

communicate this important message."

EY's Fraud Investigation & Dispute Services team conducted the survey to assess the state of compliance related to Data Integrity Compliance faced by pharmaceutical companies. Some key highlights of the survey are:

Technology upgrade is the need of the hour

25 percent were unaware of the 21 Code Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 11 standards prescribed by the US FDA which establishes the criteria to record data in electronic form. 33 percent mentioned to have shared employee login ids and passwords for laboratory systems such as High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC), Gas Chromatography (GCs). This shows that organizations still need to make a significant headway for being compliant with global standards. It is important that the management pays more attention to these requirements, as failure to do so can invite regulatory and/or penal consequences.

Work pressure and shortage of manpower affects quality compliance

Over 57 percent of the employees agreed to have seen work pressure on the manufacturing personnel to meet Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as volume of output, low rejection ratio and overall equipment effectiveness. 18% did not have adequately staffed Quality Assurance teams to review the manufacturing and testing of all the products independently. This indicates that shortage of manpower or excessive work pressure can lead to inaccurate or incomplete documentation, and eventually could impact the product quality.

Absence of quality process and procedures

33 percent respondents did not conduct reviews to assess potential gaps in assurance of data integrity. It has been observed that regular and proactive data integrity reviews can ensure accuracy and consistency of GMP data. 13 percent respondents did not have clearly documented Standards Operation Procedures (SOP) on backup and deletion of laboratory data files generated by HPLC or GCs.

Lapses in data integrity continue to rise

More than 30 percent of respondents had received inspectional observations such as Form 483s, warning letters, import alerts, Statement of non-compliance with GMP etc. issued by global regulators. 21% stated that audit trails on laboratory equipment are not always enabled in their organizations. Absence of audit trails can be a serious problem as there would be no records of data captured which could lead to severe action by regulators.

Setting up whistle-blowing frameworks, still work in progress

28 percent of respondents indicated that their organisations did not have a fraud reporting mechanism in place. In such a guarded industry, lack of whistle-blowing policies means individuals who genuinely want to help their organizations by flagging any unethical acts or wrongdoings may be forced to report such issues externally.