PHASE 3 SEARCH

The CTOQ Mandate Framework:

Reducing CMC & Quality Risk to Drive Exit Valuation in Biopharma

A Board Governance Framework by Phase 3 Search

REVISED EDITION

Phase 3 Search | May 2026

Primary audience: Board Members, Investors, and VP+ across the CMC & Quality community evaluating technical leadership in biopharma. This framework is most directly applicable to development-stage biopharma companies with manufacturing-intensive modalities approaching capital events (Series B+, crossover, IPO, M&A), though the mandate model applies to any organization with a senior technical operations leader regardless of title or company size.

Contents

1 Executive Summary ... 3

2 The Five Mandates: Simultaneous Lenses, Not Sequential Stages ... 4

2.1 How Dominant Emphasis Shifts by Stage ... 4

3 Mandate Definitions and CTOQ Emphasis Profiles ... 5

3.1 The Upstream CTOQ ... 6

3.2 Organizational Development as a CTOQ Mandate ... 7

3.3 The "Platform vs. Machine" Distinction ...

4 How Alignment Drives Funding, Valuation, IPO Success, and M&A Attractiveness ... 8

4.1 The Financial Impact of CRLs on Biopharma Valuations ... 9

4.2 IPO Success: Disclosure Discipline and Readiness Under Scrutiny ... 12

4.3 M&A Attractiveness: Integration Risk and External Innovation Dependence ... 12

5 Case Studies Mapped to Mandate Alignment ... 14

6 Information Architecture: How Operational Risk Reaches the Board ... 17

6.1 Structural Mechanisms ... 17

6.2 The CTOQ as GMP Educator: Founder Preparedness as a Governance Function ... 19

6.3 The Strategic Advantage of CMC Expertise on the Board ... 21

7 Board Actions, KPIs, and Red Flags ... 25

7.1 Governance Actions by Mandate ... 25

7.2 KPI Set and Red Flags Boards Can Audit ... 25

8 Board Conversation Calibration Tool ... 26

8.1 How to Use This Tool ... 26

8.2 Hard Gates (Capital-Type Specific) ... 26

8.3 Suggested Default Emphasis Weights ... 26

9 Limitations and Boundary Conditions ... 27

10 Conclusion ... 28

11 Appendix: Source Verification Notes ... 30

1 Executive Summary

The purpose of a biopharma company is to deliver life-changing therapies to patients. Everything else—capital structure, valuation, exit strategy—is the mechanism that funds that mission. When boards conflate scientific credibility with operational capability in evaluating technical leadership, the cost shows up in clinical holds, Complete Response Letters, down rounds (equity financings priced below prior valuations, signaling eroded investor confidence), and acquisition structures laden with contingent value rights (CVRs—contractual instruments that defer a portion of the purchase price to future milestones, effectively pricing unresolved operational uncertainty as contingent payout)—and in therapies that patients cannot access. Technical risk in biopharma does not announce itself. It sits quietly until someone else reprices it: the FDA, an acquirer, the IPO market, or the next financing round. By then the damage is structural. This whitepaper provides a governance framework for identifying and governing that risk before it is repriced by someone with less patience and more leverage.

A note on terminology: This paper uses "CTOQ" to denote the senior-most technical operations leader—the executive accountable for translating scientific assets into manufacturable, regulatorily defensible products. Depending on the company, this role may carry the title Chief Technical Officer, SVP of Technical Operations, VP of CMC, Head of Pharmaceutical Development, or similar variants. The mandate framework applies to the function, not the title. Boards should identify who in their organization owns the technical operations function and evaluate accordingly.

The stakes are quantifiable. Across 9,704 drug development programs (2011–2020), overall likelihood of approval from Phase I was 7.9%. More recent data (10,954 programs, 2014–2023) shows that figure declining to 6.7%, with attrition increasing at every phase. As clinical probabilities tighten, operational execution—the domain of the CTOQ mandate—becomes a proportionally larger determinant of enterprise value. In a cross-sectional analysis of FDA Complete Response Letters for 43 novel therapeutics ultimately approved (2020–2024), manufacturing facility deficiencies and CMC deficiencies were among the most commonly cited categories, with a median delay of 1.28 years from CRL to approval. The FDA's July 2025 public release of 202 CRLs confirmed the pattern at scale: 74% cited quality or manufacturing deficiencies as contributing factors.

This framework proposes five mandate lenses through which boards should evaluate CTOQ alignment:

- **Possible:** Make a product possible—translation into an investable, regulator-legible development position.
- **Reproducible:** Make the manufacturing process reproducible and robust—yielding product that consistently meets specifications for purity, safety, and potency, and ensuring process portability across facilities without significant redevelopment.
- **Acquirable (Investable):** Make the organization diligence-survivable—documentation, data integrity, and supply chain withstand external scrutiny under any capital event. Boards and

investors may recognize this mandate more readily as “Investable”—the organizational discipline that determines whether external scrutiny reveals a fundable asset or a liability.

- **Scalable:** Build the operational machine—processes are portable from bench to commercial scale, and the platform supports multiple programs without collapse.
- **Durable:** Harden enterprise performance under stress—inspections, shortages, geopolitics, redundancy.

These five mandates are not a linear developmental sequence. They are simultaneous dimensions of technical leadership, all requiring active management at every stage. What shifts is their relative weight: at any given stage, one mandate is dominant—meaning its failure is most likely fatal to the current capital event—but the others remain operational requirements, not completed milestones. This framework applies whether manufacturing is in-house or outsourced to CDMOs; sponsors bear full regulatory accountability regardless.

The sections that follow develop this framework into actionable governance tools: mandate definitions and emphasis profiles, the distinction between building a platform and running a machine, financial impact analysis across funding stages, case studies, board-level KPIs and red flags, deflection-resistant board questions, and a Board Conversation Calibration Tool for surfacing disagreements among directors about mandate emphasis and authority gaps.

2 The Five Mandates: Simultaneous Lenses, Not Sequential Stages

A critical structural point: these mandates are not stages a company “passes through.” A gene therapy company working toward an IND must solve reproducibility before it can achieve **Possible** in any meaningful clinical sense. A Phase II biotech seeking crossover financing must be managing **Acquirable** concurrently with **Reproducible**. Reassuring a board that the company has “passed” a mandate is precisely the kind of governance failure this framework is designed to prevent.

The correct mental model is a radar chart. At each stage, all five mandates are active. One is dominant—meaning its underperformance is most likely to destroy the current capital event—but neglecting any of the others creates latent risk that will surface at the worst possible time.

2.1 How Dominant Emphasis Shifts by Stage

This table describes where the dominant risk lies at each stage. It does not imply that non-dominant mandates are inactive—all five require concurrent governance attention. The columns reflect degree of operational load: "Dominant" is the mandate most likely to be fatal to the current capital event; "Rising Importance" is gaining near-term relevance; "Active Maintenance" is under meaningful operational load without being the primary risk; "Latent" requires monitoring but limited active resource.

Stage	Dominant Mandate	Rising Importance	Active Maintenance	Latent (Monitor)
Pre-IND	Possible	Reproducible	Acquirable	Scalable, Durable
Phase I–II	Reproducible	Acquirable	Possible	Scalable, Durable
Late Phase II / Pre-filing	Acquirable	Scalable	Reproducible	Possible, Durable
Multi-program	Scalable	Durable	Acquirable	Possible, Reproducible
Commercial	Durable	Scalable	Acquirable	Possible, Reproducible

3 Mandate Definitions and CTOQ Emphasis Profiles

The table below describes what a well-aligned CTOQ emphasizes at each stage. These are not distinct roles or archetypes that require different people. Most CTOQs must hold multiple emphasis profiles simultaneously. The framework is useful for identifying where emphasis is insufficient—not for specifying a hiring profile.

