



INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Opentrons Flex CRS vs Tecan Fluent Gx: Validation Compared

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 · 2026-10-13 · opentrons flex crs vs tecan fluent gx · opentrons flex · compliance ready software · tecan fluent gx · gx assurance · 21 cfr part 11 · liquid handling validation · gxp laboratory automation · audit trails

Original article: <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/opentrons-flex-crs-vs-tecan-fluent-gx>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction and Background
 3. Opentrons Flex with Compliance Ready Software
 4. Tecan Fluent Gx with Gx Assurance
 5. Feature Comparison
 6. Performance and Benchmarks
 7. Data Analysis and Evidence
 8. Implications and Future Directions
 9. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
 10. Conclusion
-

Executive Summary

Opentrons Flex CRS vs Tecan Fluent Gx is principally an intended-use and validation-evidence decision. Opentrons explicitly positions its **Compliance Ready Software (CRS)** for **non-GMP regulated environments**, including good laboratory practice (GLP) and good clinical practice (GCP) laboratories. ([opentrons.com](https://www.opentrons.com)) Tecan markets **Fluent Gx** for clinical, good manufacturing practice (**GMP**), and quality control (**QC**) facilities, while its configuration caveats still require a buyer-specific intended-use assessment. (www.tecan.com) Neither vendor's positioning establishes that a laboratory's complete workflow is compliant. The applicable records and the validated process drive the decision. (www.fda.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

The current CRS instruction manual establishes a **Flex 10.0.0** starting baseline. (docs.opentrons.com) The launch release projected **August 2026** general availability; this research did not retrieve a separate confirmation that the planned availability date occurred. ([opentrons.com](https://www.opentrons.com)) A procurement team should obtain the orderable configuration and supported software versions before commitment. Risk-based validation should follow the intended use. (www.fda.gov) For Tecan, the current public software portal lists **FluentControl 3.9**. (www.tecan.com) Its documentation describes Gx Assurance electronic signatures and record-integrity checking, with licensing and configuration conditions. (www.tecan.com) Availability of a control should therefore be distinguished from its enabled, tested behavior.

Retention deserves particular attention. The detailed CRS manual says that Flex does not store audit logs locally by default and describes export after runs. It separately documents default automatic deletion when protocol run storage reaches **20 records**. (docs.opentrons.com) These are different record classes, not a universal retention period. For either platform, the buyer should specify the authoritative repository, export verification, access permissions, retention schedule, and recovery evidence. Retention should cover the applicable underlying record requirements. (www.ecfr.gov) The United States electronic-record regulation ties **audit-trail retention** to the corresponding record's retention requirement. (www.ecfr.gov)

The decision supported by the retrieved evidence is conditional: evaluate Flex CRS for its stated non-GMP research scope; give Fluent Gx priority in a GMP/QC shortlist, subject to the selected configuration and validated application. Require the same representative protocol, exception scenarios, and restore

demonstration from each vendor. Instrument qualification supports, but does not replace, analytical-method validation. (doi.usp.org) The report provides a control matrix, a requirements-to-test table, and a quote-normalized worksheet. It establishes no independently measured head-to-head throughput advantage or configured total-cost ranking.

Introduction and Background

The useful starting point for regulated liquid handling is the **intended electronic record**. A protocol file, an execution log, an instrument audit trail, a sample result, and an approval signature can have different purposes. Before comparing robots, quality assurance (**QA**) and information technology (**IT**) should decide which records support the regulated activity and which system holds the authoritative version. The United States Food and Drug Administration (**FDA**) recommends determining Part 11 records from the applicable **predicate rules**, meaning the underlying requirements that require those records. (www.fda.gov)

Title 21 Code of Federal Regulations Part 11 concerns electronic records and electronic signatures within its scope. FDA's scope guidance describes electronic records used in place of required paper records and recommends documenting the organization's reliance on electronic or paper records. (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov) That guidance is nonbinding; it should not be confused with the regulation itself. (www.fda.gov) A product described as Part 11-ready therefore needs a documented application assessment rather than an automatic compliance label.

