



April 2026

CoreStream GRC for Conflicts of Interest

Enabling COI Governance Across the Lifecycle

Solution **Perspective**

Governance, Risk Management & Compliance Insight

©2026 GRC 20/20 Research, LLC. All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of GRC 20/20 Research, LLC. If you are authorized to access this publication, your use of it is subject to the Usage Guidelines established in client contract.

The information contained in this publication is believed to be accurate and has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable but cannot be guaranteed and is subject to change. GRC 20/20 accepts no liability whatever for actions taken based on information that may subsequently prove to be incorrect or errors in analysis. This research contains opinions of GRC 20/20 analysts and should not be construed as statements of fact. GRC 20/20 disclaims all warranties as to the accuracy, completeness or adequacy of such information and shall have no liability for errors, omissions or inadequacies in such information. Although GRC 20/20 may include a discussion of related legal issues, GRC 20/20 does not provide legal advice or services and its research should not be construed or used as such.

Table of Contents

COI Management with Integrity in Decision-Making	4
Governing the Conflict of Interest Lifecycle.....	5
Why Siloed Approaches Fail.....	6
The Case for an Integrated Conflict of Interest Management Solution	7
CoreStream GRC for Conflict of Interest Management	8
Enabling COI Governance Across the Lifecycle	8
CoreStream GRC COI Management Client Experiences.....	9
<i>CoreStream GRC Enables an Integrated COI Lifecycle</i>	11
<i>How CoreStream GRC Addresses the COI Management Lifecycle</i>	12
Benefits Organizations Receive with CoreStream GRC for COI.....	14
Considerations in Context of CoreStream GRC for COI Management	16
About GRC 20/20 Research, LLC	18
Research Methodology	18

CoreStream GRC for Conflicts of Interest

Enabling COI Governance Across the Lifecycle

COI Management with Integrity in Decision-Making

Modern organizations run on decisions: hiring, procurement, investments, partnerships, grants, research, contracts, vendor selection, investigations, regulatory interactions, and the allocation of scarce resources. Every one of those decisions depends on trust in the objectivity of the people involved. That is why conflict of interest management (COI) has become a critical governance issue. It is not simply an ethics policy or annual disclosure exercise; it is a direct test of whether the organization can achieve objectives while acting with integrity.

Conflicts of interest are broader than many organizations acknowledge. They are not limited to blatant misconduct or intentional wrongdoing. They often emerge in ordinary business activity:

- **Manager** involved in supplier selection has a family relationship with one bidder;
- **Physician** receives payments or benefits from industry while influencing purchasing decisions;
- **Executive** has outside board roles or investments that may shape judgment;
- **Staff member** has secondary employment or personal loyalties that complicate objectivity.

In many cases, the issue is not only an actual conflict, but also a potential or perceived conflict. Regulators, investors, employees, counterparties, and the public judge whether decisions appear independent, fair, and defensible.

Many organizations still manage conflict of interest through static and fragmented means: annual forms, self-assessments, spreadsheets, shared drives, email approvals, and isolated registers. On paper, this can look like coverage. In practice, it is often paperwork without control. Conflicts of interest rarely become damaging because the organization lacked a policy; they become damaging because the issue was normalized, misunderstood, not escalated, or left unresolved until after a consequential decision was made.

Conflict of interest governance is where effective management begins. Governance defines what must be disclosed, by whom, when, and in what circumstances. It clarifies

who has authority to review, escalate, approve, reject, recuse, or impose mitigation. Without that structure, conflict management fragments into disconnected administrative tasks. With it, conflict management becomes a disciplined process that protects decisions, relationships, reputation, and trust.

Governing the Conflict of Interest Lifecycle

Too often, organizations treat conflict of interest management as an annual attestation exercise. Employees complete a form, the organization stores it, and attention moves elsewhere until the next cycle. That is inadequate because conflicts are dynamic. Roles change, reporting lines shift, incentives evolve, new relationships form, outside appointments are accepted, investments change, and external data reveals new information. A mature program therefore has to govern the full lifecycle of disclosure, review, mitigation, and reassessment.