Mandate	CTOQ Emphasis	Authority Required	Dominant Risk	Regulatory Anchor
Possible	Scientific translation: mechanism → TPP, indication posture, IND strategy	Gatekeeping: development path, kill criteria, IND posture	Ambiguity—unclear product definition	FDA IND Content and Format guidance; ICH M3(R2)
Reproducible	Systems building: validation, analytical control, CMC discipline	Veto over process lock, validation depth, comparability strategy	Irreversibility masked by heroics	FDA Process Validation guidance; ICH Q10
Acquirable	Governance technology: data integrity, audit readiness, narrative stability	Control over data room standards, documentation, QC/QA escalation	Credibility under scrutiny	FDA Data Integrity guidance

Scalable	Enterprise architecture: shared infrastructure, portfolio orchestration	Cross-program prioritization; shared CMC/QA protection	Complexity—local optimization breaks enterprise	ICH Q11; FDA Comparability Protocols guidance
Durable	Resilience engineering: supply chain, inspection defense, geopolitical mapping	Authority to fund redundancy and slow efficiency when needed	Fragility + macro shocks	FDA supply resilience guidance

Regulatory expectations map tightly to the middle mandates. FDA guidance on process development, characterization, and lifecycle control defines the minimum bar for reproducibility at scale. Analytical methods must be qualified during development and validated before BLA/NDA filing—a progression that begins under the **Reproducible** mandate and completes under the **Scalable** mandate. Early investment in fit-for-purpose assay qualification is a leading indicator of CTOQ mandate alignment.

FDA's data integrity guidance clarifies that integrity is a CGMP requirement, not a preference—central to the **Acquirable** mandate. CMC (Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls) encompasses the full scope of drug substance and drug product chemistry, the manufacturing process, and the analytical methods (Controls) used to ensure quality, purity, safety, and potency.

3.1 The Upstream CTOQ

The five mandates as defined above describe what a well-aligned CTOQ accomplishes. What they do not fully capture is when that work begins. The conventional view treats CMC and technical operations as a receiving function: research defines the molecule, and the CTOQ's organization translates it into a manufacturable product. The most effective CTOQs reject this sequencing. They engage upstream—participating in molecule selection, target product profile definition, and early development decisions alongside research—rather than inheriting finished candidates.

This is not a semantic distinction. A molecule defined without input from process development, analytical sciences, and manufacturing frequently embeds structural problems that are expensive or impossible to resolve downstream: unstable modalities that cannot be reliably produced at commercial scale, formulations incompatible with required routes of administration, analytical methods that cannot detect critical quality attributes. When CMC deficiencies surface during BLA/NDA review, the root cause often traces back not to execution failure in the CMC organization but to decisions made years earlier, when research-CMC integration was absent. A meaningful share of the CRL pattern cited earlier is structurally pre-determined by upstream design choices, not by downstream manufacturing incompetence.

For boards, this has three implications. First, a CTOQ who frames their organization as "technology" rather than "translation" is signaling upstream engagement, and this is a leading indicator that the

Possible mandate is being executed well. Second, organizational designs that silo research from CMC at the leadership level systematically produce downstream friction; boards should probe whether the CTOQ has meaningful input into research decisions, not only accountability for CMC execution. Third, the **Possible** mandate should be evaluated not by whether the CTOQ can translate what research has handed over, but by whether research and CMC jointly define what is worth pursuing. A CTOQ without a seat at the molecule-selection table is a CTOQ operating with one hand tied.

3.2 Organizational Development as a CTOQ Mandate

The five mandates describe what a CTOQ must accomplish. But accomplishment at each stage depends on building and sustaining the organization capable of executing it. Organizational development is not a separate competency from mandate alignment—it is the mechanism through which mandates are fulfilled. A CTOQ who understands the **Reproducible** mandate but lacks the team architecture to execute it has not aligned to the mandate; they have merely described it.

Boards evaluating CTOQ mandate readiness should assess organizational development across three dimensions that map directly to execution capacity:

Leadership. Does the organization have the appropriate technical leadership in each functional area? "Appropriate" means not only technical depth but strategic thinking—the capacity to anticipate what the function needs now and will need as the company advances through development stages. A functional leader who cannot articulate how their area contributes to the organizational mission and current mandate emphasis is a structural gap, not a personnel issue. As the dominant mandate shifts, the leadership profile required underneath the CTOQ shifts with it: a Pre-IND organization needs leaders who can translate science into development strategy; a multi-program organization needs leaders who can manage cross-functional complexity and resource contention.

Technical Expertise (Subject Matter Depth). Does the organization have sufficient technical skill in the required disciplines—biological assay development, chemical assay development, process development, process characterization, analytical sciences, and the modality-specific competencies that the product demands? The **Reproducible** mandate in particular cannot be met without deep subject matter expertise in these areas. A common failure pattern is organizations that have leadership without adequate SME depth, or SME depth without the leadership to deploy it strategically. The CTOQ's organizational development responsibility is to ensure both exist and are connected. This dual requirement is the foundation of technical governance in decision-making: without the right depth, issues are not flagged; without the right leadership, issues that are flagged are not accurately assessed or addressed. In resource-constrained environments, there is persistent pressure from investors to maintain timelines, and that pressure can be directly at odds with the technical gatekeeping that prevents downstream failures. A CTOQ who lacks either the organizational depth to surface problems or the positional authority to act on them will preside over decisions that optimize for speed at the expense of quality—a tradeoff that compounds through every subsequent mandate.

Capacity. Does the organization have enough heads and hands to execute the work plan to the required timeline? Capacity is the dimension most often sacrificed in resource-constrained environments, and the one most likely to force the "heroics" that substitute for systems under the **Reproducible** mandate. A CTOQ who reports strong process development strategy but whose team is operating at 130% utilization has described a plan, not demonstrated a capability. Boards should treat capacity assessment as a leading indicator of mandate execution risk, not an HR metric.

These three dimensions—**leadership, technical expertise,** and **capacity**—form the organizational substrate on which mandate alignment operates. A CTOQ who excels at strategic mandate identification but cannot build the cross-functional team to execute it will produce sophisticated governance narratives and preventable CRLs. Boards should evaluate organizational development capability as part of CTOQ mandate readiness, particularly as companies transition from single-program to multi-program stages where the organizational demands increase non-linearly.

3.3 The "Platform vs. Machine" Distinction

Many companies can claim a scientific platform. Far fewer can demonstrate an operational machine that supports multiple programs with controlled change, comparability, QA bandwidth, and supplier resilience. This is one of the most underappreciated sources of value destruction in biopharma: the gap between platform narrative and operational reality.

Moderna's pre-IPO S-1 is an illustrative example of what explicit operational language in investor communications looks like. It frames mRNA as enabling "scalable infrastructure built on a digital backbone and enabled by automation," and discloses a modular Norwood facility designed to integrate raw materials through filled vials—an operating system, not just a molecule.

> *Caveat: Moderna's S-1 language demonstrates what the **Scalable** mandate looks like in practice. It does not prove that mandate alignment caused the IPO outcome. The $604M raise and ~$7.9B valuation reflected the unprecedented mRNA platform opportunity, the specific investor climate of 2018, and subsequent COVID tailwinds. Using any single success as causal evidence for a framework is a post-hoc reasoning problem that sophisticated readers will identify immediately.*

4 How Alignment Drives Funding, Valuation, IPO Success, and M&A Attractiveness

Boards often discuss valuation as "market comps," but biotech capital still fundamentally prices risk. Practitioner guidance emphasizes that common biotech valuation methods (rNPV, VC method, real options) yield different outputs because they treat regulatory and development risk differently; disagreement on risk treatment can change required dilution and even block financing.