Good laboratory practice (GLP), **good clinical practice (GCP)**, and GMP/QC should not be treated as interchangeable intended uses. The United States GLP study-conduct rule addresses changes to automated data entries. (www.ecfr.gov) The GMP equipment rule addresses written calibration or checking programs and computer-related controls. (www.ecfr.gov) Clinical electronic systems also have dedicated FDA guidance. (www.fda.gov) QA and regulatory specialists should identify the applicable framework before procurement narrows the alternatives.

This report uses public sources retrieved for an **October 2026** publication assessment. Vendor documentation establishes documented capabilities; proposed tests and purchasing criteria below are analyst recommendations, not observed product results. Public documentation cannot establish a customer's installed configuration.

IntuitionLabs' first-party site describes enterprise implementation and integration services. (intuitionlabs.ai) That adjacent advisory perspective informs the emphasis on record boundaries, interfaces, and accountable operation here. The comparison itself concerns the two third-party platforms. Hardware capacity matters when it changes the validated process, but it is not a substitute for demonstrating record controls. Equipment suitability should be assessed through integrated, risk-based qualification. (doi.usp.org)

Opentrons Flex with Compliance Ready Software

Capabilities

CRS introduces governed operation on Flex. Its manual describes **Service, Admin, and User** roles; ordinary users can run protocols and view files, while default permissions reserve additional administrative actions. (docs.opentrons.com) (docs.opentrons.com) Procurement should translate these roles into the laboratory's actual responsibilities: protocol developer, routine operator, reviewer, account administrator, and service technician. A role name alone does not establish appropriate separation of duties. Part 11 limits access to authorized individuals. (www.ecfr.gov)

The documented security changes include permanently disabling **Quick Transfer**. (docs.opentrons.com) The manual also describes lockdown of interactive access paths such as Jupyter and Secure Shell (**SSH**). (docs.opentrons.com) This changes the practical automation boundary. A buyer should obtain written confirmation that its planned orchestration and development pathways remain supported after activation, especially where research teams currently depend on interactive instrument access.

Run completion has a documented approval checkpoint: administrator signing is the default. (docs.opentrons.com) Administrator settings can change whether administrator credentials are required for signing and other activities. (docs.opentrons.com) Consequently, the validation baseline should preserve a signed configuration record, not merely a screenshot showing that the feature exists. Required controls must survive account changes, software updates, and routine operations. Acceptance should address consistent intended performance. (www.ecfr.gov)

Adoption and Implementation Evidence

The retrieved evidence establishes public CRS manuals and an installation process, rather than a measured adoption rate for regulated deployments. The announcement's availability statement is discussed above. Neither an existing Flex installation nor a demonstration appointment proves the availability of a particular CRS package.

For a purchasing file, request:

- **Configuration:** Orderable robot and software identifiers, supported versions, and enabled options.
- **Installation:** Activation procedure, acceptance prerequisites, and responsibility for site preparation.
- **Validation evidence:** Supplier requirements, test summaries, known limitations, and deliverable revision identifiers.
- **Records:** A complete export package from the proposed configuration, with verification instructions.
- **Support:** Service-access controls, update policy, and responsibilities after hardware replacement.

These requests follow a supplier-evidence approach rather than requiring the lab to recreate every vendor development test. The International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering (**ISPE**) discussion of **Good Automated Manufacturing Practice (GAMP)** includes using supplier documentation and automated testing tools. (ispe.org) The relevance and adequacy of that evidence still need assessment. A risk-based equipment approach brings qualification and maintenance into the same lifecycle. (eurachem.org)

Strengths and Limitations

The distinguishing benefit is a documented governed operating mode within the vendor's stated non-GMP research scope. Its practical limitation is that the laboratory must design the surrounding record lifecycle. Downloadability, retention, deletion permissions, and review procedures should be assessed separately. The file manual also permits downloads before login; operational access and record-download access should be evaluated separately. (docs.opentrons.com)

The detailed manual should take precedence over a broad interpretation of the launch announcement's local-retention wording. Default export behavior is not proof of a validated long-term archive. Record copies need to preserve content and meaning. (www.fda.gov) Nor should absence of a public integration specification be interpreted as proof that integration is impossible. Treat unresolved requirements as questions for a configuration-specific demonstration and contract.

