JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

RISK-BASED PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR EUROPEAN UNION (EU) ONCOLOGY GENERIC DRUG APPROVAL: A REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR EFFICIENT MARKETING AUTHORIZATION

K. Siva Teja Reddy*[1], M.V.Nagabhushanam[2], M. Beena Devi[3],G. Rama Krishna[4], Adilakshmi.Ch[5],Sk.Sanjuda[6]

*[1] Student, Dept. of. Regulatory Affairs, Hindu College of Pharmacy, Guntur.

[2] Professor & Head of the Department, Dept. of. Regulatory Affairs, Hindu College of Pharmacy, Guntur.

[3] Asst. Professor, Dept. of. Regulatory Affairs, Hindu College of Pharmacy, Guntur.

Corresponding Author:
K. Siva Teja Reddy,

Abstract

The development and marketing authorization of oncology generic medicines in the European Union (EU) involves complex regulatory, scientific, quality and project-management requirements. Although the EU regulatory framework provides established requirements for generic medicinal products, effective coordination of regulatory activities, Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls (CMC), bioequivalence (BE), documentation and submission-related activities remains an important challenge. The present study aimed to develop a risk-based project-management framework for efficient marketing authorization of oncology generic medicines in the EU by integrating regulatory requirements with systematic risk and project-management principles.

A structured regulatory-document analysis was performed using applicable EU legislation, European Medicines Agency (EMA) guidelines, International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) guidelines and Common Technical Document (CTD) requirements. Regulatory requirements were identified, extracted and mapped to the relevant CTD modules. A regulatory requirement matrix and gap-analysis approach were used to identify areas of potential non-compliance or incomplete documentation. Identified risks were categorized into CMC, bioequivalence, documentation and project-management risks. Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) was applied to prioritize risks based on Severity, Occurrence and Detectability, followed by Risk Priority Number (RPN) assessment. Critical-path analysis was subsequently performed to identify activities capable of influencing the overall regulatory project timeline. Regulatory intelligence and risk-mitigation strategies were incorporated to support proactive management of regulatory changes and high-priority risks.

Based on the integrated assessment, a Risk-Based Regulatory Project-Management Framework was developed comprising regulatory intelligence, requirement identification, CTD mapping, gap analysis, risk identification, FMEA-based prioritization, critical-path analysis, risk mitigation, residual-risk assessment and submission-readiness evaluation. A regulatory case-study methodology was used to demonstrate the practical application of the proposed framework to an oncology generic development scenario.

Keywords

European Union; Oncology Generic Drugs; Marketing Authorization; Regulatory Affairs; Regulatory Risk Management; Project Management; Quality Risk Management; Failure Mode and Effects Analysis; FMEA;

Critical Path Analysis; Common Technical Document; CTD; Bioequivalence; Chemistry, Manufacturing and Controls; Regulatory Intelligence; Risk-Based Regulatory Framework.

INTRODUCTION

European Union Pharmaceutical Regulatory System

The European Union has established a coordinated regulatory system for medicinal products intended for human use. The EU pharmaceutical regulatory system operates through collaboration between the European Commission, the European Medicines Agency (EMA), national competent authorities of the Member States and other specialized scientific and regulatory bodies. This network-based system is intended to ensure that medicines available within the EU meet appropriate standards of quality, safety and efficacy [9,10].

The principal legal framework for medicinal products for human use is established primarily through **Directive 2001/83/EC**, which provides the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, and **Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004**, which establishes EU procedures for the authorization and supervision of medicinal products and establishes the EMA [9,11]. These legal instruments form an important basis for marketing authorization, pharmacovigilance and regulatory supervision within the EU.

The European Medicines Agency plays a central scientific and coordinating role within the European medicines regulatory network. EMA works closely with national competent authorities and provides scientific evaluation through its scientific committees, including the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP). The European Commission subsequently takes legally binding decisions for products authorized through the centralized procedure [10,12].

National competent authorities remain responsible for authorization and regulatory activities for medicinal products that fall outside the mandatory scope of the centralized procedure. They also participate in scientific assessments and provide experts to EMA committees and assessment teams [13]. Consequently, the EU system is not a single regulatory authority model but rather a coordinated network involving EU-level and national regulatory institutions.

The EU provides several marketing authorization procedures for medicinal products. These include the **centralized procedure (CP), decentralized procedure (DCP), mutual recognition procedure (MRP), and national procedure**. Under the centralized procedure, a single application is scientifically evaluated by EMA and a legally binding marketing authorization is subsequently granted by the European Commission. The authorization permits the product to be marketed throughout the EU Member States within the scope of the authorization [12].

