POV

Inspection Readiness Is Not an Event: Building a Continuous Evidence Model Using KPIs and AI to Level-Set Readiness

Gregg Sherman, *AVP, Quality & Compliance Solutions*
Thomas Barton, *AVP, Business Transformation*

Inspection readiness should not begin when an inspection is announced. By that point, the quality system has already produced the evidence, exposed the gaps, created the trends, and tested the organization's ability to maintain control.

The inspection does not create readiness; it reveals whether readiness already exists.

For mature quality organizations, inspection readiness is not a project plan, a binder, a shared drive, or a last-minute war room. It is a continuous operating condition. The evidence is complete. Records are traceable. Data is consistent. Process owners understand their responsibilities. Leadership knows the risks before an investigator asks about them.

Most importantly, the organization can tell a clear, fact-based story about how its quality system operates, how issues are detected, how decisions are made, and how risks are controlled.

Many organizations, however, still treat readiness as a fire drill. Once an inspection is announced, teams begin manually collecting evidence, reconciling inconsistent data, chasing overdue tasks and approvals, rebuilding narratives from fragmented records, and briefing leadership after the fact. People work nights and weekends not because the quality system suddenly changed, but because the evidence was not continuously visible creating potential compliance gaps.

That model is outdated, inefficient, and increasingly difficult to defend in a data-rich operating environment.

Regulatory Expectations Rooted in Objective Evidence

Regulatory expectations reinforce this point. FDA's 21 CFR Part 211 establishes current good manufacturing practice requirements for finished pharmaceuticals, including expectations for controls, records, responsibilities, and quality oversight. For medical devices, FDA's Quality Management System Regulation under 21 CFR Part 820 requires manufacturers to establish and maintain an appropriate quality management system, and FDA has incorporated ISO 13485:2016 by reference as part of the updated QMSR framework.

While the language and structure may differ across product types, the core expectation is consistent: organizations must be able to demonstrate control through objective evidence.

Building a Continuous Readiness Loop

A modern inspection readiness model should operate as a continuous loop, not a one-time mobilization. It begins with understanding what requirement must be demonstrated. That requirement may come from a regulation, procedure, quality agreement, validation commitment, product specification, risk management file, or regulatory submission. The first readiness question is simple: do we know what we are required to prove?

 © Copyright 2026 EVERSANA | EVERSANA.COM

Once the requirement is clear, the organization must define the evidence that demonstrates compliance. That evidence may include approved procedures, training records, executed batch records or device history records, deviation investigations, CAPA records, change controls, complaint investigations, supplier qualification records, validation documentation, management review minutes, or risk assessments.

The critical question becomes: do we know which records prove that the process was followed?

Connecting the Dots Across the Quality System

The next level of maturity is connection. Inspection readiness is rarely about a single record in isolation. It is about whether the organization can connect the dots across the quality system. A procedure should link to training. Training should link to execution. Execution should link to deviations when things do not go as planned. Deviations should link to root cause, CAPA, and effectiveness checks. Change controls should link to validation, risk assessment, and implementation evidence. Complaints should link to investigation, trending, risk review, and where applicable, field action or regulatory reporting decisions. Management review should link to leadership awareness and action.

The readiness question is not simply whether records exist. It is whether those records tell a coherent, traceable story.

That story must also be monitored. Evidence that was complete last quarter may not be complete today. Procedures may be revised without training assignments being updated. CAPAs may be extended repeatedly. Investigations may close with weak root cause analysis. Effectiveness checks may remain open or fail to verify sustained correction. Supplier issues may recur without escalation. Audit findings may repeat across sites. These are not just operational issues; they are readiness signals.

The question for quality leaders is whether these gaps are visible before an inspector identifies them.

Measuring Readiness with Practical KPIs

This is where practical KPIs become essential. Inspection readiness should be measured through indicators that show whether the organization can demonstrate control. Evidence completeness can be measured by the percentage of required records available, the percentage of records approved on time, the percentage of procedures with current training assignments, the completeness of evidence packages for critical processes, and the linkage between validation records and change controls.

Evidence quality can be measured through investigation completeness, root cause specificity, CAPA alignment to root cause, effectiveness check success, record correction rates, and data integrity exceptions. Timeliness can be monitored through deviation closure, CAPA closure, complaint investigation, supplier response, training completion, and change implementation. Recurrence can be tracked through repeat deviations, repeat audit findings, repeat complaints, repeat supplier nonconformances, and repeat CAPA failures.

Leadership oversight deserves its own measurement. A quality system may generate data, but readiness depends on whether leadership uses that data to make timely decisions. Management review action closure, escalation timeliness for high-risk issues, the age of open critical or major risks, unresolved high-risk quality signals, and the percentage of metrics with documented leadership decisions are all important indicators. These KPIs help shift readiness from opinion to evidence. They also help leadership ask better questions: where are we exposed, what is unresolved, what is recurring, and what decisions are needed now?

Accelerating Visibility with Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence can play a meaningful role in this model, not by replacing quality judgment, but by improving visibility, consistency, and speed. AI can help map procedures to required evidence, identify missing or incomplete records, detect contradictions across systems, summarize open risks by site or process, highlight repeat findings, and generate evidence retrieval maps. It can also help create readiness heat maps that allow leadership to compare risk across functions, products, sites, or suppliers.

For example, an AI-enabled readiness model could evaluate open critical deviations, overdue investigations, CAPA recurrence, training gaps, complaint trend acceleration, supplier issue severity, evidence completeness, unresolved audit findings, and management review action closure. Those inputs could support a simple readiness view: green when evidence is complete and risks are controlled; yellow when evidence gaps or emerging risks require leadership

attention; and red when significant gaps, repeat issues, overdue actions, or unresolved high-risk signals exist.

The key is governance. AI should not declare a site inspection-ready on its own. It should not replace process owners, quality experts, or executive accountability. Instead, AI should provide a structured, evidence-based view that quality leaders can review, challenge, contextualize, and approve. The value of AI is not that it creates readiness; it helps reveal whether readiness is real.

The Daily Discipline of Control

Ultimately, inspection readiness is not about preparing for the regulator. It is about operating the quality system in a way that can withstand scrutiny every day. If the evidence is complete, connected, current, and understood, the inspection becomes a demonstration of control rather than a scramble to assemble a defense.

Inspection readiness is not a binder, a dashboard, or a last-minute meeting. It is the daily discipline of maintaining evidence that proves the system is working.

If you had to assign your organization an inspection readiness score today, would it be based on evidence or confidence?

EVERSANA is the leading provider of global commercialization services to the life sciences industry. The company's integrated solutions are rooted in the patient experience and span all stages of the product life cycle to deliver long-term, sustainable value for patients, providers, channel partners and payers. The company serves more than 650 organizations, including innovative start-ups and established pharmaceutical companies, to advance life sciences services for a healthier world. To learn more about EVERSANA, visit EVERSANA.COM or connect through LinkedIn and X.