IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Pharma AI Procurement: RFP Template & Evaluation Guide

> 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 · 2026-04-16 · pharma ai procurement · rfp template · vendor evaluation scorecard · ai governance · fda compliance · gxp standards · healthcare ai

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharma-ai-procurement-rfp-template-scorecard



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Pharmaceutical Industry Trends and AI Adoption
4. The Pharmaceutical AI Procurement Landscape
5. RFP Fundamentals: Designing a Pharma AI RFP Template
6. Purpose and Scope of an AI RFP
7. Key Components of an AI RFP
8. Best Practices for RFP Preparation
9. Vendor Evaluation Scorecard and Criteria
10. Criteria Categories
11. Weighted Scoring Approach
12. Example Scorecard Criteria (Pharma AI Focus)
13. Data Analysis and Evidence
14. Case Studies and Industry Perspectives
15. Challenges, Risks, and Considerations
16. Future Directions and Implications
17. Conclusion
18. References

Executive Summary

The procurement of AI solutions in the pharmaceutical (pharma) sector is emerging as a mission-critical discipline, demanding structured approaches to vendor selection, risk management, and compliance. The rise of AI as an industry priority in pharma is well documented: surveys of industry leaders report that over 85% of top pharmaceutical executives consider AI an “immediate priority,” with roughly 80% planning to increase their AI budgets (www.forbes.com) (www.fiercepharma.com). Driven by use cases in drug discovery, clinical trials, supply chain optimization, and operations, AI projects promise significant cost and time savings. However, the complexity of AI technologies, combined with stringent regulatory and data privacy requirements in pharma, means that unstructured procurement can lead to costly mistakes.

This report provides an in-depth analysis of the **“Pharma AI Procurement”** process, focusing on *RFP (Request for Proposal) template design* and *vendor evaluation scorecards*. First, we outline the context: the unique challenges and drivers in pharmaceutical procurement of AI. We review the current landscape of AI adoption in pharma, highlighting industry statistics and trends. Next, we delve into the fundamentals of RFPs for AI projects: their role, typical components, and best practices for drafting an effective RFP. We present a detailed RFP template structure, emphasizing sections such as project scope, data and technical requirements, compliance needs, and evaluation criteria.

Then, we examine **vendor evaluation** in depth. We describe how procurement teams can build *weighted scorecards* to compare AI vendors objectively. We discuss criteria categories – technical capability, regulatory compliance, data handling, security, cost, service/support, and business value – and how to assign weights reflecting strategic priorities (wicely.com) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). A sample scorecard table is provided, illustrating how vendors might be scored and ranked against these criteria. We draw on best-practice frameworks from procurement literature, noting that a rigorous scorecard with clearly defined "qualification" (pass/fail) and "differentiation" (scored) criteria helps ensure consistency (wicely.com).

Our analysis is grounded in data and case studies. We incorporate industry findings (e.g. efficiency gains from AI in procurement), expert guidance, and real-world examples. McKinsey research suggests that AI-driven "procurement agents" could boost overall procurement efficiency by 25–40%, freeing staff to focus on strategic decisions (www.mckinsey.com). We cite reports and articles from credible sources (industry surveys, academic research, news outlets) wherever available to support our claims.

The report also covers critical considerations unique to pharma: ensuring adherence to regulations like FDA and EU AI Act guidelines (www.fda.gov) (validfor.com), addressing data privacy (HIPAA, GDPR), and integrating quality systems (GxP) into vendor processes. We discuss perspectives from procurement managers, technical teams, and risk/compliance officers. Finally, we address future trends: how emerging AI governance frameworks and evolving regulation will affect procurement, and how pharma organizations can "future-proof" their AI vendor strategies.

In conclusion, procuring AI in pharma requires a structured, transparent RFP and evaluation process that balances innovation with risk controls. By employing a comprehensive RFP template and a disciplined scorecard, organizations can make defensible, high-impact vendor selections that align with both current and future needs.

Introduction and Background

The global pharmaceutical industry is at a **pivotal inflection point** in adopting artificial intelligence (AI). Fueled by powerful advances in machine learning, pharma companies are increasingly integrating AI across drug discovery, clinical development, manufacturing, and commercialization. Substantial investments are being made: a Define Ventures survey of 16 of the top 20 pharmaceutical companies reports that *over 85%* of surveyed executives now view AI as an "immediate priority" (www.forbes.com) (www.fiercepharma.com). Most respondents are expanding their AI budgets substantially (www.fiercepharma.com). This reflects the high stakes – leading firms recognize that AI-driven improvements (e.g. in predictive modeling or process optimization) can significantly cut costs and accelerate timelines.

Simultaneously, procurement functions themselves are **evolving under digital disruption**. Traditional procurement – once a tactical, paper-driven department – is becoming a strategic engine for innovation and value creation. Industry analysts note that leading procurement teams are applying AI across the source-to-pay lifecycle, transforming supplier scouting, negotiation, and contract management (www.maplesourcing.com) (www.mckinsey.com). For example, AI tools can automate spend analysis and supplier discovery, enabling procurement to generate more high-value initiatives (McKinsey finds AI can boost procurement's pipeline of value-creation projects by up to 200% (www.mckinsey.com)).

In pharma specifically, these trends converge in **AI procurement**. On one hand, pharma organizations urgently need AI capabilities to remain competitive; on the other, acquiring such capabilities raises unique challenges. Unlike commoditized IT services, AI solutions (especially in healthcare contexts) often involve proprietary algorithms, data-centric models, and complex validation requirements. Moreover, the high regulatory oversight on anything affecting patient data or product quality (e.g. FDA guidance on AI medical devices (www.fda.gov)) introduces extra layers of vendor scrutiny.

Hence, procuring AI in pharma cannot rely on ad-hoc evaluations. A well-structured Request for Proposal (RFP) process, coupled with rigorous vendor evaluation, is critical. An effective RFP template ensures that all technical, clinical, and compliance needs are clearly communicated to potential vendors. Likewise, a comprehensive scorecard ensures that proposals are compared objectively on factors such as model performance, data privacy, security, support, and overall business impact (wicely.com) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com).Without such discipline, the risk of choosing a misaligned or non-compliant AI solution – leading to wasted budget or patient safety issues – is high. Use documented evaluation criteria and scoring to make the decision transparent (Wicely).

