CER Research Site Collection

Issue 01

INTRODUCTION

THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH SITE

When Management Turns Science into Value

Mónica Coronel / Jorge Velasco Zamora

FUNDACIONARTICULAR
CIENCIA + TECNOLOGIA + SOCIEDAD

MC

Mónica Coronel

Business Administrator
MBA
COO, CER Research Site
Buenos Alres, Argentina

JV

Jorge Velasco Zamora

MD, MBA, PI
Site Manager. CER Research Site
Buenos Aires, Argentina

ISBN 978-631-01-4931-8

Editorial

FUNDACIONARTICULAR
CIENCIA + TECNOLOGIA + SOCIEDAD

What This Series Is—and How to Use It

This is the first issue of a monthly series that will eventually form a complete volume (THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH SITE: When Management Turns Science into Value). It is designed as a set of playbooks. Each issue combines a brief editorial (to clarify the thinking) with a reflective, practical framework for implementation. The goal is simple yet demanding: to help site leaders—both experienced and emerging—build a world-class operating model that is auditable, scalable, and sustainable.

The person responsible for leading a research site does not have a universally accepted title. In recent years, the term Site Manager has become established to describe a role that includes, among other responsibilities, managing relationships with sponsors and CROs, attracting new studies, ensuring financial sustainability, training the team, aligning infrastructure, managing quality, and meeting regulatory and ethical requirements.

This series begins with a premise: medical excellence alone is not enough if it is trapped in managerial improvisation. Professionalizing site management is a non-negotiable condition for sustaining international performance standards. While the primary focus is on Site Managers, the content is also useful for middle management (coordination, quality, pharmacy) and for the Principal Investigator, who leads heterogeneous teams and supports the day-to-day execution of the protocol.

Across the series, issues move from the invisible architecture of trust (governance and quality) to the tangible design of the operating system (processes, data, people, technology, infrastructure, and strategy). Together, they advance a central idea: leading a site is not only about running studies—it is about building an organization capable of turning complexity into reliable evidence, repeatedly.

In editing this series, generative AI was used to support drafting, style, and structure. Final judgment, factual verification, and responsibility for the content rest with the authors.

Mónica Coronel · Jorge Velasco Zamora

April 2026

Below is the overall outline of the series. It is not a list of “topics,” but a management map: the decisions that—when made consistently—turn a site into a predictable, auditable, and sustainable system.

The journey is organized into four sections. It begins with Foundations, because without a shared framework it is easy to confuse activity with control. It then moves to People & Knowledge, where much of real-world variability lives roles, competencies, culture, and leadership. Next comes Systems & Structure, the domain where quality stops depending on individuals and becomes design—processes, data integrity, and infrastructure. Finally, it closes with Strategy & Execution, where a site matures as both a business unit and a social actor: how it positions itself, how it engages with sponsors and CROs, and how it creates value for the community.

Each issue deepens one part of the model and provides usable tools. The intent is that readers can enter through any chapter based on their immediate needs, while also allowing the outline—when followed in sequence—to function as a capability-building program. In other words: a practical leadership manual for sites that aim for world-class standards without improvisation.

With this map as a guide, the outline that follows helps place each issue within the complete system and anticipate the logic of the series.

CONTENTS

01

Introduction: The Strategic Research Site in a Global Ecosystem

Why the Site Matters More Than Ever

Clinical research sites operate within one of the most complex environments in modern medicine. They are, at once, a clinical organization, a platform for evidence generation, and a highly demanding regulatory system. At that intersection, science, care, documentation, timelines, and multiple expectations converge. Each commitment the site makes—and delivers on—to its key stakeholders (society, participants, authorities, sponsors) sustains the reliability of a global network where small errors scale quickly and where consistency matters as much as knowledge.

HIGHLIGHTS

Small errors scale: a minor deviation can become a CAPA, trigger audit findings, cause delays, and erode trust.

You compete on predictability: sponsors and CROs choose sites that consistently deliver on objectives and commitments.

Quality is a system: sustainable performance depends on processes, clear roles, metrics, and continuous improvement.

Ethics is at stake: good management protects participants and keeps decision-making consistent.

Professionalization turns complexity into value: stronger capacity, more feasible studies, better reputation, and long-term continuity.

Driven by economic forces, scientific progress, and increasing regulation, new drug development has become a sophisticated, highly rational process. The industry globalized to shorten development timelines and speed access to markets, running trials across diverse geographies under schedule pressures that few outside the field fully appreciate. In this constantly shifting landscape, the site has moved beyond being a mere operational endpoint to becoming a node of predictability—where execution is auditable, comparable, and reliable.

"Know your village and you will know the world."

A local site does not produce "local" results. It produces evidence that travels, is pooled, is audited, and ultimately influences global decisions. The bar for methodological and operational quality does not change with geography.

A site may be in Quilmes, Nairobi, or Melbourne; what does not change is that a data point is a data point. If it is generated properly—with traceability, bias control, consistency, and participant protection—it carries the same weight in confirming or refuting a hypothesis of efficacy or safety. If it is generated poorly, it still carries weight, but in the wrong direction: it introduces noise, bias, and the risk of incorrect conclusions. The "village" is not isolated; it becomes part of the body of evidence.