Mandate alignment affects valuation and exit outcomes through four channels:

1. Risk Discount Compression (Reproducible / Durable)

Manufacturing and CMC failures are not rare tail risks; they are development-blocking and approval-blocking. At the IND stage, CMC deficiencies trigger clinical holds—the best available

peer-reviewed data (Pietrusko et al., 2023) found that 21% of cell and gene therapy clinical holds were CMC-attributed, with a mean duration of 8.4 months. At the BLA/NDA stage, they generate Complete Response Letters that are time-expensive. CRL data suggests manufacturing and CMC deficiency categories are among the most commonly cited, with median CRL-to-approval timelines exceeding one year. Aligning technical leadership to reproducibility reduces the probability of rework and delay, tightening investor discount rates.

4.1 The Financial Impact of CRLs on Biopharma Valuations

The financial consequences of CRLs are severe regardless of root cause, but the nature of the deficiency determines both the magnitude and recoverability of the valuation impact. The table below separates manufacturing/CMC-driven CRLs—the category this framework is designed to prevent—from clinical/efficacy-driven CRLs, which fall outside the CTOQ's operational mandate but illustrate the broader valuation dynamics boards must understand.

Company	Year	Decline	CRL Type	Basis & Valuation Impact
Fortress Biotech	2025	–33.7%	CMC / Mfg	cGMP facility deficiency (CUTX-101). Market focused on cash position ($74.4M) and survival timeline. Manufacturing CRL preserved long-term asset value but created acute financing overhang.
Alvotech	2025–26	–34%	CMC / Mfg	Reykjavik manufacturing facility deficiency. Triggered class-action investigations; negative read-through to other programs at same facility revealed systemic infrastructure weakness.

Immunomedics	2019–20	Delayed	CMC / Mfg	Multiple CMC deficiencies delayed approval of Trodelvy. Reproducible mandate execution gap; asset was ultimately acquired by Gilead for $21B, but the approval delay extended capital burn and foregone revenue prior to the acquisition.
Applied Therapeutics	2024	–75%	Clinical	Clinical efficacy failure (AT-007). Near-total program NPV write-down. Not a CMC failure—included to illustrate the valuation difference between addressable and non-addressable CRL categories.
Corcept Therapeutics	2025	–50%	Clinical	Additional efficacy evidence requested despite positive pivotals. Revenue-generating company cushioned from existential risk but growth inflection delayed. Not CTOQ-mandate addressable.

Individual company sources cited in footnotes ,,,,

The governance distinction is critical. Manufacturing-focused CRLs (Fortress/Sentynl, Alvotech, Immunomedics) preserve more long-term asset value than efficacy-driven rejections (Applied Therapeutics, Corcept)—the underlying science remains intact—but still compress valuations substantially through extended timelines (typically 2–4 years to approval for first-time launchers), increased capital requirements, and heightened discount rates. Buy-side valuation models typically adjust probability of approval from 70–80% pre-CRL down to 10–40% post-CRL, depending on deficiency type.,

For boards, this table makes the mandate framework concrete: the difference between a 33.7% decline (addressable manufacturing deficiency within the CTOQ's mandate) and a 75% decline (fundamental clinical failure outside it) is the difference between a company that had operational systems and one that did not. The **Reproducible** and **Acquirable** mandates exist to prevent the manufacturing-category value destruction. Clinical failures require different governance tools.

2. Information Asymmetry Reduction (Acquirable)

Sponsors' public narratives have historically been incomplete relative to the regulatory record. A BMJ cross-sectional study (2008–2013 CRLs) found that sponsor press release statements matched only 14% of CRL content, with only 15% of safety statements and 16% of efficacy statements represented—documenting a systematic disclosure gap that raises diligence costs for acquirers and underwriters.

> *Precision note: The BMJ study documents a disclosure gap—companies saying less publicly than the CRL revealed—rather than information asymmetry in the traditional financing sense. The governance implication is that the **Acquirable** mandate must address narrative completeness and answer stability, not just data room documentation.*

The FDA's CRL publication program and openFDA endpoint reduce this disclosure gap and raise external expectations for answer consistency.

3. Stage-Linked Valuation Evidence (Acquirable / Scalable)

A study of 311 biopharma acquisitions (US/EU, 2005–2020) found that valuation was "mainly driven" by development stage, with multi-indication companies valued higher than single-indication peers in Phase I and Phase II—illustrating that late-stage capital and acquirers explicitly price de-risking and optionality.

4. Capital Type Fit (VC vs. Crossover vs. Strategic)

Later capital (crossover/public) underwrites narrative durability and operational readiness more than exploratory science. Misalignment manifests as down rounds, failed "window timing," or M&A structures that shift risk back to sellers through milestones and CVRs.

The 2024–2026 venture capital environment has amplified these dynamics. In Q1 2024, biopharma companies raised $5.9 billion across 209 VC rounds, reflecting a bifurcated "haves versus have-nots" financing environment. PitchBook's 2025 analysis found $33.8 billion deployed but heavily concentrated in later-stage programs ready for pivotal work or commercialization—a pronounced shift away from regulatorily complicated stories. Industry commentary characterizes 2025 as a prolonged "winter" in which many VC firms were effectively pausing deals they would normally pursue, demanding clearer regulatory pathways before committing to long-duration capital.,,

CMC has evolved from a technical box-checking exercise to a core investment gating criterion. William Blair's 2024 analysis found that 85% of small biopharma companies outsourced API production and 77% outsourced finished-dose manufacturing—both record highs—while FDA-supported data confirm that CMO/contract manufacturing sites account for approximately half of facility-deficiency CRLs for biologics. Investors now intensively scrutinize supply chain robustness, CDMO strategy, and prior regulatory inspection history before committing new capital. Persistent or poorly explained CMC/CRL histories narrow the investor universe to those willing to price in

turnaround profiles, leading to smaller round sizes, lower pre-money valuations, harsher anti-dilution provisions, tranched milestone structures, or royalty and credit-like instruments rather than clean preferred equity.,

Against this backdrop, a CMC-driven CRL effectively flags a company as both higher-risk and more capital-intensive, making it substantially harder to secure a position within the smaller pool of later-stage-biased VC transactions. Companies with unresolved CRLs increasingly pursue M&A, out-licensing, or other strategic alternatives because financing markets discount them prohibitively.

4.2 IPO Success: Disclosure Discipline and Readiness Under Scrutiny

A practical definition of IPO success is: (i) pricing within or above range at adequate size, (ii) credible post-IPO execution without repeated technical surprises, and (iii) ability to raise follow-on capital without credibility shocks.

Wilson Sonsini's 2024 IPO report (IPOs >$75M) quantifies the cyclicality: life sciences IPO counts fell from 93 (2021) to 9 (2022) and 10 (2023), recovering to 25 (2024). Within that 2024 sample, 72% priced within range, 16% below, 12% above—suggesting limited tolerance for fragile stories.

Nature Biotechnology's sector data confirms the extreme 2020–2021 spike: 154 R&D-driven biotechs went public in 2021, with average IPO proceeds of $167M per company. Companies that "window-timed" had unusual access to capital; those windows are not a planning assumption.

The JOBS Act's EGC provisions reduce disclosure burdens for many newly public life sciences issuers but do not remove the need for internal discipline. Scaled disclosure can temporarily mask governance immaturity—raising the value of **Acquirable** mandate discipline before the market forces it.