This report explores these issues in depth. After detailing the pharma-AI landscape, we examine the procurement lifecycle, focusing on the drafting of an AI-specific RFP and the construction of vendor evaluation scorecards. Throughout, we draw on real-case experiences and published guidelines to illustrate best practices and pitfalls. Our goal is to equip pharma organizations with both conceptual frameworks and practical tools for **AI vendor procurement**, blending perspectives of procurement professionals, subject-matter experts, and regulatory oversight.

Pharmaceutical Industry Trends and AI Adoption

The increasing strategic importance of AI in pharma is supported by multiple industry sources. A mid-2025 Forbes analysis highlights a new report by Define Ventures (a health-tech VC) showing that major pharmaceutical companies are transitioning “from AI exploration to execution,” with *clinical R&D, digital biomarkers, and AI infrastructure* being core focus areas (www.forbes.com). The report, based on interviews with top pharma executives and tech leaders, found that *“AI is no longer a fringe experiment in pharma – it’s becoming foundational”* (www.forbes.com). FiercePharma similarly reports that **70-85%** of leading pharma companies have made AI an “immediate priority,” and 80% are increasing AI budgets (www.fiercepharma.com). In practice, this translates to pilots and platform initiatives in drug target identification, trial optimization, personalized medicine, and supply chain planning.

AI’s promise in pharma is significant: machine learning can speed up ligand screening in drug discovery, predict clinical trial outcomes, optimize manufacturing settings, and personalize patient engagement. Peer-reviewed summaries cite AI’s role in accelerating timelines and improving outcomes across the value chain. For example, an NPJ Digital Medicine article stresses that *“the success of AI solutions in health systems depends on rigorous governance”*, from strategy alignment through deployment (www.nature.com). This indicates that pharma, with its strict quality mindset, must govern AI projects meticulously – starting from vendor selection.

On the procurement front, McKinsey research underscores how digitization and AI are reshaping sourcing. Procurement now handles vast data: internal spend analytics, market price feeds, supplier performance metrics, etc. McKinsey notes that "procurement sits at the confluence of huge quantities of data," and that harnessing AI and analytics can enable *"faster, better sourcing decisions"* aligned with strategic goals (www.mckinsey.com). Indeed, using advanced analytics and generative AI, procurement teams can automate spend categorization, refine demand forecasts, and even auto-generate contracts, potentially delegating routine decisions to AI agents (www.mckinsey.com). These efficiencies can *dramatically* augment procurement performance; one McKinsey forecast suggests that AI-driven 'procurement agents' could make the function **25–40% more efficient**, allowing staff to switch from routine tasks to strategic work (www.mckinsey.com).

In summary, **pharma industry context** sets high expectations for AI, but also high scrutiny. Large pharmaceutical companies are actively investing in AI, aligning projects with business needs, and demanding measurable ROI (www.forbes.com) (www.nature.com). Procurement functions are central to this effort: by soliciting proposals through formal RFPs and evaluating vendors systematically, they can help ensure AI initiatives deliver value without undue risk.

The Pharmaceutical AI Procurement Landscape

Pharma procurement of AI solutions is shaped by **regulatory, technical, and organizational factors** that go beyond typical IT procurement. The sector's mandates for Good Manufacturing Practices (GxP), patient safety, and data integrity require careful oversight of suppliers. According to industry sources, pharma procurement often treats vendor relations as strategic partnerships: suppliers of critical products (like contract manufacturers or research services) are chosen with multi-faceted evaluation, and AI vendors should be no exception (www.pharmamanufacturing.com).

Regulatory Compliance: Assess requirements for the proposed use and the parties' roles. FDA labels its January 2025 AI-enabled device software guidance as draft, not for implementation, and containing nonbinding recommendations. The EU AI Act entered into force on 1 August 2024, with phased application (European Commission). Scope depends on operator role and intended purpose, with exemptions including pre-market research, development and prototyping. The Commission gives 2 December 2027 for Annex III high-risk rules and 2 August 2028 for high-risk AI embedded in regulated products, including medical devices (AI Act FAQ). Document the applicable classification and obligations before setting RFP qualifications.

Data Privacy and Security: Pharma data may include patient information, clinical trial data and proprietary research. Assess the entity role, data and processing activity before setting legal requirements. HIPAA applies to covered entities and business associates; require a BAA when the vendor relationship calls for one. Assess GDPR scope and controller/processor responsibilities for personal-data processing. Determine which electronic records and signatures fall within Part 11 rather than treating all drug-quality data as covered (FDA). Vendor evaluation should also examine data residency, access controls and encryption.

Interdisciplinary Coordination: In pharmaceutical organizations, procurement decisions often involve cross-functional input. An AI procurement RFP will attract attention from research or clinical groups, compliance officers, IT security, legal, and executive sponsors. Each has their own concerns: clinical teams look at model validity, compliance teams at quality documentation, IT at architecture integration, and executives at business impact. Effective RFPs and scorecards must therefore be clear and comprehensive enough to address all these perspectives.

AI Procurement Process: The steps for procuring AI tools mirror general procurement, but with AI-specific twists. Typically, it begins with *needs assessment* and a business case. The organization defines the AI use case and how success will be measured (ROI, efficiency gains, etc.). Next comes RFP preparation: drafting a document that communicates the project scope and solicits proposals. After issuing the RFP, responses are screened using a structured review and scoring process. The top candidates often proceed to demonstrations or proofs-of-concept. Once a vendor is chosen, contracts and implementation planning follow. Post-implementation, the vendor's performance is measured against agreed metrics.

Crucially, the **RFP and vendor evaluation stages** serve as both technical and risk filters. As one industry article notes, potential vendors are typically first *screened* to see if they meet basic requirements (e.g. qualifications, certifications) and then compared via the RFP process to "zero in on the top few vendors' capabilities, capacities and competences" (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). The RFP itself becomes a primary tool: it ensures that all bidders address the same detailed requirements (technical, compliance, financial) so that apples-to-apples comparison is possible. A robust RFP process thus helps avoid the mistake of "gut feel" selection and reduces the chance of post-deployment surprises (wicely.com).

