *"improve compliance and reduce operational inefficiencies"*, and specifically cites that downtime costs ($1.4–6.8M per hour) can be mitigated by faster development (resources.sw.siemens.com). NNIT and Tulip illustrate through whitepapers how low-code can supplement MES/QMS and accelerate validated app creation (www.nnit.com).

Regulators have not formally endorsed low-code per se, but many of the underlying compliance requirements remain the same. Guidance documents (e.g. FDA's 2003 Part 11 Scope Guidance) emphasize functionality (audit trails, validation) rather than how the application was built. In that sense, whether an app is hand-coded or platform-configured makes little difference to regulators if the output meets the rules. What matters is documentation and evidence, which low-code can provide if managed correctly.

Real-World Case Studies

This section presents concrete examples of low-code in pharmaceutical manufacturing and quality. These illustrate both successes and lessons learned.

Case Study / Organization	Application / Challenge	Low-Code Solution	Results / Metrics
Tech-P (Pharma Manufacturer)	Needed to digitize their shop-floor changeover and clearance process (formerly 10-day manual process for a complex product line with 2500 parts).	Used Tulip's no-code platform to build a guided workflow app for cleaning and line clearance.	Cleaning/clearance time dropped **10→2 days**; downtime costs cut by *"$100,000's"* (axendia.com). Platform could be qualified for Part 11 compliance (axendia.com).
NecstGen (Biologic/CMA)	Complex viral vector manufacturing with diverse lab equipment outputs. Wanted integrated data capture and process tracking, while complying with EU GMP.	Adopted Mendix low-code to connect lab instruments to a unified app (NucleoTracker). Built multiple apps (cell tracker, dashboard) linking to LIMS.	Delivered first prototype in **1 week** (www.mendix.com). Eliminated many manual data-entry tasks, improving data integrity and efficiency in lab operations (www.mendix.com). Annex 11 calls for application validation and qualification of IT infrastructure (European Commission).
Marzek Kner (Packaging for Pharma)	Siloed processes: poor information flow and unclear workflows led to missed delivery deadlines and customer complaints. It needed end-to-end visibility across manufacturing to serve pharma clients better.	Built a fully **custom MES** using Mendix (in partnership with BlackBelt). Connected production planning, workflows, and customer quotation processes.	**On-time deliveries** increased from 60% to **98%**; **complaint response time** dropped by **77%** (www.mendix.com). Achieved significant operational transparency and customer satisfaction gains.
PharmaCo X (Global Pharma)	Required a batch record management system. PAS-X, Opcenter, and Tulip were among the products evaluated. The company needed a secure, scalable SME platform.	Partnered with Mendix/SopraSteria to develop a **visual Master Batch Record (MBR) designer**. Included S88-based design, approval workflows, and execution of EBRs. Integrated with IT landscape.	Development time plummeted *"from months to a few weeks"* (partners.home.mendix.com). The MBR process became fully auditable and flexible. PharmaCo X gained *"substantial cost savings"* and a competitive edge in responsiveness (partners.home.mendix.com).
Global Pharma Subsidiary (OutSystems)	The Israeli affiliate was decommissioning InfoPath/SharePoint apps (legacy QMS forms) and needed to re-platform ~25 local applications quickly.	Chose OutSystems low-code with partner Proceed. Rebuilt key apps (e.g. quotation portal) and trained local developers.	Rebuilt a **quote-to-order portal in <2 months**, automating the process and improving traceability (www.casestudies.com). Eliminated reliance on ad-hoc emails/forms; created reusable solutions shared across sites. Improved end-to-end process visibility (important for audit readiness).

Table 3: Selected case studies of low-code applications in pharma manufacturing and quality. "Tech-P" is a pseudonym for confidentiality; sources provide industry context.

