



# The Evolution of eCTD Publishing to Unified Archives

By IntuitionLabs • 8/13/2025 • 30 min read

ectd

regulatory submissions

ectd publishing

unified archive

drug lifecycle management

regulatory operations





# From 'Publisher' to Platform: Building a Unified Drug-Lifecycle Archive

**Introduction:** In the pharmaceutical industry's early forays into electronic submissions, organizations relied on specialized *publishing* tools to assemble regulatory dossiers (e.g. in eCTD format). These "submission assembly" tools – often simply called **publishers** – were used almost exclusively by regulatory operations teams to compile PDFs and metadata into agency-compliant packages. They served their narrow purpose in preparing filings, but operated largely in isolation from the rest of the drug development process. Today, however, leading companies are transforming these once-specialized tools into **enterprise-wide platforms** that function as a unified **drug lifecycle archive**. In this evolution, the system that once only packaged submissions now underpins **cross-functional collaboration** – connecting clinical, quality, safety, and regulatory teams on a shared content backbone. This article traces that journey from publisher to platform, highlighting how features like **faceted search**, robust **sequence management**, and **cross-team visibility** have been pivotal in this transformation. The result is a [single source of truth](#) across the product lifecycle that accelerates development and improves compliance.

## The 'Publisher' Era: Submission Assembly in Isolation

In the early 2000s, as health authorities adopted the Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) standard for drug applications, pharmaceutical companies introduced dedicated publishing software to meet these requirements. A **submission publisher** (such as legacy eCTD compilation tools) allows regulatory teams to organize hundreds of individual documents (study reports, quality data, labeling, etc.) into the strict modular structure required by agencies, and to generate the accompanying XML backbone and tables of contents. These tools ensured technical compliance – for example, producing properly named PDF files, hyperlinking documents, validating format errors – which was a critical function as industry moved away from paper dossiers to [electronic submissions](#). However, the scope of these publisher applications was limited to *end-stage assembly*. Content was written and reviewed in separate systems (or even on paper), then handed off to regulatory operations to be "published." The publisher's user base was typically small (a few specialists), and other stakeholders had little direct interaction with it.

**Challenges of the siloed approach:** Because the publishing tool sat at the end of the process, much of the work upstream remained **siloed**. Authors in clinical or CMC (Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls) would prepare documents in Word and email them or save them in a [document management system](#), then regulatory operations would pull them into the publishing software. If a reviewer in clinical or quality wanted to see the compiled submission (to verify

context or perform a QC check), they often had to wait for a PDF output or use separate viewers. This separation led to **inefficiencies** and inconsistency. Teams frequently found themselves **manually duplicating** information across documents and submissions, since there was no single repository – a problem that became more pronounced over a product's **long lifecycle** [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Changes had to be propagated by hand, leading to potential errors if something was updated for one submission but overlooked in another. Indeed, maintaining CMC information across multiple global filings required “substantial manual input and **rework** throughout a product's lifecycle” under the document-centric paradigm [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The limits of the old approach became especially apparent in accelerated development programs (e.g. fast-track or conditional approvals) – when companies had to support **multiple simultaneous submissions** in different regions or for different indications. In those scenarios, using a basic publisher tool and manual processes could barely keep up with the pace: organizations struggled to update each dossier consistently and track which piece of data went where [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).

Another drawback of early-generation publishing tools was the lack of easy internal **review and collaboration** around submission content. Typically, **reviewing submissions** meant either printing the compiled PDFs or using the same complex publishing software to navigate the eCTD – neither of which was user-friendly for broader teams. It was common to hear complaints such as “*using our publishing tool to check submission content is complex and cumbersome*” [extedo.com](https://extedo.com). Without a dedicated way to review submission builds, identifying what changed between one sequence and the next was tedious. Regulatory operations would often create summary spreadsheets or email notes to inform functional contributors of updates, a very manual form of version tracking. In short, the “**publisher era**” was characterized by *isolated processes*: the submission assembly was a distinct final step, with minimal integration back to authoring or upstream systems.

## Integrating Review: From Publisher to Collaborative Archive

As the volume and frequency of submissions grew – and as regulatory teams sought more **efficient review cycles** – the industry realized that the publishing tool needed to become more accessible and connected. This gave rise to enhanced platforms that not only compile submissions, but also provide capabilities for **viewing and reviewing** them in a collaborative environment. In the mid-2010s, vendors and in-house IT teams began extending submission systems with web-based viewers and workflow features. Instead of treating the compiled submission as an output to be handed off, companies started treating it as content to be managed and iterated within a central system.