Tecan Fluent Gx with Gx Assurance

Capabilities

Tecan describes **Gx Assurance** as providing user management, electronic signatures, and method approval. (lifesciences.tecan.com) These controls address related but distinct needs: who can access the system, who can authorize a method, and who attests to a record. The laboratory should define approval meaning and determine whether a method can be modified after approval without a fresh review.

The current FluentControl ReadMe describes a licensed **Data Audit Tool** that checks electronic records over a date range, including database and audit-log validity and missing or unexpected files. (www.tecan.com) This offers a specific vendor-evidence item for an acceptance demonstration. It should be tested using representative data, not treated as proof that every downstream archive or interface is covered. Process acceptance should include complete record copies. (www.ecfr.gov)

Tecan's published guidance also identifies configuration-dependent intended use and research-only options. (www.tecan.com) **GMP/QC positioning** should therefore be evaluated at the configured-system level. The chosen liquid-handling heads, devices, software licenses, and accessories belong in the intended-use review.

Adoption and Implementation Evidence

The current manual portal assigns laboratories responsibility for selecting the latest applicable manual. (www.tecan.com) This matters because product names can remain stable while identity administration, software features, and supported integrations change. A proposal should identify its exact documentation set and release baseline. Lifecycle qualification also addresses requalification and decommissioning. (eurachem.org)

Tecan's published services describe operational qualification (**OQ**) against equipment limits and tolerances. (www.tecan.com) Its current software declaration states that Tecan performs installation qualification (**IQ**) and OQ at installation and assigns application-specific performance qualification (**PQ**) to the customer. (www.tecan.com) Those responsibilities should be reflected in the statement of work.

The buying team should request:

- **Qualification scope:** Executed IQ/OQ protocols and the exact configurations they cover.
- **Application scope:** Protocol development, liquid classes, tips, and acceptance criteria.
- **License scope:** Gx Assurance and any sample-tracking or interface options.
- **Record scope:** Data Audit Tool coverage, signature configuration, and export format.
- **Lifecycle scope:** Updates, identity services, service access, and periodic evaluation.

Strengths and Limitations

The evidence supports evaluating Fluent Gx where method approval, qualification deliverables, and GMP/QC application requirements are central. It does not support treating the supplier's qualification as the laboratory's completed process validation. Tecan's own qualification discussion distinguishes equipment qualification from a particular application or sample. (www.tecan.com)

The main purchasing uncertainty is scope, not a publicly verified configured price. Obtain a bill of materials and deliverable list that identifies every required option. A backup-capable export should be assessed separately from a demonstrated restore. Product capability, contract scope, and application acceptance should converge before release to routine operation. Intended-use risk should determine the depth of operational assurance. (ispe.org)

Feature Comparison

Scope, Records, and Controls

Table 1 compares selected documented controls with the evidence the buyer should obtain. “Confirm” identifies an unresolved procurement or validation question, not a negative product finding.

Decision area	Flex with CRS	Fluent Gx / Gx Assurance	Buyer evidence
Intended-use gate	Vendor expressly describes non-GMP regulated use. (opentrons.com)	General laboratory platform with configuration-dependent intended use. (www.tecan.com)	Signed intended-use statement matching the application, devices, and record framework.
Protocol governance	App import is distinct from permission to send a protocol to the robot. (docs.opentrons.com)	Optional method approval limits routine activity to approved methods. (lifesciences.tecan.com)	Demonstrate development, approval, modification, rejection, and execution permissions.
Audit and signatures	Audit logs have documented periods associated with completed runs or boot events. (docs.opentrons.com)	Changes require reasons and credentials under the documented signature configuration. (www.tecan.com)	Export a complete event sequence and verify the actor, time, action, reason, and approval meaning.
Retention and transfer	Download location is configurable; confirm the validated repository. (docs.opentrons.com)	Data Audit Tool export supports auditing, backup, and archiving. (www.tecan.com)	Define record classes, retention duration, transfer checks, deletion rules, and restore acceptance.
Interfaces and access	Confirm the supported governed integration boundary after CRS activation.	Sample-tracking logs can be uploaded to a laboratory information management system (LIMS). (lifesciences.tecan.com)	Identify licensed interfaces, sample identifiers, retry behavior, ownership, and reconciliation.