4.3 M&A Attractiveness: Integration Risk and External Innovation Dependence

Large pharma's dependence on external innovation makes diligence readiness and integration risk decisive factors in M&A premiums. The M&A landscape has shifted dramatically toward earlier-stage targets: IQVIA data shows pre-Phase III deals represented approximately 50% of biopharma M&A value in 2024, compared to a 19% four-year average—meaning acquirers are routinely absorbing CMC-immature assets where manufacturing scalability, process characterization, and supply chain readiness have not been demonstrated. Industry estimates suggest that more than 70% of NME revenues have come from externally sourced products since 2018, with roughly 45% sourced before launch—meaning large pharma frequently acquires into uncertainty and pays more when execution risk is already bounded.

> *Source note: These widely cited figures are attributed to McKinsey. The original source should be confirmed as publicly accessible and current before circulation. EvaluatePharma, IQVIA, or major bank equity research notes provide alternative sourcing for similar data.*

Loss-of-exclusivity (LOE) pressure reinforces external innovation dependence. Major franchises face significant patent cliff exposure through 2030, driving sustained M&A appetite.

Macro context is consistent: dealmakers are responding to economic and geopolitical uncertainty by focusing on smaller transactions and novel earlier-stage therapeutics, while balancing LOE pressures.

Where risk cannot be resolved pre-deal, it is increasingly priced contractually. Sidley's survey of life sciences CVRs (May 2023–Sep 2024) documents their use to bridge valuation gaps—an institutional signal that **Durable** and **Scalable** uncertainties are being monetized as contingent payouts. Positioning CVRs as a financial instrument that prices unresolved operational risk—rather than simply a valuation gap bridge—is a useful reframe for both boards and advisors.

5 Case Studies Mapped to Mandate Alignment

Scores below are directional (H/M/L) and reflect the mandate that appears dominant at the time of the event, based on public disclosures. They are illustrative, not predictive. Failure cases are more analytically defensible than success cases because failure modes are more attributable than success.

A note on case selection: Failure cases are drawn from 2019–2026 because post-2020 CRL disclosure data is substantially more complete and verifiable. Success cases (Kite, Moderna) predate this period because large, well-documented acquisitions and IPOs with clear mandate alignment signals are infrequent. The temporal asymmetry does not imply deteriorating industry performance; it reflects the maturation of public CRL data and the analytical advantage of attributing failure modes versus success causes.

Company	Outcome	Evidence	Mandate Snapshot
AveXis / Zolgensma (2019)	Data integrity credibility shock post-approval	FDA statement on data accuracy issues; Novartis provided integrity updates. The data manipulation was referred to the FDA's Office of Criminal Investigations; Novartis subsequently absorbed AveXis into its global quality organization and engaged third-party quality consultants for remediation. Demonstrates Acquirable mandate failure: the product was Possible, but organizational credibility systems were inadequate.	Possible H / Reproducible M / Acquirable L / Scalable M / Durable M

Immunomedics (2019–2020)	CRL due to CMC; later $21B acquisition by Gilead	FDA review notes CRL issued due to multiple CMC deficiencies. Reproducible mandate execution gap that delayed approval timeline; the underlying asset ultimately supported the $21B Gilead acquisition.	Pre-CRL: Possible H / Reproducible L / Acquirable L-M / Scalable M / Durable M
bluebird bio (2025)	Capital stress; acquired with CVR structure	Carlyle/SK deal: $3 cash + $6.84 CVR tied to sales milestone. CVR structure prices unresolved Durable and Scalable risk as contingent payout.	Possible H / Reproducible M / Acquirable M / Scalable L-M / Durable L
Fortress Biotech (2025)	CRL; −33.7% same-day; manufacturing facility deficiency	cGMP facility issues for CUTX-101. Market focus shifted immediately to cash position ($74.4M) and survival timeline. Manufacturing CRL preserved more long-term value than clinical failure but created acute financing overhang.	Possible H / Reproducible L-M / Acquirable L / Scalable M / Durable L
Alvotech (2025–26)	CRL; −34%; class-action investigations	Reykjavik facility deficiency triggered negative read-through across pipeline. Investors applied broader risk discounts beyond the specific rejected asset—perceiving systemic infrastructure weakness.	Possible H / Reproducible L / Acquirable L / Scalable L / Durable L
Kite – Gilead (2017)	$11.9B strategic acquisition	Acquisition explicitly framed as platform/pipeline play; integration risk centered on manufacturing throughput in CAR-T contexts.	Possible H / Reproducible M / Acquirable M-H / Scalable M / Durable M

Moderna (2018 IPO)	Record $604M IPO; ~$7.9B valuation	S-1 discloses modular Norwood cGMP facility, digital integration, explicit “scalable infrastructure” language. Illustrates Scalable mandate communication, not proof of framework causality.	Possible H / Reproducible M-H / Acquirable M / Scalable H / Durable M

Interpretation: These cases demonstrate that late-stage value is not only “clinical data quality.” In multiple outcomes, the decisive friction was reproducibility, credibility, or resilience—mandate-level operational issues that boards can influence through authority design, systems investment, and information architecture.

A 2025-2026 example reinforces this pattern. Regeneron received Complete Response Letters tied not to clinical data, but to unresolved FDA inspection findings at Catalent Indiana (now under Novo Nordisk ownership), the fill-finish site included in filings for odronextamab and the Eylea HD prefilled syringe. The impact was not "the drug does not work." It was commercially more damaging: launch timing, regulatory credibility, and competitive positioning were impaired by a third-party manufacturing bottleneck. Regeneron subsequently disclosed plans to add both a second vial filler and a second prefilled syringe filler. This is exactly the redundancy the Durable mandate is designed to force before the crisis arrives. The broader lesson is not "never outsource." It is that CDMO strategy, fill-finish redundancy, inspection history, and alternate-site readiness are board-level valuation issues. A company can clear the science and still be delayed by the operating system. If the board only asks whether the product works, it is asking half the question.

The Enbrel case further illustrates the financial magnitude of manufacturing capacity failure. Immunex, which developed Enbrel for rheumatoid arthritis, could not scale manufacturing to meet surging demand beginning in 1999. Patients were placed on waiting lists, new prescriptions were suspended, and Immunex’s share price declined sharply. The manufacturing shortfall directly contributed to Amgen’s acquisition of Immunex for approximately $16 billion in 2002. Under Amgen’s manufacturing infrastructure, Enbrel generated over $86 billion in cumulative worldwide sales. Manufacturing capacity failure did not destroy the product—it transferred the majority of its lifetime value to the acquirer.

The inverse pattern—where manufacturing and operational agility created value—is equally instructive. Merck’s pembrolizumab (Keytruda) was nearly abandoned in early 2010 when the company had little oncology commitment. Bristol Myers Squibb held an approximate five-year lead with nivolumab (Opdivo). Merck reactivated the program, accelerated clinical development through an adaptive trial design, and achieved FDA approval for Keytruda three months before Opdivo (September vs. December 2014). Keytruda has since generated over $163 billion in cumulative sales—the highest-grossing pharmaceutical product in history. The case demonstrates that operational agility, including manufacturing readiness for accelerated clinical supply, can overcome

substantial competitive deficits. For every day a $3 billion-per-year product is delayed, approximately $8–10 million in sales is permanently lost from the back end of patent exclusivity.

6 Information Architecture: How Operational Risk Reaches the Board

Diagnosing what boards should monitor is necessary but insufficient. The harder governance problem is ensuring that operationally relevant information reaches the board in the first place.