**Emergence of submission viewers:** A key development was the introduction of integrated eCTD viewers (sometimes called “reviewer” modules). These allow any authorized user – not



just the publisher – to **navigate through submissions**, inspect documents, and even compare changes between sequences in an intuitive interface [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). For example, an eCTD viewer presents the hierarchy of Modules 1–5 and all the submitted files under each, much like regulators see it. Team members can click through to view a specific study report or data table right from the system, without hunting through network drives or emails. This greatly streamlines internal QA and functional review of submissions. A clinical scientist or CMC expert can verify that the correct file (say, a updated protocol or an updated stability report) is indeed in the package, *before* it's sent to the agency. One industry user noted that without a proper viewing tool, *"I am not able to quickly identify what has changed within the lifecycle of a submission"* [extedo.com](https://extedo.com) – a pain point that modern platforms directly address by clearly highlighting new vs. old content.

**Collaboration and simultaneous access:** The improved systems also began supporting real-time collaboration and parallel work on submissions. Rather than the publisher "locking" the dossier until completion, now multiple users could be involved. For instance, regulatory operations could be assembling Sequence 0045 while subject matter experts concurrently review earlier sequences or contribute missing documents. One vendor advertises the ability for teams to "simultaneously collaborate using in-progress submission access" so that review and authoring can proceed without waiting for the final compile [extedo.com](https://extedo.com). This was a significant shift from the one-person-at-a-time model. It also enabled better **commenting and communication** within the context of the submission – some tools let reviewers **annotate** or leave comments on documents in the compiled view, fostering dialog between the regulatory publisher and content owners. In the past, sharing review feedback meant external PDFs and mark-ups; now it could be done inside the system. The result is faster turnaround and fewer miscommunications.

**Consolidating multiple formats and sources:** Another aspect of this evolution was handling of different submission formats and sources in one place. Companies often had submissions in eCTD format for FDA/EMA, but also NeeS or other regional formats, or even legacy paper scans. Unified archive solutions emerged to bring all those under one roof. For example, a **Submissions Archive** application can import both eCTD and non-eCTD submissions so that *"those submissions are accessible by any user, anywhere across the globe"* in a single system [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). This means headquarters and affiliates worldwide can all search and view the official dossiers for any market. Previously, if a local affiliate submitted something, the central team might not have easy access to that file set (especially before eCTD). With an archive platform, the **global transparency** is improved – everyone sees the full history of what was submitted in each country. In fact, one vendor emphasizes that their archive provides *"a complete view of regulatory communications in a validated environment,"* breaking down regional silos [veeva.com](https://veeva.com) [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help).

**Case in point – a dedicated reviewer tool:** Vendors like EXTEDO and others introduced products specifically to address these review and visibility gaps. For instance, EXTEDO's eSUBmanager is marketed as *"an easy-to-use tool for viewing, sharing and tracking submission*

content.” It explicitly asks, “Are you still using your publishing tool to review submission content?” – highlighting that many were repurposing their old publisher for lack of a better option [extedo.com](#). The dedicated tool then solves those issues: it gives a **single source of truth** for all submission dossiers, and makes it easy to spot changes, even if a submission sequence is out of the standard format [extedo.com](#) [extedo.com](#). The benefit is not only felt by regulatory staff; other departments (clinical, medical writing, etc.) can independently check the status or contents of a submission in such a system. This transitional step – from a closed publisher to an **interactive submissions archive** – set the stage for the next leap: using the platform not just for submissions, but for *everything*.

## The Unified Drug-Lifecycle Platform: An Enterprise Backbone

With robust review and archive capabilities in place, leading organizations began to see the submission system not as a final step, but as the **core of a connected ecosystem** spanning the entire drug lifecycle. The same repository holding regulatory documents could be extended “to share and reuse content to drive efficiency across research, clinical, regulatory and manufacturing processes,” as one industry expert noted [blogs.opentext.com](#). In other words, the walls between functional silos were coming down. **Regulatory Affairs, Clinical R&D, Quality, and Pharmacovigilance** all produce information critical to a product’s life – so why not manage it in one interoperable platform?