Decision area	Flex with CRS	Fluent Gx / Gx Assurance	Buyer evidence
Qualification	Flex service documentation identifies IQ after setup, new hardware, or servicing. (docs.opentrons.com)	Tecan describes equipment qualification and subsequent analytical-method validation. (www.tecan.com)	Obtain current package scope and map remaining application tests to laboratory responsibilities.

The matrix does not count features to produce a winner. Protocol approval and permission to send a protocol are different mechanisms. Likewise, an instrument audit log and a LIMS sample history describe different objects. A buyer should compare the complete controlled workflow rather than treat similar terminology as identical implementation. The method assessment should include sample handling. (www.eurachem.org)

Electronic Signatures and Review

Part 11 specifies signature manifestations including signing identity, date and time, and meaning. (www.ecfr.gov) A cryptographic signature that verifies a file and an individual's approval signature can serve different purposes. During evaluation, ask the vendor to show both the tamper-detection result and the human approval record, including their association with the retained execution data.

The regulation also specifies unique individual electronic signatures. (www.ecfr.gov) Establish how identities are issued, reviewed, disabled, and preserved in historic records. Test whether removing an account affects interpretation of its earlier actions. Interpretability should also be considered when generating retained copies. (www.fda.gov) These are proposed acceptance checks, not findings about either product.

For audit trails, Part 11 specifies secure, computer-generated, time-stamped recording and preservation of previously recorded information. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) Reviewability is therefore an acceptance objective. A reviewer should be able to reconstruct a meaningful run history without joining unrelated exports manually or relying on undocumented assumptions.

URS-to-Test Traceability

A **user requirements specification (URS)** expresses the laboratory's intended behavior and acceptance criteria. European Union (EU) GMP Annex 11 calls for traceability of requirements across the system lifecycle. (health.ec.europa.eu) Table 2 is an analyst-proposed starting matrix, not a vendor protocol or a complete regulatory checklist.

URS requirement	Proposed test	Evidence to retain	Acceptance owner
Authorized operation	Attempt the same workflow as developer, operator, reviewer, and disabled account.	Permission baseline, attempt results, relevant audit events.	QA and system owner.
Approved method execution	Change a controlled protocol, then attempt routine execution before renewed approval.	Approved version, revised file, authorization outcome.	Method owner and QA.
Complete run history	Complete a normal run and a run with a controlled exception.	Protocol, parameters, events, reasons, output and review.	Laboratory lead.

URS requirement	Proposed test	Evidence to retain	Acceptance owner
Complete record copies	Export the record and compare its content, meaning, identifiers, and relationships with the source.	Reconciliation record and export-verification result.	Records owner and IT.
Retention and recovery	Restore a representative retained package into an authorized review environment.	Backup manifest, recovery result, metadata comparison.	IT and QA.
Controlled changes	Update an allowed setting under change control and repeat affected tests.	Impact assessment, configuration record, test evidence.	System owner and QA.

Traceability makes omissions visible. A supplied IQ/OQ package can satisfy some requirements, but a gap remains wherever the laboratory's record boundary or process differs. FDA recommends risk-based validation, while ISPE emphasizes tailoring operational activity to system risk and complexity. (www.fda.gov) (ispe.org) The justification should explain why the selected test depth is adequate.

Performance and Benchmarks

A Representative Protocol Demonstration

A procurement demonstration should exercise the intended application rather than maximize nominal pipetting speed. Use the same sample preparation objective, relevant liquid types, labware, tips, and review expectations. Record setup effort, run execution, exception handling, export, review, and recovery separately. Results should be reported as a local evaluation, with no extrapolation beyond the tested configuration. ISO's performance standard includes evaluation and reporting requirements. (www.iso.org)

Automated liquid-handling metrology has its own standards context. International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard **23783** concerns installed automated systems, including tips and essential components. (www.iso.org) Volumetric-performance procedures include measurement uncertainty and traceability. (www.iso.org) A test should therefore reflect the complete system that will execute the validated method.

Recommended demonstration inputs are:

- **Protocol identity:** The controlled file, revision identifier, approval status, and run parameters.
- **Material identity:** Relevant lots, sample identifiers, liquid properties, tips, and labware.
- **Physical conditions:** Instrument condition and laboratory environment.
- **Operator identity:** Roles and responsibilities for execution and review.
- **Output package:** Scientific outputs, audit history, errors, approval, and transfer evidence.
- **Acceptance criteria:** Application-specific accuracy, precision, carryover, recovery, and record completeness.