The conflict of interest lifecycle includes the following phases:

- 1. Policy, Context, and Disclosure Expectations.** The lifecycle begins with clarity of policy and expectation. The organization must define what constitutes an actual, potential, or perceived conflict; what categories are in scope; what events trigger disclosure; and what standards of independence, recusal, and mitigation apply. This is where the organization sets the tone that disclosure is expected, protected, and part of responsible decision-making. At this stage, governance is about more than a policy document. It is about creating common understanding across employees, managers, compliance, legal, and leadership so that people recognize conflicts early and know what to do when they arise.
- 2. Disclosure and Intake.** From there, the organization moves into disclosure and intake. This includes onboarding declarations for new joiners, periodic attestations, event-driven updates, and ad hoc disclosures when circumstances change. A mature approach does not rely only on annual campaigns. It enables disclosures when they arise and captures them in a structured, consistent manner. In some sectors, this also means enriching disclosures with external transparency data, such as payment or relationship information, to reduce overreliance on self-identification alone. The goal is to move from passive disclosure collection to a living intake process that reflects real-world change.
- 3. Assessment, Triage, and Escalation.** Once disclosed, conflicts must be assessed. Not every item requires the same level of review. Some are routine and can be addressed through standard guidance. Others require management review, legal or compliance oversight, or escalation to senior leadership or the board. This phase is where organizations distinguish between low-risk matters that can be handled efficiently and higher-risk matters tied to procurement, grants, investments, hiring, promotions, investigations, regulatory relationships, or other sensitive decisions. Without triage and escalation logic, programs either clog under the weight of minor disclosures or fail to identify material issues early enough.

4. **Decision, Mitigation, and Recusal.** Conflict of interest management becomes real at the point of decision. Disclosure alone is not the control. The control is the documented determination of what must happen next. That may mean approval with conditions, recusal from a decision, reassignment of responsibility, divestment, enhanced oversight, periodic review, or rejection of the activity entirely. The organization needs named decision owners with authority to act, standard mitigation approaches where appropriate, and a clear record of the rationale behind the outcome. This is what makes the program defensible when challenged later by regulators, auditors, stakeholders, or courts.
5. **Ongoing Monitoring, Review, and Change Management.** Conflicts do not stand still. Mitigation plans must be revisited, attestations renewed, and disclosures updated when circumstances change. This requires regular reviews, reminder mechanisms, reassessment triggers, and visibility into whether a conflict remains active, has been resolved, or has evolved into something more significant. In practice, organizations often neglect this stage, leaving outdated declarations, unmanaged mitigation plans, and unresolved issues buried in files and inboxes. A mature program treats conflict management as continuous, not episodic.
6. **Reporting, Assurance, and Oversight.** Finally, the organization needs reporting and assurance. Leadership, committees, audit, and regulators increasingly expect more than anecdotal updates. They need visibility into the volume and type of disclosures, active versus inactive conflicts, timeliness of review, patterns by business area, unresolved items, and the status of mitigation actions. They also need confidence that the process is auditable and consistently applied. This phase closes the loop, giving the organization the ability to demonstrate that conflict of interest management is not merely a policy statement, but an operating capability embedded in governance and oversight.

Why Siloed Approaches Fail

Despite the logic of this lifecycle, many organizations still handle conflicts of interest through fragmented processes. HR may own onboarding attestations. Managers address issues informally. Compliance reviews some disclosures. Legal becomes involved only when a matter looks serious. Procurement, grants, or investment teams may maintain their own checks. Gifts and hospitality may sit in a separate process altogether. The result is a patchwork that makes it difficult to see the whole picture.

Spreadsheets, email trails, and static registers compound the problem. These approaches create no true system of record, no consistent workflow, no timely escalation, and often no defensible audit trail. Reporting becomes a manual exercise, historical context is difficult to reconstruct, and decisions rely too heavily on individual memory and judgment. This is especially risky where conflicts must be assessed quickly and repeatedly, or where external transparency data must be reconciled against employee declarations.

Another common failure is overreliance on self-identification. People do not always recognize that something counts as a conflict. They may believe it is immaterial, assume it will slow things down, or avoid friction. When the culture signals that speed matters

more than transparency, silence follows. That leaves the organization exposed not simply because conflicts exist, but because the operating model makes it too easy for them to remain unmanaged.