*Modern unified life sciences content management platforms provide a single repository accessible to multiple functions across the drug lifecycle. In this example interface, documents and data are organized with rich metadata (e.g. product, study phase, document type) to enable quick retrieval and cross-referencing. Such platforms allow clinical, regulatory, quality, and safety teams to collaborate on shared content seamlessly (sensitive data in screenshot is for illustration only) [blogs.opentext.com](#) [rimsys.io](#).*

**Breaking down the silos:** A unified drug-lifecycle archive means that instead of separate systems for each department, content flows through a **central backbone**. Generis, a platform provider, describes the ideal state clearly: “Regulatory Affairs, Pharmacovigilance, Clinical Research, and Quality Management cannot operate as independent islands...These departments must function as a cohesive ecosystem, sharing data, insights, and workflows seamlessly.” [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](#). The reality in many companies, however, was that legacy systems kept these functions apart – clinical trial documents lived in an eTMF system, quality events in a QMS, regulatory submissions in a publisher tool, etc. That separation caused inefficiencies and slower progress: “many organizations still lack the systems to break down barriers between these critical functions, thus losing out on increased operational efficiency, a faster time-to-market, and streamlined compliance.” [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](#). The unified platform approach directly addresses this by providing a **holistic information**



**management** framework. All the major artifact types (from research protocols, to manufacturing batch records, to submission dossiers and safety reports) can reside in a **common content lake**, linked by relationships and metadata [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com).

In practice, this means when a drug project moves from phase to phase, the information accumulates in one place. For example, in Generis's illustrative scenario of "Barry" the drug, once non-clinical studies are done, Barry's data and documents are already in the platform; when it's time to seek a Clinical Trial Authorization, *"everything needed to compile the submission is already in the platform"* for the regulatory team [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). There is no handover of files via SharePoint or email – the regulatory module simply pulls from the same repository of documents that the scientists were using. The moment the CTA is approved, the clinical team can log in to update study records, manage sites, etc., again in the *same* system [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). Later, when the product moves to marketing application stage, regulatory can compile the marketing application dossier using content that has been gathered throughout development (nonclinical, clinical, CMC) without leaving the platform [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). This approach eliminates the classic "data chase" where regulatory personnel had to ask other departments for the latest documents or data – instead, they already have appropriate access to the needed pieces via the unified archive.

**Cross-functional triggers and feedback:** One powerful outcome of linking domains on one platform is the ability to have *automatic triggers and visibility* across what used to be disconnected processes. Consider post-approval changes: Suppose a **quality issue** arises (e.g. a manufacturing deviation or a stability failure) for a marketed drug. In the old world, the Quality unit might address the issue and, separately, Regulatory might eventually prepare a variation submission to update the product's approval. In a unified system, these events can be **interlinked**. For instance, an adverse event or complaint logged in the safety/quality module can be directly flagged for regulatory action. Generis describes that *"complaints...logged within Quality...may be linked via metadata to safety cases... Through this, we have to create, author, and submit aggregate reports"* and even trigger product variations [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). In their platform, a **Quality Event** record can automatically spawn a regulatory **variation submission** record, ensuring nothing falls through the cracks [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). All relevant teams can see this chain: the pharmacovigilance team sees that a safety case led to a label change; the regulatory team sees the originating reason for the variation; quality sees that the variation was submitted and approved. This kind of **end-to-end traceability** is only possible when all functions work off a shared data model. Notably, Veeva's unified RIM platform similarly touts that all applications share a common data model so that a single Vault can tie together submissions, health authority correspondence, commitments, product registrations, etc., in context [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help).

Ultimately, the unified archive becomes the **system-of-record** for the entire drug product lifecycle. A regulatory information management (RIM) expert describes such a system as a

*“single source of truth” that “stores and manages regulatory documents, integrates with systems across the company, and creates a traceable record of all regulatory activities,”* all linked to products and regions for easy retrieval [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). It doesn’t just help Regulatory Affairs; it benefits **all teams** by providing immediate insight into the current status of any product in any market. Teams spend far less time hunting for information in disparate places. (In fact, medtech RA professionals have estimated they spend up to 50% of their time simply looking for information across scattered sources [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io) – a clear opportunity for improvement via a unified repository.)