The decentralized procedure is used when a medicinal product has not yet received authorization in an EU Member State and the applicant seeks authorization simultaneously in several Member States. An identical application is submitted to the Reference Member State (RMS) and Concerned Member States (CMSs), with the RMS leading the assessment [14]. In contrast, the mutual recognition procedure applies when a medicinal product has already received a national marketing authorization in one Member State and the applicant seeks recognition of that authorization in other Member States [9,14].

The choice of regulatory procedure is therefore a critical project-management decision. An inappropriate selection of the regulatory pathway may result in additional regulatory interactions, duplication of activities or delays in submission planning. For generic oncology products, the regulatory pathway must be assessed in relation to the reference medicinal product and its authorization status. Generic or hybrid applications referring to a centrally authorized reference product have access to the centralized procedure under Article 3(3) of Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004 [15].

Oncology Generic Drug Development

Oncology generic drug development is an important area within pharmaceutical regulatory affairs because generic availability can contribute to the affordability and accessibility of established anticancer therapies. The development of oncology generics follows the general EU principles applicable to generic medicinal products, but the characteristics of individual oncology active substances and dosage forms may introduce additional development and manufacturing considerations.

The first stage involves selection of an appropriate reference medicinal product and establishment of the regulatory strategy. The applicant must determine the appropriate legal basis for the application and identify the regulatory evidence required to demonstrate equivalence with the reference product [16,17].

Pharmaceutical development is central to oncology generic development. The applicant must establish a formulation and manufacturing process capable of consistently producing a product that meets predefined quality specifications. Critical quality characteristics may include assay, content uniformity, dissolution, impurities, degradation products, physical properties, microbial quality where applicable and stability [18,19].

Impurity control can be particularly important for oncology products. The development programme should consider process-related impurities, degradation products and other relevant impurities in accordance with applicable ICH and EU quality guidelines. Appropriate analytical methods should be developed and validated to demonstrate that the finished product meets established specifications.

Dissolution performance is also relevant to oral oncology generics, particularly when the formulation is intended for systemic exposure. Comparative dissolution testing can contribute to pharmaceutical development and, where scientifically justified, may support assessment of bioequivalence or biowaiver eligibility [20,21].

Stability studies are required to establish the quality of the finished product throughout the proposed shelf life and under specified storage conditions. Stability information is an important component of CTD Module 3 and must be appropriately planned within the development timeline [22].

The literature indicates that CTD/eCTD preparation is not an isolated regulatory activity but the culmination of information generated throughout pharmaceutical development. Consequently, a deficiency in one development function may propagate into several CTD sections.

For example:

API documentation delay
↓
Module 3 incompleteness
↓
CTD compilation delay
↓
Submission-readiness delay
↓
Potential submission postponement

Similarly:

Formulation variability
↓
Dissolution variability
↓
Potential bioequivalence risk
↓
Additional development/BE work
↓
Dossier timeline extension

Figure No. 1: The deficiency in one development function may propagate into several CTD sections.

METHODOLOGY

Case-Study Methodology

3.X.1 Case-Study Design

A structured regulatory case-study approach was used to demonstrate the practical application of the proposed **Risk-Based Regulatory Project-Management Framework** for European Union (EU) oncology generic drug approval[23].

The case study was designed to simulate the development and marketing authorization pathway of an oncology generic medicinal product using publicly available regulatory requirements. The case study integrated regulatory requirement identification, CTD mapping, regulatory gap analysis, risk assessment, FMEA, critical-path analysis and risk-mitigation strategies[24]..

The case study was not intended to represent a specific company's confidential regulatory submission. Instead, it was developed as a **representative regulatory project model** based on publicly available EU legislation, EMA guidance, ICH guidelines and generic-medicine requirements[25,26]..

3.X.2 Selection of the Case Study

The case study should be selected using predefined criteria.

Inclusion criteria[27-34]

The selected product/case should:

- Represent an oncology generic medicinal product.
- Have an established reference medicinal product.
- Be suitable for evaluation under the EU generic regulatory framework.
- Have publicly available information regarding its regulatory and scientific requirements.
- Require assessment of CMC and bioequivalence considerations.
- Permit mapping of information to CTD Modules 1–5.
- Have sufficient information to identify potential regulatory and project-management risks.