The Case for an Integrated Conflict of Interest Management Solution

Delivering effective conflict of interest governance at scale is not possible with manual processes and disconnected tools. Organizations need an integrated conflict of interest management solution that supports the lifecycle end to end, connects disclosures to the business processes where decisions are made, and provides a single source of truth for declarations, reviews, mitigations, and outcomes.

An integrated solution enables continuous disclosure rather than annual form-filing. It provides structured workflows for routing, triage, escalation, review, recusal, and mitigation. It maintains a complete audit trail of who disclosed what, who reviewed it, what decision was made, why it was made, and whether it was acknowledged and monitored over time. It also supports reminders, periodic attestation, and change-based reassessment so the program keeps pace with evolving roles and relationships.

In more advanced environments, an integrated solution also connects conflict management to adjacent systems and data sources, including HR and onboarding processes, gifts and hospitality, procurement or grant workflows, case management, and external transparency datasets such as Open Payments where relevant. This improves efficiency, but more importantly it improves effectiveness by reducing blind spots, surfacing patterns, and ensuring reviews happen in the context of real business decisions.

The value is therefore not just operational efficiency. It is effectiveness, defensibility, resilience, and trust. Organizations that modernize conflict of interest management are better able to identify issues early, resolve them consistently, document decisions credibly, and show regulators, boards, employees, and external stakeholders that integrity is embedded in how decisions are made.

The Bottom Line: Conflict of interest management does not work as a static annual exercise or a disconnected set of disclosures, emails, and registers. To operate with integrity in a world of heightened scrutiny, organizations must treat conflict of interest as a living governance and risk process tied directly to decision-making. That means moving beyond self-assessments and administrative recordkeeping to a lifecycle approach that includes clear policy expectations, continuous disclosure, structured assessment, defined decision ownership, documented mitigation, ongoing review, and defensible reporting. The organizations that succeed will be those that recognize that conflict of interest is not a side issue for HR administration or legal cleanup after a problem surfaces, but a core governance capability that protects trust in the decisions that drive the enterprise.

CoreStream GRC for Conflict of Interest Management

Enabling COI Governance Across the Lifecycle

CoreStream GRC is a solution that GRC 20/20 has researched, evaluated, and reviewed with organizations using it to modernize conflict of interest management in complex, regulated, and high-accountability environments. It is an agile, no-code GRC platform that supports a broad range of governance, risk management, and compliance use cases while proving particularly effective for staff declarations, conflicts of interest, gifts and hospitality, and related ethics and compliance workflows. CoreStream GRC delivers a flexible information architecture, intuitive user experience, and strong configurability that allow organizations to embed conflict processes into the way the business actually works.

CoreStream GRC provides organizations with out-of-the-box capabilities to support staff declarations, conflicts of interest, and connected compliance workflows, while also allowing those capabilities to be tailored to unique policies, decision structures, approval requirements, and regulatory obligations. GRC 20/20's evaluation finds that CoreStream GRC delivers a practical, business-integrated approach that moves beyond annual forms and static registers into a structured lifecycle of disclosure, review, escalation, mitigation, attestation, and reporting.

What stands out in CoreStream GRC's use for conflict of interest management is that it is not positioned as merely a digital questionnaire or annual attestation tool. Organizations are using it to operationalize a fuller governance model. Across deployments, the pattern is consistent: CoreStream GRC is being used not simply to collect disclosures, but to structure accountability around them.

GRC 20/20's evaluation, research, and interactions with CoreStream GRC clients have determined the following:

- **Before CoreStream GRC.** Clients typically arrived from manual, email-driven, spreadsheet-based, or legacy-system approaches that made conflict of interest management cumbersome, inconsistent, and difficult to govern. Some had no central log of disclosures and no meaningful reporting capability. Others had older customized systems that were increasingly expensive to maintain and difficult to modernize. This left organizations with weak visibility, limited reporting, inconsistent follow-through, and excessive reliance on individual memory and judgment. One CoreStream GRC client stated they had hundreds of hours of time being spent on manual work to try and keep up with their COI requirements.
- **Why CoreStream GRC.** Organizations select CoreStream GRC for its configurability, ease of use, integrated architecture, and ability to align with the real operating model of conflict management. Clients value the platform's ability to support tailored workflows, decision routing, review stages, mitigation plans, and reporting without requiring brittle, one-off customization. In some sectors, specific integration capabilities such as Open Payments are decisive. In addition

to being able to connect/integrate with other GRC use cases like gifts and hospitality within CoreStream GRC's platform.