Crucially, a unified platform also sets the foundation for **new technologies and efficiencies**. When all content and data reside together, companies can leverage advanced analytics, machine learning, or structured content management much more effectively. For instance, Amgen’s regulatory innovation group has highlighted moving away from static documents toward **electronic data libraries**, where structured data can be repurposed and assembled on the fly [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). This is far easier to implement on a unified cloud platform than across siloed systems. We are already seeing features like *dynamic linking* (where a reference in one document automatically updates if the target content changes) and structured content authoring to reuse common text. These reduce the need to recreate the same content in multiple submissions and ensure consistency. As one paper notes, widespread adoption of **Structured Content and Data Management (SCDM)** across filing and review will “improve overall efficiency and speed in the compilation and review of regulatory submissions” by enabling data-driven assembly [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). In short, the move from publisher to platform not only yields immediate operational benefits, but also paves the way for future innovations in how we manage drug data.

## Key Capabilities of a Unified Archive Platform

Transforming a simple submission tool into an enterprise backbone requires several advanced capabilities. Here we highlight three of the most impactful features that today’s unified systems offer: **faceted search**, **sequence management**, and **cross-team visibility**. Each of these plays a role in breaking down information silos and improving the speed and quality of regulatory work.

### Faceted Search for Rapid Retrieval

Faceted search (or faceted navigation) is a powerful method for finding information in large repositories. It allows users to apply multiple filters – **facets** – to narrow down search results based on document attributes [kmworld.com](https://kmworld.com). Each facet represents a category like document type, product name, therapeutic area, country, date, author, etc., and within each facet the system offers relevant values. By selecting facet filters, users essentially compose an advanced query without needing any technical syntax; the interface guides them to drill down by successive refinements [kmworld.com](https://kmworld.com). Faceted search has become common in e-commerce

(where you filter products by size, color, brand, etc.) and users now expect the same ease of filtering in enterprise systems [kmworld.com](https://kmworld.com).

In the context of a drug lifecycle archive, faceted search is transformative. Regulatory archives contain tens of thousands of documents – clinical study reports, protocols, manufacturing records, submissions for each market (each with hundreds of files), correspondence, and more. Without facets, finding a specific piece of information can be like finding a needle in a haystack. With facets, however, a team member can, for example, quickly zero in on *“Module 3 Quality documents for Product X that were submitted to FDA in the last 2 years”* by combining filters. They might choose **Product: X, Submission Type: NDA, Module: 3, Region: US, Date: 2023-2025**, and instantly retrieve a manageable list of results. If that’s still too many, they could add **Document Type: Stability Report** or another facet to narrow further. As one knowledge management expert put it, *“the power of faceted search lies in allowing users to create their own custom navigation by combining various perspectives,”* instead of being stuck in one rigid hierarchy [kmworld.com](https://kmworld.com). This flexibility is ideal for life sciences content, which can be organized by product, by regulatory submission, by functional area, etc., all at once.

A practical example: Imagine a Pharmacovigilance scientist needs to find if a certain adverse event was mentioned in any clinical overview across global submissions. Using a unified system’s search, they might filter by **Document Type: Clinical Overview (Module 2)** and then use a keyword for the event, instantly searching across all submitted overviews in all countries. Without a unified archive, that task could require contacting multiple affiliates or digging through file shares. In fact, the scattered state of information historically meant even simple questions (like “does product Y have approval in Country Z?”) took days to answer [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). With centralized, indexed content and facets, those queries become trivial. Regulatory Information Management systems link all information to products and regions by design, “making it much easier to find” any needed detail [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io).

Furthermore, modern platforms often integrate powerful search engines (like ElasticSearch) under the hood to index not only metadata but also full text of documents. Combined with facets, this means users can search the **content** of PDFs (such as a chemical name or a study code) and then filter the context (e.g. limit to a specific regulatory application or a date range). Some systems also provide **saved searches** or **search facets presets** for common queries (for example, a saved facet set for “all current approved labeling for Product X in each country”). The ability to retrieve information on-demand boosts productivity and decision-making. Studies have shown RA teams spend enormous time simply gathering info; by “ensuring that up-to-date information is always easily available,” RIM platforms significantly improve team productivity [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). In summary, faceted search turns the unified archive into a **knowledge goldmine** – anyone in the company can quickly locate critical documents or data, whether they are preparing a submission, answering a health authority question, or developing a strategy.