Exclusion criteria[35-39]

The following were excluded:

- Biosimilars
- New chemical entities
- Products without an identifiable reference medicinal product
- Products for which essential regulatory information was unavailable
- Confidential company-specific regulatory submissions
- Cases requiring proprietary industry data unavailable to the researcher

3.X.3 Case-Study Data Sources[40-42]

Information for the case study was collected from authoritative regulatory and scientific sources.

Table No.2: Regulatory Sources Used for Case Study

Source	Information obtained
EU legislation	Legal basis and authorization requirements
EMA	Generic-medicine and scientific requirements
ICH	CTD, quality, risk-management and pharmaceutical-development principles
EMA bioequivalence guideline	BE requirements
Product-specific guidance	Product-specific scientific considerations
Scientific literature	Supporting technical information
Public regulatory documents	Regulatory-process information

The primary sources should preferably be official regulatory documents rather than secondary websites.

3.X.4 Case-Study Workflow[43]

The case study was conducted through the following sequential steps:

Case selection

↓

Regulatory pathway identification

↓

Regulatory requirement extraction

↓

Requirement-to-CTD mapping

↓

Regulatory gap analysis

↓

Risk identification

↓

FMEA

↓

RPN calculation

↓

Risk heat-map development

↓

Critical-path analysis

↓

Risk mitigation

↓

Residual-risk assessment

↓

Submission-readiness assessment

Fig No.2: **Case-Study Workflow**

This workflow provides a direct demonstration of how the proposed framework can be applied to an oncology generic development project.

3.X.5 Identification of Regulatory Pathway[44-48]

The first step involved identifying the appropriate EU marketing-authorization pathway applicable to the selected generic medicinal product.

The assessment considered:

- Product classification
- Reference medicinal product
- Legal basis for the application
- Applicable EU regulatory procedure
- Data requirements
- CTD requirements
- Bioequivalence requirements
- Quality/CMC requirements

The regulatory pathway should be verified against the applicable EU legislation and current EMA guidance.

For a conventional generic medicinal product, **Article 10(1) of Directive 2001/83/EC** provides the principal legal basis for an abridged application when the relevant conditions are fulfilled.

3.X.6 Regulatory Requirement Extraction[48-50]

The applicable regulatory documents were reviewed systematically to identify requirements relevant to the selected case.

Each requirement was recorded in a regulatory requirement matrix.

Table No.2. Regulatory Requirement Extraction Matrix

Requirement ID	Regulatory requirement	Source	CTD module	Evidence required	Risk
R-01	Legal basis for generic application	EU legislation	M1	Legal justification	—
R-02	API information	ICH/EMA	M3	API documentation	CMC
R-03	Pharmaceutical development	ICH/EMA	M3	Development data	CMC

Requirement ID	Regulatory requirement	Source	CTD module	Evidence required	Risk
R-04	Manufacturing process	EMA/ICH	M3	Manufacturing information	CMC
R-05	Analytical validation	ICH	M3	Validation report	CMC
R-06	Stability	ICH/EMA	M3	Stability data	CMC
R-07	Bioequivalence	EMA	M5	BE report	BE
R-08	Product information	EU requirements	M1	Product information	Documentation
R-09	eCTD technical compliance	EU/EMA	M1–5	Validated eCTD	Documentation

3.X.7 CTD Mapping[51-52]

The identified requirements were mapped against the five CTD modules.

Table No.3. Regulatory Requirement Extraction Matrix

CTD module	Major information	Case-study assessment
Module 1	EU regional/administrative information	Regulatory compliance
Module 2	CTD summaries	Consistency assessment
Module 3	Quality/CMC	High-risk assessment[53-55]
Module 4	Nonclinical information	Applicability assessment
Module 5	Clinical/BE information	BE-risk assessment

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The present study concludes that risk-based project management can provide a systematic and proactive approach to managing the regulatory complexity associated with EU oncology generic drug approval.

The existing EU regulatory framework provides comprehensive requirements for quality, safety, efficacy, bioequivalence and marketing authorization. However, successful implementation of these requirements requires effective coordination of multiple activities occurring across different pharmaceutical-development functions. Regulatory deficiencies can arise not only from scientific or technical inadequacies but also from poor planning, inadequate communication, documentation errors, resource constraints and failure to recognize critical-path activities[56-58].

The proposed framework addresses this challenge by integrating regulatory intelligence, regulatory requirement mapping, CTD analysis, gap analysis, FMEA, risk prioritization, critical-path management, risk mitigation and submission-readiness assessment into a unified project-management model.

