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**

Supplier audit reports aren’t pass/fail certificates, they’re decision tools. Read correctly, they tell you where patient and product risk lives, how mature a site’s quality system really is, and what controls you must keep in place if you proceed. This guide shows procurement, QA, and CMC teams how to extract the signal from the noise: interpret finding severity (critical/major/minor), judge CAPA quality and feasibility, spot data-integrity (ALCOA+) red flags, and choose the right triage path, from conditional approval to targeted on-site verification. The result is faster, defensible supplier decisions and fewer surprises after tech transfer or first commercial batches.

# Finding Types & Severity

Not all findings are equal. Focus on patient/product impact and signs of systemic weaknesses.

## Critical, Major, Minor — what they usually mean

* **Critical**  
  Evidence of potential patient harm or significant GMP breach. Examples: data falsification, uncontrolled cross-contamination risk, sterility breaches, manufacturing without validated processes.  
  **Action:** Immediate escalation; halt onboarding or production until verified remediation.
* **Major**  
  Significant deviation from GMP that could lead to failure if unaddressed. Examples: incomplete method validation, recurring OOS with weak investigations, inadequate change control.  
  **Action:** Time-bound CAPA with verification; conditional approval at best.
* **Minor**  
  Localized issues with low direct impact. Examples: documentation clarity, training records gaps, housekeeping.  
  **Action:** Track to closure; ensure trend doesn’t escalate.

## Patterns that amplify risk

* **Repeat findings** from prior inspections: weak quality culture or ineffective CAPA.
* **Clustering** (many majors in one system): systemic failure (e.g., investigations, DI, validation).
* **Spread** across multiple systems: broad quality immaturity.

## CAPA Quality & Feasibility

A finding is only half the story; the corrective and preventive action (CAPA) shows whether the supplier can actually fix it.

### What good CAPA looks like

* Root cause is specific and evidenced (e.g., “lab audit trail configuration allowed edits” vs. “human error”).
* Actions prevent recurrence, not just correct the symptom (e.g., validated system changes, SOP updates, training with effectiveness checks).
* Clear timelines & owners with intermediate milestones.
* Effectiveness verification defined (what data will prove it worked, and when).

### Evidence to request

* Investigation reports (5-Whys/Fishbone), revised SOPs, **training records**, system validation/qualification docs, **trend reports** before vs after, and **change control** records that show the fix is embedded.

**Red flag:** CAPA that promises training only, without technical/system fixes; generic root causes (“operator oversight”) repeated across issues.

## Data Integrity Patterns (ALCOA+)

Data integrity (DI) is the backbone of trust. Use **ALCOA+** as a quick screen:

* **A**ttributable — who did it and when? (unique logins, signatures)
* **L**egible — readable and permanent records
* **C**ontemporaneous — recorded at the time of activity
* **O**riginal — first capture or certified true copy
* **A**ccurate — truthful, validated, error-free

“**+**” adds: **Complete, Consistent, Enduring, Available**

### Signals to examine

* **Audit trails** enabled, reviewed, and preserved (no gaps, no mass edits).
* **Access controls** (no shared logins; role-based permissions).
* **Validated spreadsheets/systems** (version control, locked formulas, change logs).
* **Metadata integrity** (dates/times, instrument IDs, sample IDs match).
* **OOS/OOE investigations**: depth, timeliness, and trend learning.

**Red flag:** Disabled audit trails, shared credentials, backdated entries, unexplained reprocessing, or “data re-creation” without raw data.

## Triage & Next Steps

Use the findings and CAPA quality to make a fast, defensible decision.

**1) Conditional approval (with controls)**

* Appropriate when no criticals and majors have strong CAPA.
* Put in place: enhanced incoming testing, reduced shelf-life, heightened batch review, and frequent status updates on CAPA milestones.

**2) Remediation follow-up**

* Schedule a documentary re-review in 30–90 days.
* Request before/after evidence (audit trails, trend charts, training effectiveness, change-control closure).
* Keep a risk register and downgrade risks only with evidence.

**3) On-site (or hybrid) verification**

* Triggered by critical findings, DI concerns, or clustered majors.
* Scope narrowly: verify CAPA effectiveness, talk to process owners, sample records, challenge audit trail reviews.
* If travel is constrained, use live system walkthroughs with screen-sharing + independent data extracts.

Decision rule of thumb: Any critical finding or a cluster of majors in one system usually requires on-site verification before release or new business.

Treat every audit report as the start of a risk-based plan, not the end of diligence. Map findings by severity and system, pressure-test the root cause and effectiveness of CAPAs, and verify ALCOA+ controls with real evidence (audit trails, access matrices, validated tools). Then set proportionate next steps: conditional approval with enhanced controls, time-boxed remediation follow-ups, or focused on-site checks. Document the rationale in a living risk register and re-score after each CAPA milestone, evidence over assurances. When combined with transparent supplier information and market intelligence, this approach keeps quality intact while accelerating sourcing decisions. Ready to apply it? Access verified suppliers and audit insights on Pharmaoffer and move forward with confidence.

**CTA: Access verified suppliers and audit insights on Pharmaoffer → Start sourcing**

**FAQs**

**Which findings require escalation?**  
Any critical finding, or clusters of majors in the same quality system (e.g., investigations, DI, validation) warrant immediate escalation and typically on-site verification.

**How do we validate DI remediation?**  
Compare before/after: audit trail configurations and review logs, user access matrices, validated spreadsheet/system reports, and targeted interviews with analysts. Look for effectiveness metrics (e.g., reduced reprocessing, fewer OOS due to DI).

**How much history is enough?**  
Aim for 2–3 years of inspections/audits, including outcomes and CAPA closure evidence. For new sites, weigh corporate history plus early internal audits with tight release controls.