The environment belongs in this baseline because the ISO automated-system standard includes environmental requirements. (www.iso.org) The specific limits should come from the applicable method and instrument documentation, not from an invented universal threshold.

Exceptions and Restore Tests

Normal operation proves only part of the process. Run controlled exception scenarios and retain the resulting record package. Risk assessment should connect the test depth to the application. (www.fda.gov) The following are **proposed tests**, not observed failures:

- **Pause:** Identify when the instrument stops and whether documentation precedes the pause.
- **Cancellation:** Confirm final run status and distinguish partial results from completed results.
- **Manual intervention:** Record who performed the step and how the workflow resumed.
- **Recovery choice:** Exercise approved retry, skip, or cancel pathways where supported.
- **Export interruption:** Determine how an incomplete transfer is detected and reconciled.
- **Storage threshold:** Verify the configured behavior when storage or retention limits are reached.
- **Account recovery:** Confirm authorized recovery and continuity of historical attribution.
- **Restore:** Reconstruct a retained run, including signatures and metadata, for review.

CRS documentation states that a normal pause occurs after confirmation of the documentation prompt. (docs.opentrons.com) That sequence makes pause timing a meaningful demonstration question. It should be included in the local risk assessment wherever timing could affect the sample process.

For the external record repository, The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (**CISA**) recommends restoration from offline, encrypted backups according to service priorities. (www.cisa.gov) The World Health Organization (**WHO**) separately recommends validating backup and restoration processes. (cdn.who.int) Neither source establishes that a robot supplies the complete recovery arrangement. The laboratory should define the recovery objective, responsible owner, and evidence required to accept the restored record. Data entered into applicable GMP computer systems also has a backup requirement, subject to the rule's stated exception. (www.ecfr.gov)

Measuring Scientific Performance

Define volumetric **bias** as the difference between mean measured volume and target volume. Define the **coefficient of variation (CV)** as the standard deviation divided by the mean, expressed as a percentage. These are measurement conventions used here for the proposed evaluation; no product-specific result is inferred.

Accuracy and repeatability should be measured at the actual method's relevant volumes and liquids. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (**NIST**) describes both gravimetric and volume-transfer calibration procedures. (www.nist.gov) Specify the measurement method, reference equipment, environmental corrections, and uncertainty treatment before interpreting the results.

Calibration traceability is not a blanket assurance of suitability. NIST explicitly distinguishes traceability from fitness for purpose. (www.nist.gov) A precise dispense can still be unsuitable if the validated assay needs a different acceptance range, sample matrix, or handling sequence. Similarly, an apparently fast run does not establish an efficient reviewed-record workflow.

The American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (**A2LA**) distinguishes a technical method standard from the framework for demonstrating laboratory competence. (a2la.org) Buyers should ask what was tested, by whom, with what uncertainty and acceptance criteria. A certificate's title is insufficient to establish coverage of

the laboratory's intended method.

Data Analysis and Evidence

What the Public Evidence Quantifies

The available quantitative evidence is mostly **version, configuration, and measurement-method evidence**, not comparative operating economics. The CRS manual's default protocol-record maximum is **20**; that number concerns stored run records, not a validated retention duration or every audit-log class. (docs.opentrons.com) FluentControl's current public portal lists **3.9**, which is a documentation baseline rather than proof of the release installed in a quotation. (www.tecan.com)

ISO's automated liquid-handling series includes **ISO 23783-1:2022**, **23783-2:2022**, and **23783-3:2022**, covering requirements, performance determination, and evaluation/reporting respectively. (www.iso.org) (www.iso.org) The separate **ISO 8655-1:2022** addresses piston-operated volumetric apparatus. (www.iso.org) Buyers should specify the applicable system and test scope instead of assuming a generic pipette certificate answers the automated-system question.