## Sequence Management and Lifecycle Tracking



Managing **submission sequences** is a unique and essential aspect of regulatory work, especially with eCTD. Each application (e.g. an IND, NDA, MAA, etc.) is not a one-time dossier but a *continuously evolving collection* of sequences (0000, 0001, 0002, ...) over many years. A unified platform must therefore provide robust **sequence management** – tracking the lifecycle of each regulatory application, showing how each new sequence relates to prior ones, and what the current approved content is. In legacy setups, this was often handled by manually-maintained trackers or by relying on agency feedback. But now, advanced tools automatically capture sequence relationships and present the full history at a glance.

One important concept is linking sequences by **regulatory activity** (or regulatory context). For instance, in FDA submissions, sequence 0000 might be the original NDA, sequences 0001 and 0002 might be amendments under that NDA review cycle, sequence 0003 might be an annual report, 0004 an efficacy supplement, etc. It's critical to relate the sequences so that anyone (sponsor or agency) can see which sequences belong to the same **regulatory activity** (e.g. which ones together constitute a particular supplement). The eCTD standard itself doesn't explicitly define those groupings – it relies on metadata to relate sequences [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com). Unified submission systems now make use of that metadata to automatically organize sequences. As one article notes, a viewer can provide a *"Submission Type view... | [that] allows both the sponsor and the health authority to see the submissions assigned to each Regulatory Activity"*, flagging any sequences that are missing a linking reference [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com). For example, if an Amendment sequence was not properly tagged to the supplement it belongs to, the system can alert the user (and indeed the FDA's systems would flag it too) [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com). By enforcing these relationships, the platform prevents the scenario of an "orphan" sequence that regulators struggle to place in context [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com).

From a user's perspective, good sequence management means being able to **view the state of the application at any point in time**. Many eCTD tools offer a *"current view"* filter: you pick a specific regulatory activity (say, Supplement 5), and the system shows you the cumulative content of that application as of the latest sequence in that activity [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com). This is incredibly useful – it mimics what the agency reviewer would see as the effective current dossier for that approval. As more sequences (amendments, etc.) are added, the ability to narrow the view to just those relevant to a particular change *"becomes more and more important"* [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com). Otherwise, with dozens of sequences, one could be lost in a sea of files. Modern unified archives thus present **timeline or hierarchical views**: you might see the application's sequences grouped by regulatory activity, with labels like "Original Approval," "Supplement – CMC Change," "Annual Report 2024," etc., each containing the sequences that pertain to it. Users can expand any group to see the sequences and the documents within them, or collapse it for a high-level picture.

*A dashboard view from a contemporary regulatory platform, illustrating sequence management and global oversight. In this example, the user can see recent submission sequences (with their sequence numbers and descriptions) and a geographical visualization of dossier distribution by*



country. Such tools give a **centralized overview** of all regulatory applications, enabling users to track the status across regions and identify changes at a glance. Important metrics – like which sequence is under which activity, or which markets have pending submissions – are readily visible, replacing the need for manual tracking spreadsheets.

Beyond visualization, unified platforms leverage sequence data for **reporting and reuse**. For instance, Veeva's submissions archive includes "time-based reporting | [that] shows an application's chronology across submissions, correspondences, commitments, and regulatory objectives" [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). This kind of report might display a timeline of when each sequence was filed, when approvals were received, what related commitments were made (e.g. post-market study commitments), all in one view. Not only is this helpful for internal auditing, it also aids planning (e.g. knowing when the next annual report is due, because the last one's date is recorded). It's effectively a **living history** of the product's regulatory life, within the platform.

Another valuable feature is content **cross-referencing and reuse** tracking. Unified archives can tell you if a document in one submission was reused in another, or if a piece of data appears in multiple dossiers. An integrated eCTD viewer, for example, can provide "information on what other applications' or submissions' content was used" [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). This "where used" functionality is a huge benefit of having everything in one system – the platform can answer, say, "this study report (or manufacturing section) was submitted in US, EU, and Canada so far". If a document is updated, users know which submissions might need an amendment. Some platforms even allow linking one document to multiple submissions so that an update can be managed in one spot. All of this fosters **consistency**: it reduces the risk that one region's dossier lags behind others in updates. A unified sequence management approach therefore contributes directly to compliance and quality – ensuring the right, up-to-date information is present globally.

Lastly, sequence management in an enterprise platform is important for **regulatory intelligence and decision-making**. With all sequence data aggregated, companies can analyze how long each type of submission takes, or how many questions each generated, etc. Dashboards might show how many active regulatory activities are in progress per product or region. This visibility allows regulatory leaders to allocate resources better and predict timelines more accurately [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). In essence, the platform provides not just tracking, but *insight* – elevating regulatory affairs from a reactive function to a more data-driven one.