- **How CoreStream GRC is used.** CoreStream GRC is being used to support onboarding declarations, annual and periodic attestations, ad hoc conflict disclosures, gifts and hospitality declarations, management review, compliance review, mitigation assignment, employee acknowledgment, and enterprise reporting. In more advanced use cases, it supports threshold-based logic, multi-level routing, mitigation plan libraries, quarterly reviews, and integration with external data.
- **Where CoreStream GRC has excelled.** Clients consistently highlight the platform's flexibility, intuitive interface, workflow design, and reporting visibility. They also point to the value of CoreStream GRC's implementation guidance, centralized visibility, automated notifications, and strong support culture. In conflict of interest management, where adoption and follow-through matter as much as feature depth, that combination is important.

Overall, CoreStream GRC enables organizations to move conflict of interest management out of scattered forms, inboxes, and static registers and into a governed, auditable, and repeatable operating model. It supports transparency without creating unnecessary friction and allows organizations to tailor the process to different risk levels, decision types, and stakeholder groups.

CoreStream GRC is particularly compelling where organizations need a single, connected environment for conflict of interest management rather than another standalone compliance utility. That includes organizations wanting to connect staff declarations to HR and onboarding, healthcare organizations reconciling internal disclosures with external payment transparency information, foundations managing sensitive governance issues, and regulated firms aligning conflicts, gifts and hospitality, compliance, and broader risk oversight in one system.

CoreStream GRC COI Management Client Experiences

Organizations across industries are using CoreStream GRC to strengthen conflict of interest management and related ethics and compliance processes, achieving improvements in visibility, workflow discipline, reporting, and operational consistency.

GRC 20/20 has found a consistent pattern: organizations are moving away from email-driven, spreadsheet-based, or highly customized legacy approaches toward a more structured, auditable, and business-integrated model.

In this evaluation, GRC 20/20 conducted three specific client reference discussions that found:

- **A UK-based reinsurance organization (~50 employees)** implemented CoreStream GRC for conflicts of interest and gifts and hospitality as an extension of its existing risk and compliance environment. They stated, "Great to have

everything in one system, we've rebranded it the risk and compliance system." Prior to CoreStream GRC, these processes were manual, fragmented, and largely driven by emails and informal approvals, with limited reporting, no centralized log, and little auditability. With CoreStream GRC, the organization established enterprise-wide conflict declarations, quarterly attestation cycles, compliance review and approval workflows, and a centralized repository for active and historical conflicts. Gifts and hospitality were brought into the same governance model, creating a familiar and consistent user experience across risk and compliance. Results include moving from 40% response rates with the old tool to a 95% response rate.

- **A large global private foundation (~5,000 employees)** selected CoreStream GRC for conflicts of interest and a related disqualified persons process tied to self-dealing prevention. The legacy environment had become expensive to maintain, difficult to evolve, and increasingly misaligned with modern user expectations. CoreStream GRC stood out because it could meet complex requirements without heavy customization and because it demonstrated specific working capabilities rather than generic promises. At the time of the reference discussion, the program was still in implementation and not yet live, but the client had already identified compelling value in fewer false positives, reduced dependence on a single individual for sensitive processes, and a better fit for nuanced foundation workflows. The team were particularly impressed by CoreStream GRC coming to their offices for design workshops, stating "They are great partners, flexible, smart, people who know their stuff. I would recommend."
- **A large U.S. healthcare organization (~50,000 team members)** selected CoreStream GRC as a dedicated conflicts of interest solution after outgrowing a makeshift process that had moved from a learning management system to a repurposed policy management environment. A decisive factor in selecting CoreStream GRC was its ability to integrate Open Payments data: "a key USP of CoreStream". The client used CoreStream GRC to design a more structured workflow that includes threshold-based flagging, supervisor review, escalation to the next level of leadership, mitigation planning, compliance review, and employee acknowledgment. While the organization had not yet completed a full enterprise-wide campaign, early experience was strongly positive around configurability, workflow automation, and implementation quality.