In most early-stage biotechs, CMC and manufacturing risk is filtered through the CEO before reaching the board—not through bad faith, but because CEOs are optimizing for capital-raising narratives. The structural result is that boards learn about operational problems after they have become expensive. A governance framework that does not address this information flow problem is incomplete.

6.1 Structural Mechanisms

Direct CTOQ Access to the Board

The CTOQ (or most senior technical operations leader) should have standing access to the board and its technical or audit committee—including regular attendance at board meetings, direct relationships with appropriate directors for advice and mentoring, and participation in Science and Technology sub-committee meetings. This is not about undermining the CEO or creating a parallel reporting line; it is about ensuring a second channel exists for information that the CEO's narrative incentives may structurally filter.

The Time Tension: Reporting vs. Execution

Standing board access must be distinguished from reporting theater. The governance goal is direct information flow—ensuring operational reality reaches the board without CEO filtering—not elaborate deck preparation for every meeting. With that distinction in mind, the hardest part of board-level reporting for technical operations leaders is not alignment with a governance framework—it is the time required to do it well. Every hour a CTOQ spends preparing board materials, calibrating messaging for a non-technical audience, or sitting in committee sessions is an hour not spent on the manufacturing floor, the CDMO relationship, or the process validation campaign. This is not a scheduling complaint; it is a structural tension that governance design must acknowledge and manage.

Yet time spent calibrating messaging for a non-technical audience is sometimes more important than time spent on the manufacturing floor. If a CTOQ cannot describe a strategy to a non-technical person, they do not have a strategy—they are simply executing. The critical capability is articulating the risks of impossible timelines before it is too late. Part of the problem is optimism; part of the problem is translation loss when risk passes through the CEO to the board. People know CMC is hard, but they rarely know how to predict when CMC difficulties will impact the business. A CTOQ—or a board member with CMC experience—who sees this coming and can influence

planning and budget accordingly is the difference between proactive governance and post-hoc crisis management.

The solution is not less board access—it is a reporting architecture calibrated to the company's stage and the dominant mandate. A practical model: the CTOQ holds a standing seat on the executive leadership team, attends the board quarterly, delivers one to two formal operational updates per year, and participates in committee discussions when GxP, supply chain, or manufacturing quality topics surface. This provides clear board visibility into operational risk without consuming the execution bandwidth that the CTOQ's mandates demand. The reporting cadence should expand during pre-filing periods and capital events—precisely when the **Acquirable** mandate becomes dominant and the board's need for operational information intensifies.

The underlying principle: reporting frequency should track mandate dominance, not calendar cadence. A CTOQ who reports quarterly in steady state but weekly during pre-submission readiness is governing adaptively. A CTOQ who reports identically regardless of stage is performing compliance, not governance.

Technical Committee Composition

- *"What is the current deviation/CAPA aging backlog, and what is the trend line over the last three quarters?"*
- *"How many processes currently depend on a single individual? What is the bus factor for our lead program's manufacturing process?"*
- *"When was the last time we ran a mock pre-approval inspection? What were the findings?"*
- *"For our top three critical raw materials, what is the single-source exposure and the qualified backup timeline?"*
- *"If an acquirer's diligence team arrived tomorrow, what would they find that we would not want them to find?"*
- *"Are we appropriately resourced for the current stage—heads, capital, external partners—or are we assuming heroics? For the work we cannot staff internally, have we qualified the right external execution, and are those timelines realistic?"*
- *"Are our process development, analytical, and manufacturing timelines realistic given the clinical plan—or are we carrying compression risk that will surface as a deviation backlog, a failed tech transfer, or a CRL?"*

Board technical committees should include members with operational backgrounds—not only scientific advisory expertise. A committee composed entirely of academic scientists and former CSOs will evaluate clinical plausibility but not manufacturing readiness, QA system maturity, or supply chain resilience. The committee needs at least one member with hands-on experience in CMC, process development, or regulatory operations.

Questions Boards Should Ask That CEOs Cannot Easily Deflect

These questions work because they are specific, quantifiable, and resistant to narrative deflection. They surface the operational reality that mandate alignment is designed to govern.

Pre-Filing Operational Review Cadence

Before any major capital event—Series B+, crossover round, IPO filing, or M&A process initiation—the board should require a structured operational readiness review covering: current mandate emphasis vs. stage requirements, authority alignment gaps, documentation/data integrity status, QA capacity vs. projected demand, and supply chain single-point-of-failure exposure.

6.2 The CTOQ as GMP Educator: Founder Preparedness as a Governance Function

One of the most consistently underappreciated responsibilities of the CTOQ in early-stage biopharma is GMP compliance education—not of the manufacturing team, but of the founders, the executive team, and the board itself. In a sector where most founding teams come from academic or discovery backgrounds, the gap between scientific innovation culture and GMP compliance culture is not just a training issue. It is a governance risk that compounds silently until it surfaces as a CRL, a failed inspection, or a diligence finding that reprices an entire transaction.

GMP preparedness is not a box to check before filing. It is a foundational operating discipline that the CTOQ function must begin building from the earliest stages of development—and that requires the founder and CEO to understand why it matters, what it costs, and what happens when it is deferred. The CTOQ's mandate under the Reproducible lens includes creating organizational fluency in GMP principles at every level, starting at the top.

Why Founder GMP Literacy Is a CTOQ Responsibility

Academic founders typically carry deep mechanistic knowledge but limited exposure to GMP manufacturing environments. The cultural distance between a discovery lab and a cGMP facility is enormous: documentation practices that feel bureaucratic in a research context are non-negotiable regulatory requirements in a manufacturing context. Deviation management, change control, data integrity protocols, and CAPA systems are not overhead—they are the operating system that determines whether a product is approvable.

When founders do not understand this, the consequences are predictable. CMC investment gets deferred in favor of "one more experiment." Process validation timelines get compressed to meet financing windows. Quality systems get built reactively after an inspection finding rather than proactively before it. When the CTOQ function fails to educate the founding team on GMP realities, the organization accumulates regulatory debt that will eventually come due at the worst possible time.

The Technical Rigor Problem Disguised as Compliance Failure

A related and frequently observed dynamic deserves explicit attention: compliance and regulatory findings that are, at root, failures of technical rigor in process development—not failures of the quality or regulatory functions tasked with managing them. In many organizations, these issues do not become visible until an FDA inspection or CRL surfaces them. At that point, they are categorized as QA or Regulatory deficiencies and assigned to those functions for resolution. The technical team that created the underlying condition—through insufficient process characterization, inadequate

analytical method development, or undisciplined tech transfer—is structurally insulated from accountability.

This accountability displacement is one of the most common and expensive patterns in biopharma operations. A process development team that does not fully characterize its critical process parameters will produce a process that appears to work—until it does not, at which point the deviation is logged by QA, the regulatory response is managed by Regulatory Affairs, and the root cause is never attributed to the upstream technical decision that created the vulnerability. In weak organizations, this cycle repeats: the technical team continues to operate with insufficient rigor, QA and Regulatory absorb the consequences, and the board sees a growing deviation backlog or regulatory finding without understanding that the problem is not quality system capacity but process development discipline.

The CTOQ's governance responsibility here is twofold. First, to establish a culture of technical rigor in which process development, analytical sciences, and CMC functions own the upstream quality of their work—not as a compliance obligation but as a scientific and engineering standard. Second, to ensure that root cause analysis for regulatory and compliance findings traces accountability back to the originating technical decision, not merely to the function that documented or reported the problem. A CTOQ who allows compliance findings to be structurally misattributed to QA and Regulatory is not managing technical operations; they are enabling a cycle of organizational self-deception that will eventually surface as a CRL, a failed inspection, or a diligence finding that reprices the company.