## Cross-Team Visibility and Collaboration

Perhaps the most profound change from the old "publisher" model to the new platform model is the level of **visibility it gives to cross-functional teams**. In the past, once a document left, say, the clinical group and entered the "black box" of regulatory publishing, the clinical team might not see it again until the drug was approved. Now, with an integrated archive, any authorized user can check on the status or content of submissions in real time. The barriers are reduced so that everyone is working off the **same information pool** rather than fragmented copies.



**Enterprise-wide access:** Modern unified systems are typically cloud-based or centrally hosted, allowing global access. As mentioned, Veeva's Vault RIM, for example, lets regulatory users import submissions and then those become *"accessible by any user, anywhere across the globe,"* in a validated environment [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). Role-based security controls ensure people only see what they should, but within that, it's open to all departments. This is a huge shift from when only regulatory ops had the submission on their local drive. Now a clinical project manager in Japan, a manufacturing site lead, or a medical affairs scientist could all log into the platform and find the documents or health authority letters they need. Cross-team visibility means **fewer email requests** bouncing between departments. A quality engineer doesn't need to email RA for the latest approved product labeling – they can retrieve it themselves from the archive (knowing it's the official approved version). Conversely, if Regulatory wants to know about the latest manufacturing change or a clinical trial result, they might find it already stored in the system by those teams. One life sciences IT specialist observed that using a single repository across departments *"ensures the secure and organized storage of critical data and documents,"* while making retention and retrieval easier for all stakeholders [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com) [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com).

**Collaboration workflows:** Beyond passive visibility, unified platforms promote **active collaboration** through workflows that span functions. For instance, an end-to-end platform can route a document for review through clinical, quality, and regulatory sequentially, capturing everyone's input in one place. In the case of a major submission, teams from all areas can populate a **content plan** together in the system – listing out needed documents and who will provide them [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). This replaces the infamous Excel trackers and ensures accountability is visible to all. RIM systems often have project management features (tasks, timelines) that allow even external partners (like a CRO or a local distributor) to participate by requesting or delivering information via the system [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). All of these collaborative features mean that a unified archive is not static storage, but a *living workspace* for the enterprise.

One concrete example of cross-team process is how **change management** is handled. In a platform like OpenText's, a change request can be initiated that involves updating documents in regulatory and quality domains, and the system will route the tasks to the respective owners and capture approvals in one audit trail [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com) [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com). Another example: Generis CARA's platform triggers we discussed earlier – a complaint in the safety system leads to a regulatory variation submission – also inherently notify and involve the relevant people in each department automatically [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). The unified nature means each group isn't maintaining their own list; they're working off a shared record.

**Visibility to management and external parties:** Cross-team visibility also extends upward and outward. Because all data is centralized, **executive dashboards** and reports can be generated to show overall status. For example, a dashboard might display all upcoming regulatory milestones across the portfolio, pulling from data entered by various teams. This level of reporting was rarely possible when information was scattered – now it's often built into RIM platforms [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io) [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). Management can see, for instance, how many submissions were

completed this quarter, or how many are delayed due to pending documents, etc., and importantly *why*.

External stakeholders like *affiliates* also benefit. Many unified archives allow local offices to directly access the global system to download submissions or upload their local regulatory correspondence. This ensures that what the headquarters sees is up-to-date. In the past, if an affiliate sent a letter to an agency and got a response, that might sit in an email and not be known to HQ until much later. Now it can be logged in the central archive under the product's record immediately [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help). Some systems even have an "Affiliate Portal" for this purpose. The result is a truly **global regulatory intelligence** capability – one that aggregates inputs from all around the world in real time.

Finally, cross-team collaboration supported by the platform yields big compliance and efficiency gains. When everyone sees the same single version of each document or data point, you reduce discrepancies. It also cuts down redundant work – as Generis notes, the platform approach "*avoid [s] duplicate work, and maintain [s] consistency and compliance*" by connecting all areas on a single platform [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com). Quality and regulatory, for example, won't unknowingly be maintaining two different versions of a manufacturing process description; one source means one truth. Companies have reported that implementing an integrated RIM system leads to "*stronger, more confident global regulatory compliance, and [the] ability to get new products to market more quickly,*" by virtue of better coordination [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io). In a sense, the platform becomes an **information backbone** supporting every department – much like an ERP system does for finance or supply chain, the unified archive does it for regulated content and knowledge.