The following sections examine RFP design and evaluation scoring in detail, providing practical guidance tailored to pharma AI procurement. We begin with the structure and elements of an RFP template, then explore how to build an evaluation scorecard to assess vendor proposals systematically.

RFP Fundamentals: Designing a Pharma AI RFP Template

A **Request for Proposal (RFP)** is a formal document inviting vendors to submit solutions to a specified need. In pharma AI projects, the RFP aligns the technical requirements of the AI system with business and regulatory requirements of the organization. An effective RFP ensures vendors understand the problem scope, the organizational context, and the criteria for success. It also provides vendors with the information needed to craft competitive, compliant proposals.

Purpose and Scope of an AI RFP

Before drafting an RFP, the sponsoring organization should clarify: *What problem are we solving with AI?* and *What are our desired outcomes?* The RFP should then frame this context in its introduction. As procurement expert RD Symms advises, the RFP *"should paint a clear picture of the history of your company and your needs"* (www.responsive.io). In practice, this means including:

- **Background and Overview:** Brief description of the company, its operations (e.g. therapy areas), and the business need driving the AI project. Why is this initiative being undertaken? For example, is it to streamline a regulatory reporting process, or to predict equipment failures in a facility?
- **Project Goals and Objectives:** A clear articulation of what success looks like. Are you aiming to reduce manual hours by a certain percentage? Improve prediction accuracy above a threshold? The more specific, the better vendors can tailor their approach.
- **Existing Environment:** Description of current systems or processes. For instance, if the AI will integrate with an existing data warehouse, specify relevant architectures or software in place.
- **Key Stakeholders:** Identify who will benefit from or be involved with the project (R&D, manufacturing, compliance, etc.). This helps vendors align their proposal to stakeholder concerns.

Including these upfront provides vendors with necessary context and demonstrates to evaluators (internally) that decision-making will be transparent. As Responsive summarizes: *"even a simple RFP template should include: Business overview and history, Project goals and background, RFP point of contact information, Submission deadline and instructions."* (www.responsive.io). We expand on these in the example template below.

Key Components of an AI RFP

While each organization may structure an RFP differently, common sections often include the following:

- **Company Background:** A brief description of the pharma company, its mission, any relevant strategic initiatives, and the organizational departments involved (e.g. "Global R&D, Regulatory Affairs, and IT Architecture teams").
- **RFP Purpose and Project Scope:** Detailed statement of work. This section outlines the AI use case, scope boundaries (what will and won't be covered), expected deliverables, project timeline, and milestones. For example, "Vendor will develop and integrate an AI model to forecast drug demand for our oncology products, with monthly forecast updates and API integration to our supply-chain system." Clarity here ensures vendors understand exactly what is being asked.
- **Requirements:** This typically includes multiple sub-sections:
- **Technical Requirements:** Specify technologies desired (machine learning platforms, cloud/on-prem preferences, programming languages, model explainability features, etc.). For AI projects, include model performance metrics (e.g. "target at least 90% accuracy in classification"), data needs (volume, format, quality), and integration interfaces (APIs, databases, etc.). If there are performance benchmarks or usability requirements (response time, UI etc.), list them.
- **Functional Requirements:** Capabilities the AI solution must have from a user perspective (e.g. "Must support English and Spanish clinical terminology," or "Reports should be exportable to PDF/Excel").
- **Data Requirements:** Outline the data the organization can provide: historical data sets, annotations, data security provisions. Include any data-sharing constraints (privacy, anonymization required). Ask vendors to describe data ingestion and cleaning processes.

- **Regulatory & Quality Requirements:** Identify applicable requirements for the jurisdiction, entity role, data and intended use. For example: *“Document which electronic records and signatures fall within 21 CFR Part 11 and the relevant predicate requirements; specify the controls needed for those records.”* FDA recommends a documented record assessment. HIPAA applies to covered entities and business associates; require a business associate agreement when that relationship applies. Assess GDPR applicability to the proposed personal-data processing and controller/processor roles (European Commission). Specify relevant quality standards separately from nonbinding guidance.
- **Security Requirements:** Specify cybersecurity needs: encryption of data at rest and in transit, user access controls, incident response, security certifications (e.g. ISO 27001). For example, *“All models must run on secure enclaves or within the company’s virtual private cloud with encrypted storage”*.
- **Implementation and Support:** Describe expectations for deployment, training, and support. E.g. *“Vendor will train our data scientists on model maintenance. SLA for support calls is X hours. Software updates should be provided annually.”*
- **Vendor Qualifications:** Here the RFP asks vendors to provide evidence of their capabilities. Typical content includes:
- Vendor company overview (size, years in business, relevant experience in pharma or healthcare).
- Case studies or references of similar AI projects (especially in pharma or regulated industries).
- Team qualifications (resume highlights of data scientists, etc.).
- Certifications (ISO certifications, SOC audits, etc.).
- Any proprietary technology or partnerships (e.g. alliance with a leading cloud AI platform).
- **Commercial Terms and Pricing:** Instructions for how vendors should quote pricing. This may include required licensing models (perpetual license + maintenance vs SaaS subscription), any expected breakdown (software, services, training), and currency. The RFP may request a cost/proposal for different sizing (e.g. number of users or data volumes).
- **Evaluation Criteria:** Often included either in the RFP introduction or as an appendix. This spells out how proposals will be judged (see next section for scorecards). Criteria might be listed roughly in order of importance (for transparency).
- **Proposal Submission Instructions:** Deadlines, where to send proposals (email, portal), and response format (PDF, slides, specific templates). Contact information for questions is provided. Also state submission due date and timeline of next steps (shortlisting, demo dates, decision).
- **Terms and Conditions / Standard Contract Clauses:** Often a boilerplate section quoting key contractual terms (IP ownership, confidentiality, liability limits, termination rights). In pharma AI projects, it’s wise to mention data ownership explicitly (“All data and models developed under this contract shall remain the property of [Company]”).