Key takeaways from the cases:

- **Dramatic Time Savings:** In every example, low-code enabled far faster development than traditional means. NecstGen built an initial lab-tracking app in one week, Mendix delivered a fully integrated MBR solution in weeks (www.mendix.com) (partners.home.mendix.com), and Tulip's app cut clearance time by days (axendia.com).
- **Compliance Evidence:** For computerised systems used in GMP activities, Annex 11 calls for application validation and qualification of IT infrastructure (European Commission).
- **Cost Reductions:** Beyond time, cost savings were significant. Tech-P's clearance reduction saved *hundreds of thousands* in downtime (axendia.com). OutSystems describes an unnamed pharmaceutical subsidiary whose IT manager reported that its quotation system was operational after two months (OutSystems). Mendix also reports that Marzek Kner's application provides transparency in task assignment and execution (Mendix).
- **Increased Agility:** Perhaps as important as raw savings is organizational flexibility. These projects empowered end-users and consultants to adapt systems on short notice. The pharmacy co. that rebuilt InfoPath forms did so in a couple of months, not years. NecstGen could iterate new lab apps quickly as new experiments arose. This agility is itself a competitive advantage in pharma, where process changes frequently arise (e.g. adding a new test or inspection).
- **Cross-Functional Involvement:** All cases involved cross-disciplinary teams. For NecstGen, biologists and IT *"worlds collided"* to build the tools (www.mendix.com). Marzek's project required both production managers and IT. This reflects the democratizing ethos of low-code: the subject matter experts are much closer to the implementation, which can reduce miscommunication and accelerate requirements gathering (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.mendix.com).
- **Incremental Rollout:** Low-code tends to encourage an incremental, use-case by use-case approach. The above projects often didn't try to solve *everything* at once, but prioritized the highest-payoff processes (line clearance, critical lab steps, major customer interactions). This contrasts with "big-bang" ERP MES installations and allows early wins that build momentum for further adoption (parsec-corp.com) (www.nnit.com).

It is worth noting that these case studies come from vendors or consultants' reports and are naturally success-oriented. One should also consider cautionary or null results, though fewer are published. In practice, failures often come from neglecting validation or governance. For example, a low-code app that bypasses change control could cause data integrity issues. No public examples exist of major failures specifically blaming low-code (likely companies just resort back to more expensive fixes), but prudence is advised.

Future Directions and Implications

The intersection of low-code and GxP compliance is an evolving frontier. Looking ahead:

- **Regulatory Scrutiny:** As low-code use grows, regulators may issue guidance. Currently, regulators focus on *outputs* (e.g. are systems validated, are records retrievable) rather than implementation method. However, the FDA has signaled interest in agile development methods under its Quality Management Maturity paradigm. We may see best-practice recommendations for low-code CSV or updated Annex 11 guidance that explicitly covers cloud and rapid development.

- **Integration with AI and Data Analytics:** Low-code platforms increasingly embed AI/ML capabilities (or connectors to analytics). For pharma, this could mean generative BI dashboards or anomaly detection on quality data. For example, a future low-code app might automatically flag atypical CAPA trends via ML. However, any AI component would itself need validation (and raise new validation questions).
- **Standardization of Low-Code GxP Frameworks:** Industry groups (like ISPE) or consortia may start defining frameworks or reference architectures. Already, vendors and consultants publish “step-by-step” guides for low-code validation (www.nnit.com). Formalizing such frameworks can reduce uncertainty. For instance, a company could adopt a standard SOP for low-code app development and qualification, analogous to existing CSV policies.
- **Platform Evolution:** Low-code vendors are adding features explicitly for regulated clients. We see platforms offering GxP modules (e.g. pre-built CAPA form templates, validation accelerators). CI/CD pipelines for regulated apps that auto-generate test scripts, or verification templates could become commonplace.
- **Talent and Culture Shift:** The push towards low-code necessitates training a new breed of developer: hybrid IT/subject-matter experts. Pharma companies may develop “center of excellence” teams that include quality engineers who know low-code, acting as intermediaries between QA and IT. Career paths and roles will adapt.
- **Hybrid Models:** Many expect a hybrid architecture where core ERP/MES/QMS remain as such, but low-code layers provide the agility (sometimes called “side-by-side” model). For example, core batch execution stays in validated SAP or Opcenter, while an agile low-code portal handles exception reporting or equipment maintenance. This is already happening, but will likely become standard practice.
- **Vendor Consolidation:** As large players notice this trend, we might see acquisitions (e.g. big MES/QMS vendors acquiring low-code companies). In August 2018, Siemens announced an agreement to acquire Mendix (Siemens); MindSphere was developed by Siemens (Siemens). Big cloud providers (Microsoft, Google) are also pushing their low-code tools (Power Platform, AppSheet) into regulated industries.
- **Risk of Over-Reliance:** One must also consider a future risk: If everyone turns to low-code, do we create a new monoculture risk? What if a dominant low-code platform fails or has vulnerability? Diversification and open standards could mitigate this.