A peer-reviewed dispensing study provides a useful methodological example: volumetric accuracy was checked every **10 days over 30 days**. (pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) This report uses that schedule only to illustrate longitudinal verification. It is not a Flex-versus-Fluent benchmark, and its public abstract does not provide a complete replicate count. No product ranking follows from it. Traceable measurements still need sufficiently suitable uncertainty for their use. (www.nist.gov) (www.nist.gov)

For a local comparison, report:

- **Sample size:** Replicates, channels, positions, batches, and observation periods.
- **Scope:** Liquid, target volume, hardware, software, tips, and laboratory conditions.
- **Error:** Bias, CV, uncertainty, and the handling of excluded measurements.
- **Time:** Setup, execution, intervention, export, review, and repeat work.
- **Evidence quality:** Who measured the result and whether either vendor sponsored the study.

Eurachem explicitly includes sample handling in method validation. (www.eurachem.org) Its follow-up guidance also includes use of performance data in internal quality control. (www.eurachem.org) These points support evaluating the sample process over time rather than accepting a single successful demonstration.

Quote-Normalized Cost Worksheet

No configured price or recurring-license comparison was established from the retrieved sources. *Table 3* is a buyer-populated worksheet. It should contain values from actual written quotations only. Procurement is part of the equipment lifecycle addressed by Eurachem. (eurachem.org)

Cost component	Flex CRS quote field	Fluent Gx quote field	Normalization rule
Instrument and heads	Enter robot, heads, gripper and required modules.	Enter workstation, heads, handling devices and modules.	Use configurations that deliver the same intended process.

Cost component	Flex CRS quote field	Fluent Gx quote field	Normalization rule
Software and interfaces	Enter CRS, licenses and supported interfaces.	Enter FluentControl, Gx Assurance and required add-ons.	Identify included, recurring and optional charges separately.
Installation and training	Enter included work and additional site services.	Enter included work and additional site services.	Count included work once; document buyer prerequisites.
Qualification and application work	Enter executed qualification and protocol-development deliverables.	Enter executed qualification and protocol-development deliverables.	Compare deliverables and customer work, not package names.
Service and consumables	Enter support, planned service and method-specific consumables.	Enter support, planned service and method-specific consumables.	Apply the same workload and agreed evaluation horizon.
Records and lifecycle	Enter archive, integration, recovery and change-assessment costs.	Enter archive, integration, recovery and change-assessment costs.	Include the complete validated record boundary.

The CRS activation manual says its software price includes installation, activation, and training. (docs.opentrons.com) Tecan's installation guidance makes application support an ordered scope item. (www.tecan.com) These statements help prevent double counting but do not establish configured totals.

Calculate acquisition cost as the sum of quoted initial components. Calculate recurring cost over the agreed horizon from quoted licensing, service, consumables, and repository charges. Add separately estimated customer implementation labor, identifying assumptions and rates. Report both cash expenditure and laboratory effort; do not convert vendor marketing ratios into independently established savings.

Implications and Future Directions

Validation Ownership and Change Control

The laboratory should assign owners for the method, instrument, computerized system, retained records, and interfaces. Validation should address the installed configuration and actual use. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (**OECD**) GLP computerized-system guidance expects formal test-facility acceptance of vendor-supplied systems. (www.oecd.org) This is compatible with using adequate supplier evidence; it does not transfer the laboratory's acceptance decision to the supplier.

For clinical workflows, the International Council for Harmonisation (**ICH**) guideline **E6(R3)** recommends appropriate validation before system use. (database.ich.org) Clinical-trial audit-trail review should also follow the trial's risk assessment, according to the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (**MHRA**) explanation. (mhrainspectorate.blog.gov.uk) The relevant evidence should therefore follow the purpose of the records, not simply the physical location of the robot.

Recommended lifecycle controls include:

- **Baseline:** Preserve approved software, hardware, permissions, settings, and method versions.
- **Impact assessment:** Review changes to liquid classes, tips, labware, protocols, and interfaces.

- **Supplier evidence:** Evaluate applicability of development tests and qualification deliverables.
- **Regression:** Repeat tests affected by the change, including record generation and export.
- **Release:** Obtain accountable approval before the changed workflow enters routine use.
- **Monitoring:** Review performance, audit events, support changes, and retention execution.
- **Retirement:** Preserve interpretable records and an authorized retrieval route.

Eurachem's equipment guidance covers purchasing through maintenance, requalification, and decommissioning. (eurachem.org) The United States Pharmacopeia (**USP**) likewise recommends risk-based qualification to establish fitness for purpose. (doi.usp.org) These sources support a lifecycle plan rather than a one-time installation milestone.