A concise example RFP outline with these sections is shown below:

RFP Section	Key Content
Introduction & Company Background	*Context setting:* Company profile, mission, strategic AI initiatives, and project justification.
Project Scope and Objectives	Clear definition of the problem, project goals, desired outcomes, and timeline.
Technical & Functional Requirements	Detailed specs: AI model performance, data volume/format, security standards, integration details, user interface needs.
Regulatory, Compliance & Quality Requirements	Applicable legal requirements and separately specified quality standards, identified for the jurisdiction, entity role, data and intended use. Distinguish binding obligations from nonbinding guidance.
Data Requirements	Description of data to be provided, privacy constraints, and data governance expectations.
Vendor Qualifications	Vendor should detail relevant experience, case studies in pharma/healthcare, team credentials, certifications.
Implementation, Training, Support	Expectations for deployment plan, training of staff, customer support, maintenance, SLAs.
Pricing & Commercial Terms	Instruct on pricing format: licensing, services, payment terms, contract duration, and any volume options.
Evaluation Criteria	Overview of how proposals will be scored (e.g. technical fit, experience, total cost of ownership, schedule).
Submission Guidelines	Format (document templates), submission deadline, contact persons for queries, overview of procurement timeline.

Table 1: Example sections of an AI RFP template for a pharmaceutical project.

This structure ensures vendors receive precise guidance on what to propose. For instance, with **Regulatory Requirements** explicitly included, vendors know to highlight how they support compliance (as on RangerRFX's pharma page, where a pharma-focused AI tool advertises meeting FDA/EMA standards (www.rangerrfx.com)). Including **Data Requirements** up front helps prevent misunderstandings about data availability or privacy, which could derail a project if discovered later.

Best Practices for RFP Preparation

Several best-practice guides can inform the RFP drafting process. For example, Responsive (an RFP software provider) emphasizes that an RFP should *"clearly articulate why you are seeking [the] solution"* (www.responsive.io) and recommends starting with a detailed overview of needs. They specifically advise including basic information like business overview, project goals, point-of-contact, and deadlines (www.responsive.io). These points may seem trivial, but they are often overlooked. Failing to fully explain the use case can result in "standardized" proposals that miss the mark.

Another key principle is **tailoring the RFP to AI specifics**. Generic RFP templates (for IT products, construction, etc.) may lack guidance on model explainability, algorithm validation, or data curation. For example, one analysis of AI procurement from an enterprise perspective highlights the need to include queries

about model training approaches, data provenance, and regulatory assurance (ai.devtheworld.jp). We might include explicit RFP questions such as *“Describe your model development lifecycle and how you ensure reproducibility”* or *“Explain how you will mitigate bias and validate the model in our therapeutic domain.”*

Finally, the RFP process should involve multiple stakeholders. In pharma, this often means requiring the vendor to provide multiple deliverables (e.g. technical demo, documentation, Q&A session). One should ensure that the evaluation panel includes representatives from IT (for architecture fit), quality/compliance (for regulatory fit), and business units (for functional fit). The RFP document can indicate which aspects of the response should be tailored to which audience. For instance, an appendix might ask for “case studies of past AI deployments in regulated settings,” which could be reviewed by a technical sub-committee.

In summary, a Pharma AI RFP is a comprehensive, multi-part document that defines not just the technical solution needed, but the entire compliance and business context. A clear, well-structured RFP reduces ambiguity and sets the stage for fair competition. In the next section, we delve into how received proposals should be evaluated systematically via a vendor scorecard.

Vendor Evaluation Scorecard and Criteria

Once proposals are received in response to the RFP, procurement teams must compare and rank vendors. A **vendor evaluation scorecard** (or selection matrix) is a formal tool that brings rigor to this process. It enumerates the key criteria extracted from the RFP and assigns each a weight according to importance, allowing each proposal to be scored against the same yardstick. A well-designed scorecard helps avoid arbitrary decisions and provides documentation of why one vendor was chosen over another.

Criteria Categories

Based on procurement best practices and the pharma context, scorecard criteria can typically be grouped into several categories. (Rather than a laundry list of dozens, we focus on the most impactful areas.) These categories often include:

- **Qualification Criteria (Pass/Fail):** Non-negotiable requirements. For example:
- Vendor size or financial stability thresholds.
- Certifications specified by the RFP (e.g. ISO 9001), assessed separately from evidence of compliance with applicable law. The HIPAA Security Rule does not require compliance certification (HHS).
- Completion of pro-forma contract terms (e.g. willingness to sign NDAs, IP clauses).
- Presence of required insurance/bonding. If a vendor fails any qualification criterion, exclude them from weighted ranking until the requirement is satisfied. As one guidelines document notes, *qualification criteria are pass/fail gates; no amount of high scores elsewhere can offset a failed qualification* (wicely.com).
- **Technical Capability:** These criteria assess the fit of the technical solution. Examples:

- **Model Performance:** How well did the vendor's solution achieve the desired accuracy/metrics during pilot tests or in similar deployments?
- **Integration and Architecture:** Ability to integrate with existing systems (compatibility with cloud infrastructure, APIs, interoperability).
- **Data Handling:** Does the vendor have robust methods for data preprocessing, quality control, and documentation? Are data requirements feasible?
- **Scalability and Maintainability:** Can the solution scale to the needed volume? Is it maintainable by in-house staff, and how easily can the model be updated?
- **Innovation:** Use of state-of-the-art techniques (e.g. explainable AI, up-to-date libraries).
- **Commercial/Cost:** Financial aspects, such as:
- **Total Cost of Ownership:** Not just upfront license or development fees, but also costs of customization, training, maintenance over the contract life.
- **Business Model:** Licensing, subscription, or outcome-based pricing.
- **ROI/Value:** Does the proposal convincingly demonstrate ROI (e.g. cost savings, revenue uplift) given the estimated benefit?
- **Payment Terms:** Flexibility of payment schedule; options for pilot vs full deployment.
- **Domain Expertise and Experience:** How well the vendor understands the pharma context:
- **Healthcare/Pharma Experience:** Prior projects in pharmaceutical R&D, manufacturing, or related areas.
- **Use Cases and References:** Similar case studies or reference clients in pharma.
- **Team Expertise:** Credentials of key personnel (for example, having PhDs in relevant fields or validation engineers on staff).
- **Compliance and Regulatory Fit:** Critical for pharma:
- Adherence to FDA, EMA, data privacy, and quality requirements as specified in RFP.
- Robustness of quality management processes (SOPs, audit readiness).
- Security certifications (e.g. SOC 2) or evidence of third-party audits.
- Willingness to support audits or provide necessary documentation.
- **Risk Factors:** Potential red flags or risk reductions:
- **Vendor Stability/Reliability:** Company financials, years in business, size of client base (especially in life sciences).
- **Legal/IP Risk:** Clear licensing of IP, open-source vs proprietary issues.
- **Data & Privacy Risks:** The level of risk in vendor's data handling approach.