Across these client experiences, a clear pattern emerges. CoreStream GRC is proving particularly effective where organizations need to move beyond static disclosure collection and establish a living conflict of interest management process. In smaller regulated environments, this means replacing informal approvals and fragmented tracking with a centralized, auditable system of record. In large, complex environments, it means supporting nuanced workflows, reducing manual review effort, and fitting into mission-critical or healthcare-specific contexts without forcing excessive customization.

Overall, CoreStream GRC is demonstrating that conflict of interest management can be handled as a practical, business-integrated governance capability rather than a once-a-year administrative exercise. The platform supports transparency, decision-making discipline, and defensible oversight while remaining usable enough for broad adoption.

CoreStream GRC Enables an Integrated COI Lifecycle

GRC 20/20 finds that CoreStream GRC is particularly effective when organizations need to move conflict of interest management beyond static declarations and into a more integrated governance model. It is not simply a tool for collecting disclosures. It is a platform that can support how conflict of interest issues are identified, routed, assessed, mitigated, attested, reviewed, and reported in the flow of business activity.

CoreStream GRC can be deployed rapidly for a focused conflict of interest use case while also fitting into a broader GRC architecture as organizational needs mature. Because the platform is highly configurable, (similar to building with LEGO bricks) without traditional code-based customization, organizations can reflect their own terminology, policy standards, approval logic, and operating model.

Specific enablers CoreStream GRC provides in the conflict of interest management context include:

- **From Disclosure Administration to Governance Enablement.** CoreStream GRC changes the role of conflict of interest management from a periodic administrative burden into a governance capability that supports responsible decisions. Rather than limiting the process to annual declarations and static registers, it enables an operating model in which disclosures can be captured, routed, reviewed, escalated, and acted upon in a consistent and auditable manner.
- **Business-Integrated Conflict Management.** CoreStream GRC supports conflict of interest management as part of a broader governance and compliance ecosystem. Clients are using it not only for staff declarations, but also alongside gifts and hospitality, risk and compliance processes, and related governance activities. A connected platform makes it easier to align conflict data with other governance information, reduce duplication, and provide a more complete view of integrity-related risk.
- **A Lego-Brick Approach to Process Design.** The platform's modular architecture allows organizations to build conflict workflows in a way that fits their own maturity and complexity. Some need straightforward onboarding declarations, periodic attestation, and reporting. Others need multi-step workflows with threshold-based triggers, management review, escalation paths, mitigation plans, acknowledgment loops, and special handling for highly sensitive issues.
- **No-Code Flexibility for Evolving Requirements.** Conflict of interest requirements rarely stand still. Policies are refined, thresholds change, new disclosure categories are added, and reporting expectations evolve. CoreStream GRC's no-code configurability allows organizations to adapt fields, forms, workflows, reminders, dashboards, and logic without the cost and delay of heavy redevelopment.

- **Integration Without Fragmentation.** A strong conflict of interest program often depends on the ability to connect to other systems and data sources. CoreStream GRC supports integration with HR and onboarding processes, and in US healthcare it has demonstrated the ability to integrate Open Payments data. This reduces manual cross-checking and helps organizations focus on the disclosures and relationships that warrant attention.
- **Built for Complexity, Adopted for Simplicity.** Conflict of interest management succeeds only if people actually use the system. CoreStream GRC is intuitive enough for broad adoption while still capable of supporting complex review and governance requirements behind the scenes. End users get simple, clear processes for disclosing and attesting, while managers and compliance teams get the visibility and evidence they need. One of the clients stated, “CoreStream GRC is easy to use, a straightforward system which is key as people don’t use it very often.”
- **Client-Led, Expert-Guided Design.** Clients consistently emphasize that CoreStream GRC’s value is not just in the software, but in how the team helps shape workable governance processes. In several references, CoreStream GRC did more than implement stated requirements: they helped improve workflow design, suggest automation, and translate policy intent into practical operating steps.