## Conclusion

The journey from a standalone submission publisher to an enterprise-wide platform reflects the broader digital transformation of the pharmaceutical industry. What began as a niche tool to meet electronic submission requirements has evolved into a **unified drug lifecycle archive** – a central hub that not only stores documents, but actively connects people, processes, and data across R&D, regulatory, quality, and safety. This evolution was driven by the need for greater efficiency, compliance, and agility in a complex, global regulatory environment. By enabling capabilities such as faceted search (for instant information retrieval), sequence management (for end-to-end oversight of regulatory activities), and cross-team visibility (for seamless collaboration), the modern platform overcomes the silos and manual work that once hampered drug development.

Importantly, this is not just a technology upgrade; it represents a **process and cultural shift**. Teams now work in a more transparent and integrated fashion, with shared responsibility for maintaining the single source of truth. The benefits are evident in day-to-day operations – less time wasted searching for files or reconciling different versions, faster compilation and review of



submissions, and improved ability to respond to health authorities. When a question comes from regulators, the answer may be only a quick search away, rather than a fire drill to collect info. And when internal stakeholders need updates, they can self-service via the platform's dashboards and reports.

From a compliance perspective, having all regulated content and its history in one controlled repository strengthens **audit readiness** and **traceability**. Every change is logged, every approval is captured, and one can reconstruct exactly what was submitted where. This is increasingly critical as regulations like ISO IDMP (Identification of Medicinal Products) demand consistent data across filings [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com) [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com). A unified archive is well-suited to support such initiatives, since it can serve as the authoritative source of product data that is reused in multiple contexts.

Looking ahead, the move to unified platforms is also a stepping stone to more **data-driven regulatory** approaches. As companies adopt structured content, automation, and even AI for regulatory document authoring and review, a centralized platform is essential to harness those technologies. We are already seeing examples of automation reducing repetitive tasks – for instance, automatically formatting documents to be “submission-ready,” or detecting when a piece of data changes and suggesting where else that might need updating [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). The platform provides the substrate on which these intelligent functions operate, by providing comprehensive, well-organized data. Indeed, regulators themselves (like FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research) are modernizing their review systems toward data-centric models, and they encourage industry to do the same [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Sponsors with a unified archive will find it easier to pivot to new submission formats (like future electronic data submissions) because their information is already consolidated and accessible.

In conclusion, the transformation **from “publisher” to “platform”** marks a significant maturity leap in regulatory technology and process. Companies that have embraced an enterprise backbone for the drug lifecycle are realizing faster submissions, greater compliance assurance, and enhanced collaboration both internally and with external partners. One industry story encapsulated it well: after moving to a unified RIM solution, a user commented that the team was *“immediately impressed... our team felt that this application was superior to the others we had reviewed”* [extedo.com](https://extedo.com). The integrated platform not only replaced a patchwork of tools, but also elevated how the organization works together on getting therapies to patients. As the pharmaceutical industry continues to innovate, having a unified, accessible archive of all product knowledge is proving to be an invaluable asset – truly the backbone of the enterprise that can adapt and scale with the demands of modern drug development and regulation.

#### Sources:

- Amgen Regulatory Affairs team's perspective on structured content management and inefficiencies of document-based submissions [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)





- Applied Clinical Trials (2010) – “Secrets of eCTD Related Sequences,” explaining the importance of relating sequences for regulatory activities [appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com)  
[appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com](https://appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com)
  - Veeva Systems – Vault RIM Submissions Archive overview, highlighting global access, integrated viewer, and chronology reporting [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help) [regulatory.veevavault.help](https://regulatory.veevavault.help)
  - Generis (2023) – “True Connectivity: The Lifecycle of a Drug in the CARA Life Sciences Platform,” illustrating cross-functional integration from discovery to post-market  
[caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com) [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com)  
[caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com) [caralifesciences.generiscorp.com](https://caralifesciences.generiscorp.com)
  - Rimsys (2021) – “RIM 101: What is Regulatory Information Management?” describing single source of truth, linking to products, and productivity gains [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io) [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io) [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io) [rimsys.io](https://rimsys.io)
  - EXTEDO – eSUBmanager product page, discussing challenges with using publishing tools for review and the benefits of a dedicated submission management hub [extedo.com](https://extedo.com) [extedo.com](https://extedo.com)
  - OpenText (2023) – Life Sciences content management updates, emphasizing one repository across research, clinical, regulatory, manufacturing [blogs.opentext.com](https://blogs.opentext.com) and new ways to access content in context.
  - KMWorld (2009) – “Designing for Faceted Search,” general definition and principles of faceted navigation that enhance findability in large content sets [kmworld.com](https://kmworld.com).
-