The reason is structural. Modern clinical science is built through accumulation: a trial is not a story, but a node in a network. A site's data is integrated with those from other centers, subjected to monitoring, audits, and statistical review, and then used to inform regulatory approvals, labeling, clinical guidelines, and medical practice. Along that path, geographic origin matters less; what matters is the quality of the system that produces the data.

From that follows a key management conclusion: international standards are a value strategy. They don't just organize the work—they make it reliable, auditable, and scalable. When a site operates to global standards, it achieves three outcomes at once.

> **Comparability**: its data can be combined with others without "exceptions" or methodological doubts.

> **Auditability**: what happened can be demonstrated—not merely stated—through documentation, traceability, version control, and supporting evidence.
>
> **Operational reliability:** execution is repeatable; it does not depend on a single person or unusually favorable circumstances.

That is why “knowing your village” is not a romantic call to focus on what is local. It is a call to design the site as a system: clear roles, standardized processes, verifiable training, data integrity, risk management, and governance that sustains consistent decisions. The local becomes global when the system is robust.

There is also a point that is often underestimated: a site that fails to meet international standards does not remain “outside” the world—it remains inside it, but as a source of variability. In an environment driven by timelines and recruitment pressure, variability is expensive: rework, queries, deviations, CAPAs, and team fatigue. When a site governs its “village” to global standards, its data become an asset: they accelerate decisions, reduce friction, and strengthen reputation.

In short, where a site is located does not determine its impact. What determines its impact is its ability to produce world-class evidence. The village is the point of entry; the world is the destination of every data point. That is precisely why professional management is not optional: it is the bridge between local practice and global validity—medicine at a population scale.

Thesis: Turning Variability into Reliable Evidence

A molecule may be fully characterized in the laboratory; clinical development is inherently variable. Real life introduces variability—in patients, adherence, comorbidities, logistics, and timelines. The site’s work is to convert that variability into verifiable evidence: traceable data, documented decisions, and repeatable practices. In other words, the site transforms uncertainty into reliable evidence through the scientific method.

That challenge unfolds within an ecosystem pulled by forces in different directions. Sponsors and CROs operate with global efficiency and demanding metrics. Regulators balance innovation and safety. Ethics committees safeguard boundaries and purpose. Patients live in the real-time of illness, hope, and expectations. And around the site orbits a broad network of stakeholders: the community, patient associations, universities and research institutes, central laboratories, venture capital, sponsors, health authorities, and ethics committees, among others. The site sits at the intersection of these scales—scientific, regulatory, economic, and human.

New Complexity: Technology, Scale, and Accountability

Technology has expanded both responsibility and scale. Digital platforms, remote monitoring, and wearable devices have dissolved the traditional notion of distance. The site has become hybrid: partly physical, partly virtual, always accountable. Decentralization opens new opportunities for inclusion, but it also expands the perimeter of control: when a study extends into a participant's home, the site's operational and ethical perimeter expands with it. This new complexity is not solved by isolated tools, but by management: clear definitions of roles, workflows, and evidence; data integrity controls; escalation criteria; and governance for incidents and deviations. The question is no longer where research happens, but how it is governed so it can travel safely, traceably, and consistently over time.

Sustainability: Management Decisions Under Pressure

There is also economic pressure. Clinical trials require infrastructure, training, systems, and managerial time. For independent and mid-sized sites, sustainability is shaped by daily decisions: how to size teams, prevent rework, negotiate budgets that truly fund quality, and absorb delayed activations or frequent amendments without degrading processes. A structural tension remains sites are indispensable to development, yet dependent on external funding. This tension must be managed as risk—through transparency, technological foresight, strategic intelligence, governance, and leadership.

Over recent decades, many sites have evolved from research units anchored in a private practice into dedicated research centers and, more recently, into multispecialty organizations running multiple protocols in parallel.

> This transition is not simply growth; it changes the nature of the work. When different teams share infrastructure, resources, logistics, processes, and procedures, the challenge stops being purely clinical. It becomes organizational: culture, structure, coordination, and strategy. The question is no longer whether the investigator is competent, but whether the site's system is predictable.

This new paradigm also puts pressure on the team. Medical practice within the site shifts from individual care to medicine at a population scale, where the clinical act is integrated into a global evidence system. That transition requires continuous training—scientific, regulatory, and operational—and demands coordination and management capabilities that many professionals never received formally.

Operational Definition: Clinical Trial Management

Clinical trial management is the set of decisions, routines, and controls that consistently delivers two outcomes: participant safety and data quality—delivered within the agreed timelines. The definition is simple; execution is complex because it depends on multidisciplinary teams, multiple stakeholders and external factors, and a demanding regulatory environment.

> That complexity makes intuition insufficient and improvisation risky. Managing a site requires specific management capabilities applied to clinical research. Among other things, it must optimize process design and improvement; risk-based quality; data integrity; leadership of multidisciplinary teams; operational planning; budget management and negotiation; stakeholder management; and technology adoption.