The major contribution of the study is therefore the development of an integrated risk-based regulatory project-management framework rather than the creation of new regulatory requirements. The framework is designed to complement existing EU and ICH requirements by providing a systematic approach for translating regulatory expectations into manageable project activities.

The framework can assist Regulatory Affairs professionals and pharmaceutical project teams in identifying high-risk activities at an early stage, prioritizing resources, monitoring critical-path activities, controlling documentation, managing regulatory changes and improving overall submission preparedness.

The study also highlights the importance of distinguishing between regulatory risk and project risk. A regulatory requirement may be scientifically understood but still become a project risk if the necessary evidence is generated late. Conversely, a project activity may be completed on time but still present regulatory risk if the resulting evidence does not adequately satisfy the applicable regulatory requirement. Integration of these two perspectives is therefore essential.

The use of FMEA provides a structured mechanism for prioritizing risks, while critical-path analysis identifies activities capable of influencing the overall project duration. Their integration creates a more comprehensive approach than using either technique independently.

The proposed framework may consequently support: [59-60]

- Earlier identification of regulatory gaps
- Better prioritization of high-impact risks
- Improved CMC and BE planning
- More effective CTD management
- Improved cross-functional coordination
- Better critical-path monitoring
- More proactive regulatory-intelligence activities
- Improved regulatory-response management
- Enhanced submission readiness

However, the framework should be considered a decision-support and project-management tool, rather than a substitute for regulatory assessment by competent authorities. Actual marketing authorization remains dependent on compliance with applicable EU legislation, scientific guidelines and the assessment of the relevant regulatory authorities.

The principal limitation of the study is that the framework requires further validation using real-world pharmaceutical development and regulatory-submission data. FMEA scoring may also involve expert judgment, and regulatory requirements are subject to periodic change. Therefore, future research should

validate the framework using industry case studies, expert consensus, historical regulatory submissions and quantitative project-performance data.

Future development may also incorporate artificial intelligence, automated regulatory intelligence, predictive regulatory-risk modelling and digital CTD-tracking systems. Such technologies could further improve the ability to identify regulatory changes, predict potential deficiencies, monitor project risks and support regulatory decision-making.

In conclusion, the proposed Risk-Based Regulatory Project-Management Framework provides an integrated and proactive approach for managing the regulatory, technical and project-related risks associated with EU oncology generic drug approval. By linking regulatory requirements with CTD mapping, gap analysis, FMEA, critical-path analysis, regulatory intelligence and risk mitigation, the framework has the potential to improve regulatory preparedness, resource prioritization and control of project activities, thereby supporting a more systematic and efficient pathway toward marketing authorization of oncology generic medicines in the European Union.

References

1. European Medicines Agency. Generic and hybrid medicines [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Available from EMA
2. European Parliament and Council. Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use. *Official Journal of the European Communities*. 2001;L311:67–128.
3. European Medicines Agency. Generic and hybrid applications [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Generic and hybrid applications
4. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence (Rev. 1). CPMP/EWP/QWP/1401/98 Rev. 1. London: EMA; 2010. EMA bioequivalence guideline
5. European Medicines Agency. Compilation of individual product-specific guidance on demonstration of bioequivalence. London: EMA.
6. European Medicines Agency. Quality guidelines [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. EMA Quality Guidelines
7. International Council for Harmonisation. M4: The Common Technical Document [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. ICH Common Technical Document
8. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9: Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH. European Medicines Agency provides the EU implementation of ICH Q9 within its quality-guideline framework.
9. European Commission. Legal framework governing medicinal products for human use in the EU [Internet]. Brussels: European Commission; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. EU pharmaceutical legal framework
10. European Medicines Agency. European medicines regulatory network [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. European medicines regulatory network
11. European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of 31 March 2004 laying down Union procedures for the authorization, supervision and pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency. *Official Journal of the European Union*. 2004;L136:1–33.
12. European Commission. Authorisation procedures: the centralised procedure [Internet]. Brussels: European Commission; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Centralised procedure