## IntuitionLabs - Industry Leadership & Services

**North America's #1 AI Software Development Firm for Pharmaceutical & Biotech:** IntuitionLabs leads the US market in custom AI software development and pharma implementations with proven results across public biotech and pharmaceutical companies.

**Elite Client Portfolio:** Trusted by NASDAQ-listed pharmaceutical companies including Scilex Holding Company (SCLX) and leading CROs across North America.

**Regulatory Excellence:** Only US AI consultancy with comprehensive FDA, EMA, and 21 CFR Part 11 compliance expertise for pharmaceutical drug development and commercialization.

**Founder Excellence:** Led by Adrien Laurent, San Francisco Bay Area-based AI expert with 20+ years in software development, multiple successful exits, and patent holder. Recognized as one of the top AI experts in the USA.

**Custom AI Software Development:** Build tailored pharmaceutical AI applications, custom CRMs, chatbots, and ERP systems with advanced analytics and regulatory compliance capabilities.

**Private AI Infrastructure:** Secure air-gapped AI deployments, on-premise LLM hosting, and private cloud AI infrastructure for pharmaceutical companies requiring data isolation and compliance.

**Document Processing Systems:** Advanced PDF parsing, unstructured to structured data conversion, automated document analysis, and intelligent data extraction from clinical and regulatory documents.

**Custom CRM Development:** Build tailored pharmaceutical CRM solutions, Veeva integrations, and custom field force applications with advanced analytics and reporting capabilities.

**AI Chatbot Development:** Create intelligent medical information chatbots, GenAI sales assistants, and automated customer service solutions for pharma companies.

**Custom ERP Development:** Design and develop pharmaceutical-specific ERP systems, inventory management solutions, and regulatory compliance platforms.

**Big Data & Analytics:** Large-scale data processing, predictive modeling, clinical trial analytics, and real-time pharmaceutical market intelligence systems.

**Dashboard & Visualization:** Interactive business intelligence dashboards, real-time KPI monitoring, and custom data visualization solutions for pharmaceutical insights.

**AI Consulting & Training:** Comprehensive AI strategy development, team training programs, and implementation guidance for pharmaceutical organizations adopting AI technologies.

Contact founder Adrien Laurent and team at <https://intuitionlabs.ai/contact> for a consultation.



---

## DISCLAIMER

The information contained in this document is provided for educational and informational purposes only. We make no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, about the completeness, accuracy, reliability, suitability, or availability of the information contained herein.

Any reliance you place on such information is strictly at your own risk. In no event will [IntuitionLabs.ai](https://IntuitionLabs.ai) or its representatives be liable for any loss or damage including without limitation, indirect or consequential loss or damage, or any loss or damage whatsoever arising from the use of information presented in this document.

This document may contain content generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence technologies. AI-generated content may contain errors, omissions, or inaccuracies. Readers are advised to independently verify any critical information before acting upon it.

All product names, logos, brands, trademarks, and registered trademarks mentioned in this document are the property of their respective owners. All company, product, and service names used in this document are for identification purposes only. Use of these names, logos, trademarks, and brands does not imply endorsement by the respective trademark holders.

[IntuitionLabs.ai](https://IntuitionLabs.ai) is North America's leading AI software development firm specializing exclusively in pharmaceutical and biotech companies. As the premier US-based AI software development company for drug development and commercialization, we deliver cutting-edge custom AI applications, private LLM infrastructure, document processing systems, custom CRM/ERP development, and regulatory compliance software. Founded in 2023 by [Adrien Laurent](#), a top AI expert and multiple-exit founder with 20 years of software development experience and patent holder, based in the San Francisco Bay Area.

This document does not constitute professional or legal advice. For specific guidance related to your business needs, please consult with appropriate qualified professionals.

© 2025 [IntuitionLabs.ai](https://IntuitionLabs.ai). All rights reserved.