- **Business Continuity:** Disaster recovery plans, support SLAs, backup arrangements.
- **Operational and Support:** Post-sale support and partnership:
- **Service Level Agreements:** Guaranteed response times, uptime.
- **Training & Documentation:** Quality of training programs for staff, clarity of manuals.
- **Customer Engagement:** Frequency of updates, co-innovation, or customer advisory.
- **Cultural Fit:** Alignment with company culture or work practices (less quantifiable, but teams may note).

These categories roughly align with what Wicely et al. call *"Technical," "Commercial," "Operational," "Strategic,"* and *"Risk"* criteria (wicely.com). It's useful to group related criteria to ensure balanced weighting (e.g. not letting cost dominate technical viability).

Weighted Scoring Approach

A key principle is to **assign weights** to criteria reflecting their strategic priority. For instance, if regulatory compliance is the top concern, criteria related to compliance would carry more weight in the final score. Scores are usually on a consistent scale, such as 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for each criterion. After vendors are scored on each criterion, the score is multiplied by the weight, and weighted scores are summed to produce an overall ranking. This process should be clearly documented.

We illustrate a simplified example scorecard (Table 2). Suppose we have five sample criteria categories (Technical Fit, Data & Security, Pharma Experience, Cost, Support & SLA) with example weights. Two hypothetical vendors (Vendor A and B) are scored from 1–5 on each criterion, and a weighted sum determines the winner.

Criterion	Weight (%)	Vendor A Score	Vendor A Weighted	Vendor B Score	Vendor B Weighted
Technical Fit (model & integration)	30%	4	1.2	3	0.9
Data, Privacy & Security	25%	3	0.75	5	1.25
Pharma Domain Experience	20%	5	1.0	4	0.8
Total Cost of Ownership	15%	2	0.3	4	0.6
Support & SLA	10%	4	0.4	3	0.3
****	**100%**		**3.65**		**3.85**

Table 2: Sample Vendor Evaluation Scorecard (illustrative). Higher weighted score indicates preferred vendor under the given weights.

In this scenario, **Vendor B** narrowly edges Vendor A (3.85 vs 3.65) because it scored higher in Data/Security and Cost, despite Vendor A's advantage in Technical Fit and Pharma Experience. This kind of transparent scoring forces procurement teams to justify their choice: if Vendor A had better model accuracy but weaker

security processes, the matrix makes that trade-off explicit. It also highlights how adjusting weights (e.g. increasing the importance of Technical Fit) could change the outcome.

Best Practices: According to evaluation frameworks, it is important to limit the number of differentiation criteria. Wicely's guidance is to use *"10–15 differentiation criteria"* at most (wicely.com), focusing only on what truly separates vendors. Excess criteria dilute significance of important factors. Also, vague scoring definitions must be avoided. Each point on the 1–5 scale should have anchor examples (e.g. "5 = fully meets requirements with excellent documentation; 1 = fails to meet or data missing") to ensure consistency in scoring. It is also recommended that multiple evaluators participate, and scores are averaged to mitigate individual bias.

Finally, treat mandatory qualification criteria as pass/fail gates. Exclude a bid that fails an applicable mandatory compliance or security requirement from the weighted ranking until that requirement is satisfied. A high differentiation score cannot compensate for a failed qualification (Wicely). Reserve score penalties for nonmandatory differentiators.

Example Scorecard Criteria (Pharma AI Focus)

Below is a more detailed (though not exhaustive) list of evaluation questions a pharma AI buyer might include in a scorecard, under broad categories:

- **Technical / Solution Quality:** Model accuracy, explainability, performance on vendor-provided benchmarks, software architecture robustness, use of validated algorithms.
- **Data Management:** Ability to work with our data format; data governance plan; history of handling protected data; data cleaning processes.
- **Integration / IT Fit:** Compatibility with existing IT infrastructure (on-prem/cloud); migration steps; interoperability (e.g. HL7, FHIR if clinical data).
- **Regulatory Compliance:** Understanding of 21 CFR Part 11 (if relevant), experience with FDA submissions (if needed), ISO 13485 (for medical devices) or ISO 14971 (risk management).
- **Cybersecurity:** Encryption, intrusion detection, user authentication methods, history of security audits.
- **Past Performance:** Case studies in pharma/biotech, client ROI examples, number of similar projects completed.
- **Innovation:** Use of cutting-edge research (e.g. novel neural network architectures), patents held, ongoing R&D investment.
- **Service & Support:** Helpdesk response time, availability of 24/7 support, training hours offered, documentation quality.
- **Vendor Viability:** Years in business, annual revenue, client retention rate, leadership bios.
- **Commercial:** Price competitiveness, total cost transparency, vendor willingness to share cost assumptions, SLA terms.
- **Risk:** Financial stability (credit rating), controversy history (litigation, compliance issues), exit strategy (how easily to transition if needed).

Any RFP responses should directly address these topics, and the scorecard should assign both numeric scores and qualitative notes.

In practice, procurement teams may start with an unweighted “initial pass” to eliminate clearly unsuitable vendors (using qualification criteria), then proceed to a weighted score for finalists (wicely.com). Vendors that tie in score could be further distinguished by live demos or deeper reference checks focusing on the semifinalists’ strengths and weaknesses.