What GMP Preparedness Looks Like as a Board-Level Priority

- Targeted GMP context at decision points. Rather than attempting broad curricular education, the CTOQ function should deliver focused, decision-relevant GMP context to the executive team and board at specific inflection points—pre-IPO and pre-crossover readiness reviews, major CDMO selection decisions, pre-submission BLA/NDA discussions, and any proposed acceleration of development timelines. The content remains strategic rather than compliance-oriented: how GMP requirements shape this particular decision, what a pre-approval inspection evaluates for this modality, why process development and characterization cannot be compressed without regulatory consequence, how CMC deficiencies translate into clinical holds at the IND stage and CRLs at the BLA/NDA stage, and the valuation destruction that follows each. This decision-point delivery model is realistic for both CTOQ and board bandwidth—and it places GMP literacy where it can actually influence outcomes.
- **GMP readiness as a milestone, not a phase.** GMP preparedness should appear explicitly in the company's development timeline alongside clinical milestones—with its own budget line, resource allocation, and board reporting cadence. Companies that treat GMP as a "later" problem consistently find that "later" is too late.
- **Founder-CTOQ alignment on quality culture.** The CTOQ must establish from the outset that quality is not in tension with speed—it is a precondition for speed that is sustainable. Every shortcut in GMP preparedness creates a probability of delay that, when it materializes, costs more time and capital than the shortcut saved. This is the conversation that founders most need to hear and most frequently resist, which is precisely why it must be a CTOQ-led governance function rather than a compliance department afterthought.

For boards evaluating CTOQ mandate alignment, founder GMP literacy is a leading indicator. A company where the CEO can articulate the difference between process characterization (required throughout development) and process validation (required for BLA/NDA filing), or explain why a change control system matters for regulatory strategy, is a company where the CTOQ has done the foundational governance work that prevents downstream value destruction. A company where GMP is "the manufacturing team's problem" is one where the **Reproducible** mandate is structurally unanchored at the leadership level.

6.3 The Strategic Advantage of CMC Expertise on the Board

The structural mechanisms above—direct CTOQ reporting, technical committees, deflection-resistant questions—are necessary but insufficient if no one in the boardroom can interpret the answers. A board that asks the right questions about deviation backlogs or comparability strategies but lacks the expertise to evaluate the responses is performing governance theater, not governance.

The gap is stark and quantifiable. Biopharma boards routinely seat commercial executives, clinical development veterans, R&D scientists, former regulators, and financial operators. The level of strategic rigor around those functions—commercial launch planning, clinical endpoint selection, R&D portfolio optimization—is sophisticated, board-tested, and supported by decades of governance precedent. No equivalent governance infrastructure exists for enterprise-level CMC and manufacturing operations. The result is a structural asymmetry: the category of risk most likely to generate CRLs and destroy value at the point of maximum capital exposure is the one with the least board-level representation.

This gap persists in part because CMC and technical operations leaders are too often treated as operators rather than strategic voices—peripheral to the conversations that shape enterprise direction. That framing is wrong, and this paper argues it is dangerously expensive. The CTOQ's mandate portfolio—from scientific translation through supply chain resilience—is directly tied to enterprise value, innovation trajectory, and the integrity of the corporate narrative. Positioning the CTOQ as a systems custodian rather than a strategic operator is precisely the governance failure that allows manufacturing-category CRLs to reach filing stage.

This is the case for placing genuine CMC or manufacturing operations expertise on the board itself—not on a scientific advisory board, not in a consultant role, but as a voting director with fiduciary authority and access to unfiltered information.

Why Scientific Expertise Is Not a Substitute

Most biopharma boards recruit scientific credibility through former CSOs, academic researchers, or clinical development veterans. These profiles evaluate mechanism of action, clinical trial design, and therapeutic differentiation. They do not typically evaluate process validation strategy, CDMO governance, analytical method robustness, or supply chain resilience—the operational domains where clinical holds and CRL-generating failures originate. Quality and Regulatory compliance function as cross-cutting lenses that, when not applied correctly or at all, lead to significant gaps causing clinical delays (inability to release batches), clinical holds on IND applications, and eventually CRLs on marketing applications. The evidence reviewed in this paper is unambiguous: the dominant approval-blocking deficiencies in recent CRLs are manufacturing and CMC, not

clinical efficacy. In cell and gene therapy, the distinction between manufacturing and efficacy is even more precarious: poor manufacturing decisions—process changes, raw material substitutions, scale-up modifications—can directly impact clinical efficacy because the product is the process to a degree that small molecules and even conventional biologics are not. The evidence is not theoretical. Novartis's Kymriah failed the Phase III BELINDA trial in lymphoma, with the company identifying the 52-day vein-to-vein manufacturing time as the most relevant factor—prolonged ex vivo culture drove T cell exhaustion and phenotypic shifts that degraded antitumor activity, a manufacturing-driven efficacy failure. Separately, bluebird bio's Skysona gene therapy produced insertional oncogenesis in 7 of 67 pediatric patients when the Lenti-D lentiviral vector integrated into proto-oncogenes—while the company's other products using a different vector design (Zynteglo, Lyfgenia) did not, demonstrating that the vector manufacturing and design decision itself determined clinical safety outcomes. Technical governance that can accurately assess the clinical implications of manufacturing changes is essential in these modalities, and boards without that expertise are exposed to a category of risk they cannot even identify. A board without CMC expertise is structurally blind to the category of risk most likely to destroy value at the point of maximum capital exposure.

What a CMC-Experienced Board Member Provides

- **Pattern recognition on operational risk.** A Board Member with CMC operating experience can distinguish between a manageable deviation trend and a systemic quality culture failure—a distinction that determines whether a CRL results in a 12-month delay or a 3-year existential crisis. This pattern recognition cannot be acquired from board presentations; it comes from having managed CAPA systems, led pre-approval inspections, and negotiated with FDA reviewers on CMC deficiency responses.
- **Real-time calibration of CTOQ performance.** Without an operational peer on the board, the CTOQ's self-assessment of mandate readiness is effectively unauditable. A CMC-experienced director can probe whether the CTOQ's confidence in process validation, analytical control, or facility readiness is well-founded—or whether it reflects the optimism bias that characterizes every pre-submission narrative until the CRL arrives.
- **Credibility with investors and acquirers.** Sophisticated crossover investors and strategic acquirers notice board composition. A board that includes CMC or manufacturing leadership signals that the company treats operational capability as a governance-level priority, not a delegated technical detail. In a 2024–2026 financing environment where CMC has become a core investment gating criterion, this signal has direct capital-access implications.
- **Informed challenge on capital allocation.** CMC investment is chronically underfunded in early-stage biopharma because clinical milestones are more narratively compelling than process development milestones. A CMC-experienced director can advocate for at-risk investment in commercial-grade process development, dual-sourcing strategies, and early validation work—the exact investments that prevent the value destruction documented in the CRL case studies above. Without this voice at the board level, CMC investment proposals are evaluated by directors who lack the context to weigh them against clinical spending.

The Innovation Dimension: CTOQs as Strategic Operators, Not Systems Custodians

A critical reframe is required. The CTOQ in mandate-aligned governance is not a quality systems custodian. The role is a strategic operating function that sits at the center of the company's innovation gearing system—the mechanism by which scientific discovery translates into manufacturable, scalable, regulatorily defensible products that reach patients. Without this gearing, innovation stalls at the bench.