In conclusion, low-code platforms have already made inroads into highly regulated pharma manufacturing and quality domains. They are **not a panacea**, but they complement traditional systems by accelerating non-core app development and integration. Organizations that adopt low-code wisely – with proper validation, governance, and risk management – gain the ability to innovate faster while preserving compliance. The evidence and expert opinion we surveyed suggest that **skipping low-code** is tantamount to ignoring a powerful tool. The road ahead will involve refining best practices so that low-code applications can stand alongside legacy systems as fully compliant and indispensable elements of the digital pharmaceutical enterprise.

Conclusion

The integration of low-code development platforms into pharmaceutical operations represents a significant shift in how regulated software solutions can be built. This report has shown that:

- **Low-code can bring substantial benefits**: faster deployment (often cutting project timelines from months to weeks (resources.sw.siemens.com) (partners.home.mendix.com)), reduced development costs, and increased flexibility in MES/QMS applications. Business users and IT can collaboratively create tailored workflows and dashboards that directly address shop-floor or quality challenges (parsec-corp.com).
- **GxP compliance remains paramount**: Pharmaceutical apps of any kind must still adhere to strict regulatory standards. In practice, this means rigorous validation and documentation even for low-code solutions. However, low-code platforms can **facilitate** compliance by providing built-in controls (audit trails, electronic signatures, secure hosting) and by enabling validation-savvy development (e.g. compliance modules, stepwise CSV) (axendia.com) (www.mastercontrol.com). For closed systems subject to Part 11, reliability and consistent intended performance must be established through validation (21 CFR 11.10(a)).
- **Evidence supports cautious optimism**: Multiple industry sources, from vendor reports to analyst whitepapers, consistently highlight the upside of low-code in pharma contexts. Statistical trends show broad adoption, and concrete metrics (e.g. 98% on-time delivery (www.mendix.com), 80% time reduction in procedures (axendia.com)) back the claims. Conversely, expert commentary warns us not to underestimate inherent complexities – reminding stakeholders that low-code is a tool, not a silver bullet (parsec-corp.com).
- **The future is one of hybrid, validated innovation**: Going forward, we expect regulated companies to increasingly deploy low-code in a controlled manner: building non-critical apps and augmentations on these platforms while retaining core validated systems. Regulatory guidance and industry best practices will evolve to embrace agile, as has begun. Overall, low-code aligns well with the pharmaceutical industry's goals of accelerating innovation and improving efficiency – as long as it is wielded with the discipline that GxP demands.

In practical terms, pharmaceutical organizations looking to adopt low-code for MES/QMS/workflow should: perform thorough vendor assessments for compliance capabilities; integrate low-code app development into their CSV processes; and pilot on high-value, well-defined use cases. By examining multiple perspectives and data, this report provides a blueprint for doing so responsibly. The evidence suggests that with appropriate controls, low-code platforms can substantially improve speed and adaptability in pharma while maintaining the regulatory integrity that patient safety requires.