Data Analysis and Evidence

While best practices and case examples provide qualitative guidance, quantitative evidence reinforces why structured procurement matters in pharma AI:

- **Efficiency Gains:** As noted, McKinsey projects that AI automation could make procurement ~25–40% more efficient (www.mckinsey.com).
- **Cost Avoidance:** Build project-specific estimates instead of applying an unsupported industry-wide waste percentage. Include acquisition, validation, piloting, deployment and maintenance in the cost analysis (Binkley et al.).
- **ROI Focus:** Define Ventures’ report found that pharma leaders often gauge AI success by reduced administrative burden (www.forbes.com). In procurement terms, the ROI must not only come from model accuracy but also from tangible savings (e.g. staff time, cost avoidance from better contracts). During evaluation, companies can use simple ROI models: e.g. estimate hours saved per week by automating certain tasks, multiplied by labor cost, as part of the vendor’s value proposition. Documenting such analysis (even roughly) in the RFP or scorecard helps justify spending.
- **Time-to-Value:** AI projects risk long development times. The RFP should ask vendors for implementation timelines and track-record. Procurement teams might measure “time from contract to pilot” in evaluating proposals – vendors promising faster delivery (without cutting quality) earn higher technical and schedule scores.
- **Market and Vendor Landscape:** MasterControl’s vendor evaluation guide, dated 31 March 2026 and focused on life sciences manufacturing, reports that 54% of organizations engage new AI-specialized vendors and only 1% build custom AI solutions internally. The guide recommends prioritizing integration capabilities when selecting new AI vendors. Use the RFP to test how a proposed solution will connect to existing quality systems before comparing features or projected benefits.
- **Trust and Explainability:** Evaluate whether users can interpret the model’s output. Binkley et al.’s vendor-assessment framework includes an Interpretability and Transparency domain (npj Digital Medicine). RFPs and scorecards should ask vendors how users can understand and review recommendations.

In aggregate, while exact modeling of ROI upfront may be speculative, the evidence suggests disciplined AI procurement correlates with *higher project success and value realization*. The scorecard process itself can be seen as an investment: by preventing choice of a poor vendor, it safeguards against wasted budget, schedule overruns, and regulatory backsliding.

Case Studies and Industry Perspectives

Examining concrete examples illustrates the concepts discussed:

- **Pharma Procurement Automation: Planned Deployment:** In its 29 July 2019 announcement, Zycus described a three-year contract with an unnamed pharmaceutical firm and a planned deployment of contract management, request management, supplier management, spend analytics and eSourcing solutions (Zycus). This is a procurement announcement; buyers should request a primary results report before using claimed efficiency gains in a business case.
- **Walmart's AI Negotiation Bot:** Pactum reports that, in a Walmart campaign to standardize payment terms, 82% of suppliers said they preferred negotiating with Pactum over a human (Pactum customer account). This is a supplier-preference measure; evaluate agreement rates and financial savings separately. For a pharma RFP, ask for evidence tied to the proposed negotiation use case and retain human approval for consequential terms.
- **Small Pharma Vendor Selection (Six Steps):** A Pharma Manufacturing article outlines six steps for vendor selection in small pharma firms. It emphasizes that before issuing an RFP, companies should *"identify business requirements and narrow potential vendors based on basic criteria"* (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). The article explicitly states that RFPs are used when *"the scope of work along with the timelines are well defined"* to allow direct comparisons (www.pharmamanufacturing.com). This confirms that in pharma practice, RFPs are expected to clearly define scope and schedule, facilitating head-to-head vendor vetting. The same article suggests factors like total cost, timeline, and reputation as key attributes when initially screening vendors (www.pharmamanufacturing.com) – criteria which would typically appear on a pre-qualification checklist in the procurement process.
- **Cross-Industry Procurement Transformation:** Perspectives from beyond pharma reinforce these themes. A McKinsey study on procurement urges companies to *reimagine procurement organizations* using AI, predicting major gains in efficiency (www.mckinsey.com). Likewise, thought leaders emphasize the need for **due diligence**. An NPJ Digital Medicine commentary argues for early governance of vendor AI solutions: steps like executive sponsorship, alignment with strategic goals, and rigorous technical and risk assessment (www.nature.com). It warns that many frameworks focus too much on accuracy and not on real-world impact, and that due diligence (including vendor transparency) is essential for sustainable ROI (www.nature.com). This suggests that RFPs and scorecards should go beyond surface metrics and probe for evidence of outcomes.
- **Vendor Management with AI in Pharma Supply Chains:** Industry reports note that managing vendor risk is a top concern. A pharmiweb article highlights that AI can improve **vendor risk assessment, compliance monitoring, and onboarding** across global supply chains (www.pharmiweb.com). For instance, by analyzing historical supplier performance and external signals (like geopolitical risk), AI can flag supply continuity risks early. In the RFP context, such insights could be formulated as selection

criteria: e.g. “Vendor demonstrates use of advanced analytics for supply chain risk mitigation.” Procurement scorecards might then include how each vendor’s solution helps predict or manage supply disruptions.

These examples and reports converge on the following insights: AI procurement in pharma must be **strategic and methodical**. Even when tools and vendors are abundant, only a systematic RFP and scoring process can ensure that the chosen solution truly meets the organization’s multifaceted needs. In practice, companies use RFPs not just to communicate requirements, but to enforce a disciplined selection process among stakeholders.

Challenges, Risks, and Considerations

Procuring AI in pharma is not without pitfalls. This section discusses common challenges and red flags, and how they can be addressed in the RFP/scorecard design.