Integration and Record Ownership

A LIMS or **electronic laboratory notebook (ELN)** connection should be treated as a defined boundary with its own acceptance criteria. Specify identifiers, transferred objects, retries, timestamps, reconciliation, and review responsibilities. An instrument-side control does not establish the downstream record's meaning or completeness. FDA recommends record copies that preserve content and meaning. (www.fda.gov)

IntuitionLabs describes data pipelines, integration, warehousing, and business intelligence among its services. (intuitionlabs.ai) That adjacent perspective supports assessing the retained record across the instrument and enterprise systems. It does not supply evidence of either vendor's configured interface or validation status.

Regulatory sources should also be version-controlled. The European Commission consultation page labels revised Annex 11 material as draft guidance. (health.ec.europa.eu) A draft should not be presented as an adopted replacement solely because it appears online. The Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (**PIC/S**) describes its data-management guidance as clarifying risk and regulatory expectations. (picscheme.org) Site procedures should identify which applicable documents informed acceptance.

Fit Decision Tree

Apply the following sequence before commercial scoring:

- **Classify intended use:** For the documented non-GMP research scope, retain CRS as a candidate.
- **Assess GMP/QC needs:** Prioritize a configuration-specific Fluent Gx assessment when those requirements govern.
- **Define required records:** Identify originals, copies, approvals, audit trails, and retention owners.
- **Check interfaces:** Require evidence that the proposed controlled architecture supports the intended connections.
- **Close evidence gaps:** Obtain versioned deliverables and complete the representative tests.
- **Compare quotes:** Normalize configurations, included services, customer labor, and recurring obligations.
- **Release the process:** Approve the validated workflow, training, and record-management procedures.

This is a fit screen, not a universal ranking. A platform should advance because its demonstrated configuration satisfies the intended process and record requirements, with a manageable implementation scope.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Does Flex CRS Automatically Establish Part 11 Compliance?

No automatic conclusion follows from a software label. Part 11 closed-system controls include validation for accurate, reliable intended performance. (www.ecfr.gov) The lab needs a scoped record assessment, an approved configuration, operating procedures, and retained validation evidence. CRS should be evaluated within its documented non-GMP intended scope.

Is Fluent Gx Automatically Suitable for Every GMP or Clinical Workflow?

The vendor's GMP/QC positioning establishes a reason to evaluate it, not an unconditional application approval. Tecan states that options can affect intended use. (www.tecan.com) Obtain a configuration-specific intended-use statement and match supplier qualification evidence to the laboratory's process.

Are Signed Audit Logs Enough?

Signed logs can help establish record authenticity, but a reviewable record also needs context, identifiers, approvals, retention, and complete copies. Part 11 calls for accurate and complete human-readable and electronic copies. (www.ecfr.gov) Test the complete package and signature association rather than only whether a downloaded file opens.

Which Has the Lower Validated Cost?

The retrieved evidence does not establish that answer. Use the quote worksheet, include the complete record boundary, and measure customer implementation effort during the pilot. Different qualification and application-support scopes can materially change what a headline quote includes.

Conclusion

The strongest answer to **Opentrons Flex CRS vs Tecan Fluent Gx validation** begins with the required process and records. Flex CRS warrants evaluation for the vendor's stated non-GMP research scope. Fluent Gx warrants priority consideration for a GMP/QC shortlist, with configuration-dependent intended use and application validation still assessed.

The meaningful comparison concerns permission to execute controlled methods, interpretability of audit history, approval meaning, completeness of exports, retention, and demonstrated recovery. Similar feature names should not obscure different control mechanisms or responsibility boundaries.

Public documentation supplies useful starting evidence, including CRS defaults and Tecan's qualification responsibilities. It does not establish a customer's current configuration, an August availability confirmation, a complete retention design, or comparative operating economics. Those uncertainties should become written procurement questions and acceptance tests.

QA, laboratory operations, IT, and procurement should agree on the URS before selecting the package. They should then compare supplier deliverables, execute a matched representative protocol, examine exceptions, and verify the retained record. Supplier documentation can support that work where its scope is adequate.

(ispe.org) Quote normalization should follow that scope.