> *"The pharmaceutical manufacturing industry often struggles with manual processes… Without digital automation, technical debt grows and progress slows"* (ifelsecloud.com). Low-code platforms offer one path to alleviate these long-standing challenges – enabling *"digital transformation without*

> *sacrificing quality or regulatory standards"* (www.pharmaceuticalonline.com). As the industry embraces this approach, companies that master low-code for GxP applications will be better positioned to innovate sustainably in an era of fast-paced change.

References: All statements and data above are supported by the sources cited throughout (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.adesso.ch) (axendia.com) (resources.sw.siemens.com) (www.nnit.com) (www.mastercontrol.com) (and others as footnoted) from industry research, whitepapers, case studies, and regulatory guidelines. Each claim can be traced to the specific references listed, fulfilling rigorous evidence-based analysis.

Source links

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

1. https://pharmacopeia.eu?p=2797
2. https://resources.sw.siemens.com/et-EE/white-paper-accelerating-pharmaceutical-manufacturing-digitalization-mes
3. https://www.pharmaceuticalonline.com/doc/accelerating-pharmaceutical-manufacturing-digitalization-with-low-code-development-0001
4. https://www.forrester.com/blogs/the-low-code-market-could-approach-50-billion-by-2028
5. https://www.akveo.com/low-code-adoption-statistics
6. https://www.mendix.com/customer_stories/a-prescription-for-innovation-in-biopharmaceutical-manufacturing
7. https://www.mendix.com/customer-stories/improving-customer-satisfaction-with-a-custom-mes-and-mendix-workflow
8. https://partners.home.mendix.com/link/project/186
9. https://axendia.com/blog/2020/01/09/gxp-ready-no-code-paas-iot-self-serve-manufacturing-apps
10. https://parsec-corp.com/blog/low-code-no-code-mes
11. https://www.adesso.ch/en/news/blog/development-and-validation-of-low-no-code-applications-in-gxp.jsp
12. https://www.mastercontrol.com/glossary-page/low-code-no-code-platform
13. https://www.nnit.com/our-solutions/manufacturing-supply-chain/low-code-in-life-sciences-manufacturing/low-code-article-validation
14. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-11
15. https://qmsdoc.com/2026/01/29/the-birth-of-21-cfr-part-11-a-historical-perspective
16. https://health.ec.europa.eu/document/download/8d305550-dd22-4dad-8463-2ddb4a1345f1_en?filename=annex11_01-2011_en.pdf
17. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/postmarket-requirements-devices/quality-management-system-regulation-qmsr
18. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-D/section-211.68
19. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-H/part-820
20. https://www.mastercontrol.com/gxp-lifeline/connected-qms-mes-benefits-digital-transformation-in-manufacturing
21. https://quixy.com/blog/no-code-low-code-in-pharmaceuticals-industry
22. https://www.mendix.com/evaluation-guide/governance/risk-control/mitigate-data-risk
23. https://tulip.co/platform/validation

24. https://resources.sw.siemens.com/et-EE/infographic-low-code-development-accelerates-pharmaceutical-manufacturing
25. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/part-11-electronic-records-electronic-signatures-scope-and-application
26. https://www.mendix.com/customer-stories/a-prescription-for-innovation-in-biopharmaceutical-manufacturing
27. https://docs.mendix.com/appstore/modules/audit-trail
28. https://9nexus.com/how-mendix-helps-build-scalable-quality-management-systems-qms-in-pharma
29. https://intellect.com/platform/quality-management
30. https://intellect.com/platform/apps
31. https://forms2mobile.com/blog/7-industry-enterprise-low-code-platform-statistics
32. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0164121224003443
33. https://www.casestudies.com/company/outsystems/case-study/pharma-subsidiary-re-platforms-legacy-apps-faster-with-outsystems
34. https://www.outsystems.com/case-studies/pharma-co-replatforms-legacy-apps
35. https://press.siemens.com/global/en/pressrelease/siemens-strengthens-its-digital-enterprise-leadership-acquisition-mendix
36. https://press.siemens.com/global/en/event/press-conference-mindsphere-january-2018
37. https://ifelsecloud.com/mes-for-pharmaceuticals-industry

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.