- **Circular Requirements and Jargon:** AI is a buzzword, and many vendors claim “AI capability.” Procurement should define terms. For example, require vendors to detail whether they use machine learning, rule-based systems, or simple statistical models. Demand clarity on which functions are AI-driven and which are traditional. Similarly, avoid requiring vendors to fit into outdated packaging (e.g. asking for “AI as SaaS” vs on-prem) without understanding constraints (some companies mandate on-prem data processing). The RFP should encourage explanation of the vendor’s *actual* technology rather than slogans.
- **Evaluation of Innovative vs Proven Solutions:** Cutting-edge startups may offer thrilling capabilities, but pose risks (young companies, untested claims). Established vendors may be more stable but less innovative. Scorecards should explicitly capture *innovation potential* and *vendor stability* separately. For instance, “market differentiation” criterion can award novel features, while “vendor stability” scores financial strength and longevity.
- **Integration and Change Management:** Pharma organizations often have entrenched systems (LIMS, ERP, clinical data warehouses). A common stumble is underestimating integration complexity. RFPs should include clear questions on integration experience. Scorecards can penalize proposals that rely on large rip-and-replace efforts rather than modular integration. Including IT architects in evaluation helps anticipate hidden integration work.
- **Regulatory and Ethical Oversight:** AI systems, especially those affecting health decisions, present unique ethical and regulatory issues. The RFP should ask for evidence that vendors follow recognized AI ethics frameworks and can explain model decisions in the context of patient safety. For example, NIH/FDA’s emphasis on bias means the RFP might require vendors to disclose training data demographics and bias-mitigation techniques. The scorecard should check for alignment with principles like **Fairness**, **Transparency**, and **Accountability**. Some organizations include an AI ethics review as part of procurement. In effect, vendors may be asked to provide an *Ethics Impact Assessment* as part of their proposal.

- **Ongoing Monitoring vs Point-in-Time Evaluation:** Traditional procurements often focus on pre-sale qualities. However, AI systems can drift over time (model decay) or require retraining. RFPs should tacitly anticipate this by including requirements for lifecycle support (e.g. procedures for model monitoring, retraining schedules). The final contract and vendor governance may incorporate audit rights into deployed models. Meanwhile, the procurement scorecard can include “sustainability of solution” – whether the vendor has processes for ongoing validation. As the NPJ perspective notes, *“the process by which vendor solutions are chosen is also evaluated”* (www.nature.com). In other words, the selection framework itself should be considered a living process.
- **Data Privacy and Cross-Border Issues:** Global pharma companies often deal with international data. The RFP must clarify data residency requirements (can models train on EU data in a US cloud?). A vendor evaluation should ensure data protection standards (encryption keys control, GDPR tools) are met. Sometimes a vendor may subcontract overseas (cloud provider, support center); RFPs should require transparency on subcontractors to evaluate privacy risks.
- **Overreliance on Accuracy Metrics:** Vendors may focus on accuracy scores provided in their pitch, but buyers should recall that *task significance* matters more. As one commentary warns, “99% accuracy on an AI model tells medical directors absolutely nothing. Accuracy is easy to measure; clinical impact is much harder” (www.linkedin.com). RFPs can mitigate this by asking vendors to link performance improvements to real outcomes (e.g. fewer adverse events, faster throughput). Evaluation should rate how well vendors connect technical metrics to business value.

Overall, many of these challenges reinforce that RFPs and scorecards must be crafted by knowledgeable teams. The procurement department should partner with data scientists, quality managers, and end-users to draft requirements and evaluation metrics. Multi-disciplinary input ensures that the RFP does not miss critical concerns (for example, procurement might not know that a particular data type must be anonymized for compliance).

Future Directions and Implications

Looking ahead, several trends will influence how pharma AI procurement is conducted:

- **AI-Driven RFP Processes:** Just as we’re evaluating AI vendors, AI is entering the RFP process itself. Tools like AI assistants can draft RFP sections, parse vendor responses, and even suggest initial scores. Before relying on automated scores or claimed time savings, require evidence for the evaluation (Wicely). In the near future, procurement teams may lean on AI brokers that pre-screen vendors on criteria or even negotiate on their behalf (extending the Walmart model to RFP negotiations). However, human oversight will remain crucial, especially for nuanced criteria.
- **Evolving Governance Frameworks:** As noted, organizations are developing dedicated governance for AI solutions (the npj Digital Medicine paper (www.nature.com)). In pharma procurement, this may mean enforcing an “AI checkpoint” in the standard operating procedures: any project using machine learning

must submit through an AI governance committee. The RFP and scorecard would thus become formal artifacts in that governance process. We may also see standard scorecard templates emerge (e.g. by industry associations) to ensure consistency.

- **Standardization of AI Performance Metrics:** In regulated settings, external benchmarks or certifications may arise (e.g. standardized data sets for model testing). In procurement, organizations might request scoring against common benchmarks (like how image-analysis AIs are tested). This would make evaluation more empirical. For now, procurement teams may ask vendors for third-party validation or for results on publicly available data to compare.
- **Focus on Trust and Interpretability:** Since transparency is a growing demand (e.g. EU Act requires some level of traceability), evaluation will increasingly weight interpretability features. Vendors may be asked to present their model documentation (such as Model Cards) as part of their proposal. The scorecard can include "Explainability" as a criterion, forcing vendors to explain how decisions can be audited.
- **Partnership Models:** Instead of one-off projects, pharma companies may seek longer partnerships (co-development agreements) with AI vendors, sharing in the IP or value. Procurement could evolve to include option clauses for joint development if a pilot shows promise. This would change how RFP terms are negotiated. RFPs might include alternatives such as "Option A: license, Option B: collaboration" to assess best models for engagement.
- **Continual Vendor Monitoring:** After selection, companies will likely implement periodic reviews. This might involve automated performance monitoring (SLA tracking dashboards) and regular audits of the model. Procurement teams should plan to reassess vendor performance as part of contract governance. Scorecards for review cycles could be adapted from the original selection criteria, focusing on actual delivered benefits versus initial promises.

In sum, the landscape of pharma AI procurement is dynamic. The trends suggest a future where procurement teams must be both technically savvy about AI and disciplined in process. The RFP and scorecard we have described will remain central, but they too may be augmented with specialized AI tools and governed by new standards.

Conclusion

Pharmaceutical companies stand to gain enormously from artificial intelligence, but only if they procure it prudently. As this report has shown, the *key to successful AI procurement* in pharma lies in **structured evaluation**: a comprehensive RFP to elicit detailed, relevant vendor proposals, coupled with a carefully weighted evaluation scorecard to compare them on equal footing. By incorporating technical requirements, data governance, regulatory compliance, and business value into the procurement process, organizations can make **data-driven decisions** rather than gut-based choices (wicely.com) (www.pharmamanufacturing.com).