Consider what the CTOQ actually controls in a well-aligned organization: the decision of whether a molecule's manufacturing process can support the target product profile (**Possible**); whether that process can be transferred, validated, and scaled without heroics (**Reproducible**); whether the documentation and data integrity systems survive diligence scrutiny (**Acquirable**); whether the operational platform supports multiple programs without collapse (**Scalable**); and whether the supply chain withstands inspection, shortage, and geopolitical stress (**Durable**). Each of these is a strategic decision that shapes which innovations advance and which die in the gap between discovery and delivery.

CTOQs who are treated as operators—asked to execute decisions made by others rather than to shape the decisions themselves—cannot fulfill this role. This distinction is not theoretical; it is the reason experienced technical leaders increasingly pursue COO or EVP titles that carry explicit enterprise-level authority rather than CTOQ roles that may or may not include it. A board-level CMC director must therefore guard against reducing the CTOQ to a governance mechanic. The value of the role lies in its proximity to innovation and its capacity to translate scientific ambition into operational reality. When boards understand this, they stop asking "is our manufacturing on track?" and start asking "is our CTOQ shaping the strategic choices that determine whether our innovation reaches patients?"

The Asymmetry Argument

The strongest case for CMC board expertise is asymmetric. The downside of not having it is catastrophic and well-documented: 30–75% single-day valuation destruction from preventable CRL categories, multi-year approval delays, financing overhangs that force companies into distressed M&A or strategic alternatives. The cost of having it is one board seat. **There is no credible governance argument for leaving this risk category unrepresented at the fiduciary level.**

External evidence supports the link between board-level technical governance and operational outcomes. ISPE's Quality Culture Maturity Model documents that organizations where quality governance reaches the board level demonstrate measurably better site-level operational outcomes —fewer critical deviations, shorter CAPA cycle times, and more successful regulatory inspections. Deloitte's longitudinal analysis of pharmaceutical R&D returns shows that the rising cost of capital in biopharma is driven significantly by operational execution risk, not just clinical uncertainty—suggesting that boards with the expertise to manage operational risk are better positioned to compress the discount rates that determine enterprise value.,

The counterfactual question remains relevant: would the manufacturing-category CRLs documented in this paper have reached filing stage if a director with CMC operating experience had been probing facility readiness, process validation coverage, and inspection preparedness in the 12 months before submission? The external evidence suggests the answer is no—not because board-

level expertise is a silver bullet, but because it changes what gets funded, what gets escalated, and what gets caught before it becomes a $100M–$500M governance failure.

Practical Implementation: Structure Matters, but Phenotype Matters More

For early-stage companies where a full-time board seat may not be feasible, a CMC-experienced board observer or a formal advisory role with board meeting attendance rights and direct access to the CTOQ provides a meaningful interim step. The critical requirement is not the title; it is unfiltered access to operational information and a standing expectation of independent assessment. As the company approaches capital events where **Reproducible** and **Acquirable** mandates become dominant—typically Series B and beyond—transitioning this role to a full voting director position becomes a governance imperative rather than an option.

A necessary caution: structure alone never solves this problem. The right reporting lines, committee charters, and board seats are necessary conditions, not sufficient ones. The effectiveness of a CTOQ—and of a CMC-experienced board director—ultimately lives or dies on personal phenotype: depth of operating experience, judgment under ambiguity, clarity under pressure, and the ability to exercise cross-enterprise influence without positional authority. The wrong person in the right structure still fails. A CTOQ who has managed CAPA systems but cannot translate operational risk into language the board and investors understand will not change governance outcomes. A board director with CMC credentials but without the conviction to challenge an optimistic pre-submission narrative will not prevent the CRL.

Boards should therefore evaluate candidates for these roles on demonstrated operating judgment, not credentials alone. The relevant question is not “have they run a manufacturing operation?” but “have they identified and escalated an operational risk that others were willing to rationalize away—and did the organization act on it?” That phenotype—the willingness to name uncomfortable operational realities at moments of maximum narrative pressure—is what separates governance from governance theater.

7 Board Actions, KPIs, and Red Flags

7.1 Governance Actions by Mandate

Authority alignment matters. Evidence from VC governance research shows that investors’ willingness to replace founders can improve performance under certain conditions, indicating leadership alignment is an outcome variable, not cosmetic.

7.2 KPI Set and Red Flags Boards Can Audit

Mandate	KPIs (Leading Indicators)	Red Flags (Board-Action Triggers)
Possible	% programs with explicit go/no-go criteria; regulator feedback clarity; TPP stability	Indication churn without decision rationale; "priority" changes every quarter
Reproducible	Deviation/CAPA aging; batch success rate; assay CV/variance; validation plan coverage	Rising deviation backlog; late process changes; "only X can run this" dependency; compliance findings consistently attributed to QA/Regulatory rather than traced to process development root causes
Acquirable	Audit severity trend; document completeness score; data integrity exceptions; time-to-answer in diligence	Inconsistent risk statements; missing traceability; repeated documentation rebuilds
Scalable	Change control cycle time; QA review throughput; supplier qualification coverage; cross-program resource conflicts	QA bottlenecks; "platform" not reusable operationally; uncontrolled customization
Durable	Supplier concentration index; inventory for critical inputs; inspection readiness KPIs; shortage/recall incidents	Single-source APIs/critical materials; no tested continuity plan; geopolitical blind spots

8 Board Conversation Calibration Tool

Because no public dataset contains "CTOQ alignment scores," the model below is a structured board conversation tool—designed to surface disagreements about where a company is, not to compute a readiness number. It uses directional scoring to frame discussion, not to predict outcomes.

Important: This tool is explicitly not a validated quantitative model. It should not be treated as one. The value lies in the conversation it structures—specifically, in surfacing disagreements among board members about mandate emphasis, authority gaps, and operational readiness. If all board members score identically, the tool has failed; the goal is to surface the disagreements.

8.1 How to Use This Tool

- **Score each mandate 1–5** for the company's current state. Each board member scores independently before discussion.
- **Identify the dominant mandate** for the current stage (refer to the emphasis table above).

- **Assess authority alignment:** Does the CTOQ have the decision rights required by the dominant mandate?
- **Assess penalty factors:** Documentation maturity gaps, QA/CMC capacity constraints, supplier/geopolitical exposure.
- **Check hard gates** before any capital event.
- **Discuss the disagreements.** Where board members scored differently is where the real governance conversation lies.

8.2 Hard Gates (Capital-Type Specific)

These are defensible heuristics grounded in the empirical evidence reviewed in this paper:

> - **IPO / Crossover: Acquirable** ≥ 4 and **Reproducible** ≥ 3. Scrutiny and reproducibility dominate when IPO windows are narrow and selective.
> - **Strategic M&A: Acquirable** ≥ 4 and either **Scalable** ≥ 3 (for platform claims) or **Durable** ≥ 3 (for near-commercial assets). Reflects integration risk and external innovation dependence.

8.3 Suggested Default Emphasis Weights

Weights below are rounded directional defaults expressed as approximate percentages. They communicate where emphasis should lie at each stage, not a computation to be performed mechanically. Boards should tune them to their specific company context.

Stage	Possible	Reproducible	Acquirable	Scalable	Durable
Pre-IND	45%	30%	15%	5%	5%
Phase I–II	20%	45%	20%	10%	5%
Late Phase II / Pre-filing	10%	25%	40%	15%	10%
Multi-program	5%	20%	20%	40%	15%
Commercial	5%	10%	15%	25%	45%

9 Limitations and Boundary Conditions

This framework is designed for a specific governance context. Acknowledging its boundaries strengthens rather than undermines its application.