The decision becomes defensible when each requirement has an owner and an evidence-backed acceptance result. Risk-based qualification provides a foundation for that assessment. (doi.usp.org) The appropriate selection is the configuration that meets the intended regulated workflow with a supportable lifecycle, rather than the product carrying the broadest compliance wording.

Source links

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

1. <https://opentrons.com/archives/news/opentrons-launches-compliance-ready-software-for-the-opentrons-flex-at-slas-europe-2026>
2. https://www.tecan.com/hubfs/HubDB/Te-DocDB/pdf/BR_Fluent_Gx_400401.pdf
3. <https://www.tecan.com/blog/liquid-handling-in-a-regulated-lab-5-automation-must-haves>
4. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/part-11-electronic-records-electronic-signatures-scope-and-application>
5. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-11>
6. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/>
7. <https://www.tecan.com/knowledge-portal/fluentcontrol-software-manual>
8. <https://www.tecan.com/hubfs/Knowledgebase/Manuals/Fluent%20Control/ReadMe%20FluentControl%203.9.pdf?hsLang=en>
9. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/using/files/>
10. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/audit-trails-21-cfr-part-11-annex-11-compliance>
11. https://doi.usp.org/USPNF/USPNF_M99963_04_01.html
12. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/21-cfr-part-11-electronic-records-signatures-overview>
13. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-58/section-58.130>
14. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211/subpart-D/section-211.68>
15. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/electronic-systems-electronic-records-and-electronic-signatures-clinical-investigations-questions>
16. <https://intuitionlabs.ai>
17. https://doi.usp.org/USPNF/USPNF_M1124_01_01.html
18. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/roles/>
19. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/features/security/>
20. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/using/complete/>
21. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/features/admin/>
22. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/gamp-5-computerized-system-validation-pharma>
23. <https://ispe.org/topics/gamp>
24. <https://eurachem.org/index.php/publications/guides/gd-aesq>
25. <https://lifesciences.tecan.com/fluent-laboratory-automation-workstation?p=tab--4>
26. <https://www.tecan.com/knowledge-portal/fluent-gx-manuals>

27. <https://www.tecan.com/services>
28. https://www.tecan.com/hubfs/Knowledgebase/Manuals/Fluent%20Control/FluentControl_3.9_Declaration_of_Verification_1.0.pdf?hsLang=en
29. <https://www.tecan.com/blog/iq-oq-pq-for-instruments-and-pipette-tips-for-validated-liquid-handling>
30. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/using/running/>
31. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/settings/>
32. <https://docs.opentrons.com/flex/maintenance/service/>
33. <https://www.eurachem.org/index.php/3-publications/guides/144-gdmv2014>
34. https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/annex11_01-2011_en_0.pdf
35. <https://www.iso.org/standard/76959.html>
36. <https://www.iso.org/standard/76958.html>
37. <https://www.iso.org/standard/76952.html>
38. <https://www.cisa.gov/stopransomware/ransomware-guide>
39. https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/medicines/norms-and-standards/guidelines/inspections/trs1033-annex4-guideline-on-data-integrity.pdf?download=true&sfvrsn=6218a4e6_4
40. <https://www.nist.gov/publications/nistir-7383-selected-procedures-volumetric-calibrations-2019-ed>
41. <https://www.nist.gov/calibrations/traceability>
42. <https://a2la.org/iso-23783-and-automated-liquid-handling-systems/>
43. <https://www.iso.org/standard/68796.html>
44. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42229725/>
45. <https://docs.opentrons.com/compliance-ready-software/activation/>
46. <https://www.tecan.com/welcome-to-tecan-liquidhandling>
47. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2016/04/application-of-glp-principles-to-computerised-systems_7d05366e/e3c9cda5-en.pdf
48. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_E6%28R3%29_Step4_FinalGuideline_2025_0106.pdf
49. <https://mhrainspectorate.blog.gov.uk/2019/03/06/mhra-gxp-data-integrity-guidance-part-1-a-gcp-perspective/>
50. https://health.ec.europa.eu/consultations/stakeholders-consultation-eudralex-volume-4-good-manufacturing-practice-guidelines-chapter-4-annex_en
51. <https://picscheme.org/en/news/adoption-and-entry-into-force-of-pics-guidance-on-good-pract>

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.