Overall, GRC 20/20 finds that CoreStream GRC enables organizations to treat conflict of interest management as a living, integrated governance process rather than a static exercise in disclosure collection. It provides the flexibility to support different levels of complexity, the usability needed for organization-wide participation, and the connected architecture necessary to bring declarations, review, mitigation, reporting, and adjacent compliance processes together.

How CoreStream GRC Addresses the COI Management Lifecycle

As detailed earlier, many organizations still manage conflicts of interest through periodic declarations, email exchanges, spreadsheets, and disconnected review processes. That approach may capture information, but it does not reliably govern the decision-making that follows. CoreStream GRC addresses this challenge by supporting conflict of interest management as an integrated lifecycle: from disclosure expectations and intake through review, escalation, mitigation, attestation, and oversight.

CoreStream GRC enables:

- **Policy, context, and disclosure expectations.** CoreStream GRC helps organizations operationalize conflict of interest policy by translating policy language into clear, structured disclosure processes. The platform supports configurable question sets, forms, workflows, and role-based access so organizations can align disclosures to their own categories of conflict, business structure, and governance expectations.

- **Disclosure and intake.** CoreStream GRC supports conflict intake at multiple points in time, not just through an annual declaration campaign. Organizations can use it for onboarding declarations, periodic attestations, quarterly reviews, ad hoc disclosures, and connected workflows such as gifts and hospitality submissions. The platform also maintains a centralized repository of active and historical disclosures.
- **Assessment, triage, and escalation.** Once disclosures are submitted, CoreStream GRC enables them to be routed and assessed according to risk, category, or other criteria. Organizations can configure workflows so disclosures move to the appropriate reviewer, and more material or sensitive matters can receive additional review through threshold-based logic and escalation paths.
- **Decision, mitigation, and recusal.** CoreStream GRC enables organizations to move from disclosure to defensible action. Disclosures can be reviewed, approved, declined, returned for clarification, or escalated within the system, with comments and rationale captured as part of the record. The platform also supports mitigation planning and acknowledgment.
- **Ongoing monitoring, review, and attestation.** CoreStream GRC supports the reality that conflicts evolve over time. Organizations can schedule periodic reviews, trigger reminders, and require employees to confirm whether existing disclosures remain accurate or whether new issues must be declared. This helps prevent outdated records and unmanaged mitigation plans from lingering without follow-up.
- **Integration of related data and external sources.** A strong conflict of interest process often requires more than self-disclosure alone. CoreStream GRC can integrate with HR and related systems, and in healthcare it has demonstrated the ability to integrate Open Payments data. This improves both efficiency and effectiveness by reducing blind spots and making disclosures more actionable in context.
- **Reporting, assurance, and oversight.** CoreStream GRC provides dashboards, drill-down views, flexible reporting, and centralized visibility into declarations and decisions. This allows compliance teams, risk leaders, committees, and executives to analyze active and historical conflicts, monitor workflow progress, and report on issues in a more timely and defensible way.
- **Audit trail, accountability, and defensibility.** Throughout the lifecycle, CoreStream GRC maintains a record of submissions, comments, decisions, approvals, clarifications, and acknowledgments. This allows the organization to demonstrate not only that disclosures were made, but that they were reviewed, that decisions were taken by the appropriate parties, and that mitigation was defined where needed.

In summary, CoreStream GRC addresses conflict of interest management not as a static questionnaire, but as a structured governance lifecycle. By supporting policy-driven

disclosure, continuous intake, risk-based triage, documented decisions, mitigation workflows, ongoing attestation, reporting, and auditability within one connected environment, the platform helps organizations operationalize integrity at the point where decisions are made.

Benefits Organizations Receive with CoreStream GRC for COI

Most CoreStream GRC clients moved to the solution because their prior approaches to conflict of interest management were manual, fragmented, and difficult to govern. Disclosures were handled through email, spreadsheets, repurposed policy tools, informal manager approvals, or older heavily customized systems that could capture information but did not provide the workflow discipline, reporting visibility, or auditability needed for a mature program.