13. European Medicines Agency. National competent authorities (human) [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. National competent authorities
14. European Commission. Authorisation procedures: the decentralised procedure [Internet]. Brussels: European Commission; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. Decentralised procedure
15. European Medicines Agency. Pre-authorisation guidance for users of the centralised procedure [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10]. EMA pre-authorisation guidance
16. European Medicines Agency. ICH M4Q: Common Technical Document for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use—Quality [Internet]. Amsterdam: EMA; [cited 2026 Aug 10].
17. European Medicines Agency. Generic and hybrid medicines. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2026. EMA – Generic and hybrid medicines
18. European Parliament and Council. Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use. *Off J Eur Communities*. 2001;L311:67–128.
19. European Medicines Agency. Generic and hybrid applications. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2026. EMA – Generic and hybrid applications
20. European Medicines Agency. European medicines regulatory network. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2026.
21. European Commission. The mutual recognition procedure and decentralised procedure for medicinal products for human use. Brussels: European Commission; 2026.
22. European Medicines Agency. Procedural timetables. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2026. EMA – Procedural timetables
23. International Council for Harmonisation. M4: The Common Technical Document (CTD). Geneva: ICH.
24. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH; 2023. EU implementation: European Medicines Agency. EMA – ICH Q9(R1) Quality Risk Management
25. European Commission. Legal framework governing medicinal products for human use in the European Union. Brussels: European Commission; 2026.
26. European Medicines Agency. Obtaining an EU marketing authorisation, step-by-step. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2026. EMA – Obtaining an EU marketing authorisation
27. European Parliament and Council. Directive 2001/83/EC of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use. *Official Journal of the European Communities*. 2001;L311:67–128.
28. European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of 31 March 2004 laying down Union procedures for the authorization, supervision and pharmacovigilance of medicinal products and establishing a European Medicines Agency. *Official Journal of the European Union*. 2004;L136:1–33.
29. European Medicines Agency. European medicines regulatory network. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – European medicines regulatory network
30. European Commission. Authorisation procedures for medicinal products. Brussels: European Commission. European Commission – Marketing authorisation procedures
31. European Medicines Agency. Generic and hybrid medicines. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – Generic and hybrid medicines
32. European Medicines Agency. Scientific guidelines for human medicines. Amsterdam: EMA.
33. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical Development. Geneva: ICH.

34. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH.

35. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M4Q: Common Technical Document for the Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use—Quality. Geneva: ICH. EMA – ICH M4Q Quality guideline

36. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q10: Pharmaceutical Quality System. Geneva: ICH.

37. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – Investigation of bioequivalence

38. European Medicines Agency. Product-specific bioequivalence guidance. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – Product-specific bioequivalence guidance

39. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH; 2023.

40. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the clinical evaluation of anticancer medicinal products—Revision 6. Amsterdam: EMA; 2024. EMA – Evaluation of anticancer medicinal products

41. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH S9: Nonclinical Evaluation for Anticancer Pharmaceuticals. Geneva: ICH. EMA – ICH S9 guideline

42. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M13A: Bioequivalence for Immediate-Release Solid Oral Dosage Forms. Geneva: ICH; 2024.

43. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M9: Biopharmaceutics Classification System-Based Biowaivers. Geneva: ICH.

44. European Medicines Agency. Pre-authorisation guidance: centralised procedure. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – Pre-authorisation guidance

45. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M4: The Common Technical Document. Geneva: ICH. ICH – Common Technical Document

46. European Medicines Agency. ICH M4: Common Technical Document—Organisation of CTD. Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – ICH M4 CTD organisation

47. European Medicines Agency. eSubmission: electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD). Amsterdam: EMA. EMA – eCTD information

48. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) v4.0. Geneva: ICH; 2026. ICH – eCTD v4.0

49. European Parliament and Council. Directive 2001/83/EC of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use. *Off J Eur Communities*. 2001;L311:67–128.

50. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M13A: Bioequivalence for Immediate-Release Solid Oral Dosage Forms. Geneva: ICH; 2024.

51. European Medicines Agency. Product-specific bioequivalence guidance. Amsterdam: EMA.

52. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M9: Biopharmaceutics Classification System-Based Biowaivers. Geneva: ICH.

53. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH M4Q: Common Technical Document for the Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use—Quality. Geneva: ICH.

54. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q7: Good Manufacturing Practice Guide for Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients. Geneva: ICH.

55. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q11: Development and Manufacture of Drug Substances. Geneva: ICH.

56. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical Development. Geneva: ICH.

57. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q1A(R2): Stability Testing of New Drug Substances and Products. Geneva: ICH.

58. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH; 2023.

59. Stamatis DH. *Failure Mode and Effect Analysis: FMEA from Theory to Execution*. 2nd ed. Milwaukee: ASQ Quality Press; 2003.

60. Project Management Institute. *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)*. 7th ed. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute; 2021.