Where the Framework Applies Most Strongly

The mandate model is most directly applicable to development-stage biopharma companies with manufacturing-intensive modalities (biologics, gene therapies, cell therapies, complex generics) where CMC risk is a material component of regulatory and capital risk. Companies approaching capital events (Series B+, crossover, IPO, M&A) will find the framework's emphasis-shifting model most actionable.

Where the Framework Has Less Purchase

The framework's urgency also varies by manufacturing platform maturity. For mature, standardized modalities (e.g., monoclonal antibodies with well-established manufacturing processes), an experienced CMC leader may suffice through early development; a CTOQ-level leader becomes critical as programs approach Phase IIb and pivotal trial planning. For emerging modalities where the manufacturing platform is itself the innovation (e.g., mRNA therapeutics, gene editing, autologous cell therapies), a CTOQ with broad technical operations experience is needed from the earliest stages. For companies where clinical risk genuinely dwarfs operational risk—first-in-class CNS programs with novel mechanisms, early-stage platform companies without a lead candidate, or digitally-native therapeutics with minimal manufacturing complexity—the mandate framework may overweight CMC governance relative to clinical development governance. In such cases, the framework should be adapted to include clinical mandate dimensions rather than applied as-is.

Methodological Limitations

- **Case study attribution:** Failure cases are more analytically defensible than success cases because failure modes are observable while success is multi-causal. The case studies in this paper demonstrate correlation between mandate misalignment and value destruction, not causation.
- **Scoring tool limitations:** The Board Conversation Calibration Tool has not been validated against outcomes data. Its value is procedural (structuring conversation) rather than predictive (forecasting events).
- **Source heterogeneity:** This paper draws on peer-reviewed publications, regulatory data, practitioner commentary, and proprietary industry analyses. Source strength varies; the Appendix identifies which sources require independent verification before external circulation.
- **Survivorship bias:** The framework is built primarily from observable failures and high-profile successes. Companies that quietly maintained strong mandate alignment and experienced uneventful regulatory pathways are underrepresented—precisely because their success generated less public data.

The Speed-Governance Tradeoff

A legitimate counterargument exists: excessive governance overhead can slow decision-making in a sector where speed-to-IND and speed-to-market have real competitive and financial value. The mandate framework does not argue for governance maximalism. It argues for governance proportionality—matching the depth of oversight to the dominant risk at each stage. A Pre-IND company does not need the same CMC governance apparatus as a pre-NDA company. Boards that over-index on governance at the wrong stage create bureaucratic drag that is itself a form of mandate misalignment.

10 Conclusion

Across recent FDA evidence, IPO market data, and M&A deal structure trends, a consistent pattern emerges: technical leadership is priced as risk management capacity.

- Clinical base rates are declining—overall Phase I→approval has fallen from 7.9% (2011–2020) to 6.7% (2014–2023)—ensuring that science remains the foundational risk while tightening the margin for operational failure.
- But the most commonly cited approval-blocking deficiencies in recent CRLs are manufacturing and CMC—mandate-level operational issues that boards can influence through authority design, systems investment, and information architecture.
- IPO windows are cyclical and selective; when access tightens, **Acquirable** discipline becomes a gating function rather than an optimization.
- Large pharma's reliance on external innovation and growing use of CVRs demonstrate that integration risk and durability are now routinely monetized in transaction structure.

The argument this paper makes is straightforward: boards systematically misprice technical risk by evaluating CTOQs as scientists rather than as operators of stage-specific risk functions. The five mandates—**Possible, Reproducible, Acquirable, Scalable, Durable**—are not a career progression. They are simultaneous governance dimensions with shifting dominant emphasis. A board that understands this distinction, builds information architecture to surface operational reality, and designs CTOQ authority to match the dominant mandate will measurably improve its probability of favorable financing terms, IPO readiness, and strategic acquisition outcomes.

The version of CTOQ governance worth building is the one that treats operational capability as a board-level risk variable—not a technical background check.

But the strongest case for getting this right is not financial. Every CRL delayed by a manufacturing deficiency is a therapy that patients cannot access. Every process validation failure that pushes approval back by 1.28 years is a population that continues to progress, deteriorate, or die on the current standard of care. The 7.9%—and now 6.7%—probability of reaching patients from Phase I is already devastatingly low. When an asset clears the science and fails on operations, the loss is not only measured in share price. It is measured in the patients who were waiting.

The prime directive of biopharma is not valuation. It is granting access to life-changing therapies. Valuation is the mechanism that funds the mission, and operational discipline is what ensures the mission is not betrayed at the last mile. A CTOQ mandate framework that prevents manufacturing-

driven CRLs does not merely protect enterprise value—it protects the reason the enterprise exists. Boards that understand this will build organizations capable of delivering therapies, not just developing them. That is the version of governance worth fighting for.

Next Steps

Phase 3 Search advises boards and investors on technical leadership alignment in biopharma. If this framework surfaces questions about your organization's CTOQ mandate readiness, board-level CMC expertise, or technical leadership search strategy, we welcome the conversation.

Alex Cooke
CEO & Founder — Phase 3 Search
+1 603 213 0084
ac@ph3.bio

Acknowledgements

This framework was reviewed and pressure-tested by fifteen long-standing CTOs that have built and led CMC & Quality organizations spanning public and private biopharma companies. Collectively they have launched over 120 commercial products. The author is grateful for both the time and the wisdom shared. Any errors are the author's own.

11 Appendix: Source Verification Notes

Source verification status as of February 2026. Items marked VERIFIED have been independently confirmed; remaining items require verification before board-level or investor circulation:

- **CRL deficiency statistics (footnote 5) — VERIFIED:** Dilek et al. (2026), "Deficiencies Delaying Prescription Drug Approvals by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2020–2024," Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science. Peer-reviewed; published February 11, 2026 (doi:10.1007/s43441-026-00921-3). Confirms: 43 novel therapeutics; manufacturing facility deficiencies most common (65%); CMC deficiencies at 51%; median CRL-to-approval 1.28 years. Independently corroborated by Pharmaceutical Technology's analysis of the FDA's 202 published CRLs (74% cited quality/manufacturing issues) and RSM US LLP's 2.5-year average lag for first-time launchers.
- **CMC deficiency corroboration (footnotes 6–8) — VERIFIED:** Footnote 6 (Pharmaceutical Technology) and footnote 7 (Pharma Manufacturing) both draw on the FDA's July 2025 public release of 202 CRLs, confirming 74% cited quality/manufacturing deficiencies. Footnote 7 also cross-references the Sacks et al. (2014) Nature Reviews Drug Discovery baseline (15% CMC in 2002–2013 CRLs), documenting the historical shift. Footnote 8 (BioPharm International) provides industry analysis of preventability. All three sources are publicly accessible trade publications analyzing official FDA data.
- **McKinsey external innovation figures (footnote 32) — VERIFIED:** Van de Vyver et al., McKinsey & Company (January 2025). >70% NME revenues externally sourced; ~45% sourced before launch. Publicly accessible at mckinsey.com.
- **LOE exposure data (footnote 33) — VERIFIED:** Evaluate (2025), "2025 World Preview" and "Portfolio Tactics to Scale the Patent Cliff." >$300B in revenues face LOE 2025–2030. Publicly accessible at evaluate.com.
- **Clinical base rate sources (footnotes 1–4):** The BIO/Informa 2011–2020 dataset is publicly available and widely cited. The Citeline 2014–2023 dataset is a commercially published white paper from Norstella/Biomedtracker; the specific figures cited (6.7% LOA, phase transition rates, rolling windows) should be confirmed against the published white paper at citeline.com. The Breckenridge & Sheridan (2025) dynamic analysis is published in Nature Communications and is peer-reviewed.