Clients particularly highlight the value of having a single source of truth for conflict of interest information. Active and historical disclosures, review comments, approvals, clarifications, mitigation steps, and related declarations can be managed in one environment rather than reconstructed from inboxes, spreadsheets, or disconnected systems. Some benefits are already realized in live production environments. Others are currently framed as expected or early-stage benefits because those programs were still in implementation or pre-full-rollout at the time of the discussions. Even with that caveat, the direction of value is clear and consistent across the references.

Specific benefits that GRC 20/20 finds CoreStream GRC conflict of interest management clients have achieved or clearly expect to achieve include:

- **A centralized system of record for disclosures and decisions.** Organizations gain one consolidated environment for conflicts of interest and related declarations, replacing email trails, Excel files, informal approvals, and repurposed tools. This provides a clear view of both active and historical conflicts and easier analysis across the organization.
- **Elimination of manual reporting effort.** Clients highlight that they no longer need to search emails, reconstruct logs, or manually compile reports for committees and compliance oversight. Reports are available on demand, and quarterly and annual reporting becomes significantly easier to prepare.
- **Faster reviews and approvals.** Structured workflows route disclosures and related requests to the right reviewers, improving response times and reducing administrative drag. In live deployments, clients specifically highlight faster approvals, centralized escalation, and easier compliance oversight.
- **Improved governance efficiency.** Conflict of interest management moves from an informal and judgment-heavy process to one with clear routing, review, and accountability. This reduces reliance on institutional memory and makes it easier to evidence governance decisions to committees and oversight functions.

- **Better risk oversight and earlier intervention.** Clients emphasize that conflicts are more likely to be declared before actions occur, which improves the organization's ability to review, decide, and mitigate issues before they become larger problems.
- **Stronger policy enforcement and awareness.** The system reinforces policy expectations by embedding disclosure, review, and acknowledgment into the process itself. This increases employee awareness and engagement and helps ensure disclosures are not treated as optional or purely administrative.
- **Reduced risk exposure through a more auditable process.** A centralized and auditable workflow gives organizations greater confidence in governance controls, better visibility into patterns, and a clearer record of decisions and rationale.
- **Higher adoption through usability and familiarity.** Clients note that the platform's familiar interface, simple workflows, and minimal-click design encourage participation, even for users who interact with the process infrequently. In one live deployment, this usability was directly tied to stronger adoption and more consistent governance across conflicts and gifts and hospitality.
- **More mature workflow-driven conflict management.** In a large healthcare implementation, CoreStream GRC enabled a more structured process involving threshold-based flagging, supervisor review, leadership escalation, mitigation planning, compliance review, and employee acknowledgment. This moves the organization well beyond basic attestation into managed conflict governance.
- **Less manual orchestration and more targeted compliance focus.** In a large healthcare implementation, expected efficiency gains include reducing manually initiated review activity, automating notifications, and helping the compliance team focus attention on the disclosures that matter most rather than sifting through volume by hand.
- **Reduced false positives and better signal quality.** In a large private foundation implementation, a major expected benefit is reducing unnecessary flagging and manual review work through more specific matching logic and better workflow design. This materially improves reviewer efficiency and reduces time spent clearing noise rather than addressing real issues.
- **Quantified productivity gains in complex environments.** One large private foundation implementation included an expected estimate of 500 - 700 hours saved annually for legal subject matter experts once the solution is in operation, driven by reduced false positives and automation of work that is currently manual or manually intensive.
- **Improved operational resilience by reducing single-person dependency.** In one large foundation use case, systematizing sensitive governance processes

is expected to reduce reliance on one or two individuals, improving continuity when key personnel are unavailable.

- **Mission enablement, not just process efficiency.** In some environments, the value of better conflict of interest management extends beyond administration and compliance. Improved workflow efficiency also helps the organization move mission-critical decisions faster while preserving integrity controls.

Overall, CoreStream GRC is showing that conflict of interest management can deliver value well beyond digitized forms. The platform helps organizations create a connected and auditable environment in which disclosures are easier to make, reviews are easier to manage, reporting is easier to produce, and governance is easier to defend. In live environments, that is already translating into faster approvals, better reporting, stronger visibility, and less manual effort. In implementations still approaching full rollout, the expected benefits are fewer false positives, less manual review, stronger accountability, and a more scalable model for managing conflicts with integrity.