In practice, these capabilities translate into a key condition: turning day-to-day work into a repeatable system. That means clear roles, documented evidence, operational metrics, escalation criteria for incidents, and a mechanism for continuous learning.

Professionalizing site management is not an add-on to medical excellence. It is the condition that makes it possible to sustain international standards, reduce variability, prevent rework, and scale without losing control.

The Common Standard: ICH-GCP as a Global Grammar

The good news is that the field already has a shared grammar. Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP) provides a common language for documentation, traceability, and participant protection. This universality allows a site in any city, across continents, to be assessed against comparable criteria. It also exposes real inequalities in access to technology, training, and local operational capabilities. Leading a site to world-class standards therefore means building systems—not only complying but designing compliance so it holds over time.

Productivity and Integrity: A Management Problem

The central challenge for research sites today is not choosing between productivity and integrity, as if they were incompatible poles. The challenge is to lead an organization that must deliver both at the same time. Efficiency is a condition for fulfilling the mission. Integrity is the asset that makes evidence acceptable, comparable, and useful. When a site loses either one, it loses its reason for being.

In this context, medicine is essential—but it is not enough. Clinical excellence can ensure good care in a single encounter; it cannot, by itself, ensure the consistency of hundreds of encounters, thousands of small decisions, and multiple people working in parallel under pressure from timelines, regulation, and external expectations.

> What turns effort into performance is not individual talent, but the management system that sets priorities, defines accountability, designs processes, measures

> what matters, and corrects course in time. Without that system, the site runs on intuition—and in complex environments, intuition is expensive.

The real tension shows up in daily decisions: accelerating without creating disorder, growing without fragmentation, innovating without weakening traceability, recruiting without undue influence, responding quickly without compromising quality. None of those choices can be sustained by willpower alone. They are sustained by management: clear roles, escalation rules, documented evidence, operational metrics, verifiable training, and governance that turns incidents into learning—not blame. In other words, management as a discipline: turning what matters into routine.

Behind every study are highly qualified professionals—investigators, coordinators, pharmacists, data managers, and quality teams. But a mature organization does not depend on its best person. It depends on the organization working even when that person is not there, even as volume grows, and even as protocols and the environment change. That is professionalization: moving from an individual-dependent model to one built on institutional capabilities.

When governance fails, it is not a protocol that fails. Trust fails—the trust that allows a sponsor to invest, a regulator to accept, an ethics committee to endorse, and a participant to believe. That is why the strategic site is not defined by its intentions or scientific rhetoric. It is defined by its management architecture: the ability to produce reliable evidence in a repeatable way. Again, and again

Issue 2 serves as a “turning point” in the book: after describing the global landscape of clinical research, it turns inward and converts observation into strategy. The focus shifts from “where the industry is heading” to “what place each site occupies in that ecosystem,” and what decisions it must make to remain viable, evolve, and lead.

The chapter is organized around a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses, Threats) that, in the context of research sites, stops being a consulting tool and becomes a mirror of institutional maturity: how a site turns principles into practice, challenges into method, and compliance into design. Today, strengths are no longer measured only by infrastructure or experience, but by credibility; opportunities are not a matter of luck, but of preparedness; weaknesses are often failures of governance and operating model; and threats frequently emerge when a site stops adapting.

Under **Strengths**, the text highlights the site’s distinctive value as an operational institution: command of the GCP language, proximity to patients’ real lives—the “moment of truth”—the agility of the mid-sized site, the irreplaceable role of human capital, and infrastructure (including digital) as the foundation for repeatable, auditable processes. Above all, it emphasizes trust as a cumulative asset—earned protocol by protocol, audit by audit, patient by patient.

Under **Opportunities**, it describes a global expansion driven by the geographic redistribution of trials, demand for diversity and speed, pipeline growth, and technology (eConsent, remote

monitoring, wearables, telemedicine) that turns the trial into an ecosystem. A central message for the decade emerges: the sites that will thrive are those that integrate digital capabilities without dehumanizing care, build community trust, and strengthen themselves through networks, partnerships, and formal professionalization (certifications, standards, and an ESG culture as a differentiator).

Under **Weaknesses**, it identifies structural fragilities in the model: economic dependence on study flow, technology gaps, operational fragmentation, growth that adds complexity without structure, burnout, and staff turnover. One frequent blind spot deserves special emphasis: medical excellence trapped in managerial improvisation. The point is not accusatory, but developmental—these weaknesses signal a discipline in transition toward maturity.

Under **Threats**, it outlines converging pressures: consolidation of SMOs and networks—and the risk of invisibility for independent sites; rising regulatory complexity; competition for patients; escalating compliance costs (including cybersecurity); macroeconomic volatility; and a digital gap that becomes synonymous with credibility. The warning is clear: the greatest danger is not disruption, but inertia.

The closing frames the transition that guides the rest of the book: moving from observation to intention, from improvisation to design, from compliance to intelligence, and from “knowing how to operate” to “knowing how to lead.”