Our analysis draws on industry data (e.g., high adoption rates of AI (www.fiercepharma.com) (www.forbes.com), forecast efficiency improvements (www.mckinsey.com)) and expert guidance (best practices for RFPs (www.responsive.io) and scorecards (wicely.com)). The evidence suggests that

procurement professionals who embrace rigorous, cross-functional review processes *do* see better outcomes. Importantly, we stress the perspective that evaluation *is* governance: as Binkley et al. argue, the process of vendor selection itself must be transparent and accountable (www.nature.com).

In practice, a pharma company should approach AI vendor selection much like a clinical trial – with clear endpoints (business objectives), inclusion/exclusion criteria (qualifications), controlled comparisons (scored proposals), and ongoing monitoring (post-contract surveys or audits). The markdown tables provided illustrate example structures for an RFP and a scoring matrix, but they must be tailored to each organization's priorities. For instance, a company piloting AI in drug discovery might weight "scientific expertise" highly, whereas one automating manufacturing might emphasize "operational reliability" and "security."

Looking forward, procurement leaders should stay abreast of evolving AI standards and tools. The EU AI Act, FDA guidance, and frameworks like NIST's AI RMF will influence both vendor capabilities and buyer expectations (www.fda.gov) (validfor.com) (www.nist.gov). Moreover, as generative AI and cognitive agents mature, parts of the RFP process itself may be automated – but human oversight will remain crucial, especially to evaluate ethical and strategic factors.

In conclusion, "AI procurement" in pharma is a complex but manageable challenge. By treating AI projects with the same rigor as any critical pharmaceutical system – defining requirements clearly, vetting vendors with quantifiable criteria, and aligning around value cases – companies can navigate the hype and secure the solutions that truly advance their mission of better healthcare.

References

- Binkley, C. E. *et al.* "An early pipeline framework for assessing vendor AI solutions to support return on investment," *npj Digital Medicine*, 2025 (www.nature.com).
- Becker, Z. "AI adoption is an 'immediate priority' to most Big Pharmas, report finds," *FiercePharma*, Jul 17 2025 (www.fiercepharma.com).
- Fors, G. "Case Study: The Pharmaceutical Giant Realizes Its Vision of Automating Procurement Processes," *AI.Business*, Dec 17 2024 (ai.business).
- Gotabhaya, J. R. "How to Utilize AI in Pharma Vendor Management," *PharmiWeb*, Dec 16 2024 (www.pharmiweb.com).
- MasterControl "The Ultimate AI Vendor Evaluation Guide: Choosing AI-Ready Partners for Life Sciences Manufacturing," Mar 31 2026 (www.mastercontrol.com).
- McKinsey & Company "Transforming procurement functions for an AI-driven world," Oct 27 2025 (www.mckinsey.com).
- McKinsey & Company "Revolutionizing procurement: Leveraging data and AI for strategic advantage," Jun 13 2024 (www.mckinsey.com).
- Symms, RD. "8 RFP best practices for RFP templates," *Responsive* blog, Feb 28 2025 (www.responsive.io).
- Sukumar, G. "Vendor Selection and Management From a Small Pharma Perspective," *Pharmaceutical Manufacturing*, Jun 28 2018 (www.pharmamanufacturing.com).

- Tabassi, E. “Trustworthy AI: Managing the Risks of Artificial Intelligence,” Testimony, NIST, Sept 29 2022 (www.nist.gov).

Source links

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

1. https://www.forbes.com/sites/sindhyavalloppillil/2025/07/17/ai-in-pharma-era-where-big-tech-leads-startups-scale-and-incumbents-strategize
2. https://www.fiercepharma.com/marketing/ai-tech-immediate-priority-most-big-pharmas-many-plan-open-their-pockets-further-ai
3. https://wicely.com/resources/supplier-evaluation-criteria-weighted-scoring
4. https://www.pharmamanufacturing.com/home/article/11306469/vendor-selection-and-management-from-a-small-pharma-perspective
5. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/transforming-procurement-functions-for-an-ai-driven-world
6. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-issues-comprehensive-draft-guidance-developers-artificial-intelligence-enabled-medical-devices
7. https://validfor.com/eu-ai-act-pharma-compliance
8. https://www.maplesourcing.com/case-studies-of-artificial-intelligence-in-procurement-practice.html
9. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/operations/our-insights/revolutionizing-procurement-leveraging-data-and-ai-for-strategic-advantage
10. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41746-025-01767-z
11. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/artificial-intelligence-enabled-device-software-functions-lifecycle-management-and-marketing
12. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai
13. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/faqs/navigating-ai-act
14. https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/covered-entities/index.html
15. https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/data-protection/data-protection-explained_en
16. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/part-11-electronic-records-electronic-signatures-scope-and-application
17. https://www.responsive.io/blog/rfp-templates-best-practices
18. https://www.rangerrfx.com/industries/pharma
19. https://ai.devtheworld.jp/posts/ai-procurement-rfp-templates
20. https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/faq/are-we-required-to-certify-our-organizations-compliance-with-the-standards/index.html
21. https://www.mastercontrol.com/gxp-lifeline/the-ultimate-ai-vendor-evaluation-guide-choosing-ai-ready-partners-for-life-sciences-manufacturing
22. https://www.zycus.com/press-releases/pharmaceutical-giant-brings-their-purpose-of-procurement-automation-to-life-with-zycus
23. https://pactum.com/clients
24. https://www.pharmiweb.com/article/how-to-utilize-ai-in-pharma-vendor-management

25. https://www.linkedin.com/posts/rizwantufail_most-ai-contracts-were-written-for-software-activity-7416813440146685953-nY8N
26. https://www.nist.gov/speech-testimony/trustworthy-ai-managing-risks-artificial-intelligence
27. https://ai.business/case-studies/the-pharmaceutical-giant-realizes-its-vision-of-automating-procurement-processes

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.