Considerations in Context of CoreStream GRC for COI Management

Every solution has its strengths and weaknesses, and CoreStream GRC is no exception. It may not be the right fit for every organization or every conflict of interest management maturity level. While GRC 20/20 has identified many positive attributes of CoreStream GRC in enabling organizations to establish more structured, auditable, and integrated conflict of interest management processes, this should not be interpreted as an unconditional endorsement.

Across the client references, CoreStream GRC is consistently praised for its configurability, usability, and ability to replace fragmented manual approaches with a more centralized and governed process. Clients value the fact that the platform can support conflict of interest management without forcing them into rigid or brittle customizations. Its no-code flexibility, integrated workflow design, and ability to serve as a single system of record are clear strengths in this context.

At the same time, the references show that value realization is not solely about platform capability. It also depends on the organization's readiness to define and operationalize a more mature governance process. In the large healthcare implementation, for example, the strongest challenge identified was not dissatisfaction with the software, but the training and change management needed to support a more sophisticated workflow and the handling of Open Payments data.

It is also important to recognize that some of the most compelling references are still in implementation or pre-full-rollout stages. In the large private foundation implementation, for example, the client was strongly positive about the partnership, design approach, and expected value, but the solution was not yet live at the time of the discussion. Similarly, the large healthcare implementation provided strong evidence around workflow design, configurability, and anticipated value, but had not yet completed a full enterprise campaign.

Clients did not identify major platform weaknesses in these conflict of interest references, which is itself notable. In the live production reference, no material concerns or feature gaps were raised. In the healthcare implementation, only minor enhancement ideas surfaced during workflow design. In the large private foundation implementation, it was still too early to identify platform concerns or feature requests because the system was not yet live.

Another consideration is fit by organizational context. CoreStream GRC appears particularly strong where organizations want to move from manual or legacy conflict processes to a more configurable and business-integrated environment. It also appears strong where conflict of interest management needs to connect to broader governance processes such as gifts and hospitality, risk and compliance workflows, onboarding, or external data integration.

Overall, CoreStream GRC has established itself as a capable, flexible, and value-oriented platform for organizations seeking to modernize conflict of interest management. It is particularly compelling for organizations that want to replace fragmented manual processes with a more governed lifecycle and for those that want conflict management to operate in connection with broader GRC and compliance processes. Prospective buyers should approach it with clear expectations: the best outcomes will come where the organization is prepared to invest in process design, user readiness, and adoption, and where it values a flexible platform that can evolve with governance needs over time.

About GRC 20/20 Research, LLC

GRC 20/20 Research, LLC (GRC 20/20) provides clarity of insight into governance, risk management, and compliance (GRC) solutions and strategies through objective market research, benchmarking, training, and analysis. We provide objective insight into GRC market dynamics; technology trends; competitive landscape; market sizing; expenditure priorities; and mergers and acquisitions. GRC 20/20 advises the entire ecosystem of GRC solution buyers, professional service firms, and solution providers. Our research clarity is delivered through analysts with real-world expertise, independence, creativity, and objectivity that understand GRC challenges and how to solve them practically and not just theoretically. Our clients include Fortune 1000 companies, major professional service firms, and the breadth of GRC solution providers.

Research Methodology

GRC 20/20 research reports are written by experienced analysts with experience selecting and implementing GRC solutions. GRC 20/20 evaluates all GRC solution providers using consistent and objective criteria, regardless of whether or not they are a GRC 20/20 client. The findings and analysis in GRC 20/20 research reports reflect analyst experience, opinions, research into market trends, participants, expenditure patterns, and best practices. Research facts and representations are verified with client references to validate accuracy. GRC solution providers are given the opportunity to correct factual errors, but cannot influence GRC 20/20 opinion.

GRC 20/20 Research, LLC
313 North Plankinton Avenue, Suite 204
Milwaukee, WI 53203 USA
info@GRC2020.com
www.GRC2020.com