

Online Grants Management System – Invitation to Tender

Overview

The Academy of Medical Sciences is seeking a Supplier to provide an off-the-shelf online grants management system to manage its small grants portfolio.

For any queries relating to this tender, please contact Dr Melissa Lewis-Brown (melissa.lewis-brown@acmedsci.ac.uk, 020 3176 2159).

This document refers to further information contained in the following appendices:

- Appendix A (pg 5) – specifications of system (grouped by application/stage)
- Appendix B (pg 11) – access and security requirements
- Appendix C (pg 12) – interface with other systems
- Appendix D (pg 13) – calendar of AMS grants activities with expected system demand

Background

The Academy of Medical Sciences

The Academy of Medical Sciences is the independent body in the UK representing the diversity of medical science. Our mission is to promote medical science and its translation into benefits for society. The Academy's elected Fellows are the United Kingdom's leading medical scientists from hospitals, academia, industry and the public service. We work with them to promote excellence, influence policy to improve health and wealth, nurture the next generation of medical researchers, link academia, industry and the NHS, seize international opportunities and encourage dialogue about the medical sciences.

Our grants portfolio and related activities overview

The Academy currently runs several grants schemes (further detail can be found on our website: www.acmedsci.ac.uk/funding-schemes). At the moment we are running six grants schemes - in the future, this portfolio of grants and programmes may expand. To date, the Academy has invested c£27m in c500 grants across its schemes. Currently, the Academy spends c£5m on c100 new grants annually. There is some diversity in the administration of our grants: individual grants vary from £3.5k to £700k, can last from one month to six years, some grants are paid to the awardee in full up-front, others are paid annually, and for some we do not manage the finances at all. As well as funding UK applicants, some of our schemes are international in nature and so we receive applications from and make awards to individuals and institutions in selected countries around the world; additional countries are likely to be included in the future. Most of our grants are made to awardees to conduct biomedical research, but a small number are for other activities, such as informing and exciting medical students about the benefits and potential of a career in research. We also run a selection process for various academic prizes and competitive entry to our conferences. Our schemes are usually run in conjunction with other medical research charities to varying degrees, and as such, for some schemes the finances are entirely managed by other organisations; we are periodically required to report to our funders on their portfolios.

Existing system to be replaced

To date, being a small funder, we have managed our grants portfolio using various systems: application via Word forms downloaded from our website and emailed back to us; peer review by email; data storage and management via a basic back office system (the grants module of the Access CRM ThankQ system), and a multitude of Excel spreadsheets.

New system

We would like to replace our existing grants management system with a new, off-the-shelf, fully online, end-to-end grants management system that can interface with systems we will be retaining, such as the CRM module of the Access ThankQ system and the SAGE accounting system. This system should comprise an online grants application 'front-end', as well as a 'back office' to allow us to manage each stage of the grants life cycle, such as application, peer review, panel, award, financial management, post-award etc.

The Academy's Grants Portfolio

The Academy's grant-making activities in numbers:

- Since grant-giving at the Academy began, c£27m has been paid out across more than 500 awards and 6 schemes.
- 5 schemes are still running (although we still manage the awards for 'discontinued' schemes).
- We run 6 grant rounds annually, 2 of which are currently managed on an external grants management system (the Royal Society's eGAP).
- 300 applications are received annually (this is an estimate as one scheme has just launched so we are guesstimating the numbers, and the number is likely to increase as we receive more funding).
- 100 awards are made each year, totalling c£5m.
- 650 reviewers are used annually, the majority of which are internal, i.e. drawn from our 1166-strong fellowship.
- There will be c5 expected key system users of the grants system from an internal administrative and management perspective (mainly Grants, Programmes and Finance teams). Other staff would benefit from read-only access.
- We work in conjunction with at least a dozen biomedical charities which provide funds for us to distribute via grants, and we are required to report to them at various points throughout the year.

The numbers above are approximate, and based partly on past averages, and partly on estimates for the future (particularly for new schemes). They are also an indication of the current environment and expectations for the next three years or so.

Timeline and demand

To give an indication of the requirements of the system, Appendix D provides an example of what the Academy's annual grants timetable looks like, in terms of the timings of grant rounds and the number of people we expect to be on the system at busy periods.

What we would like in a new system

As previously mentioned, we are seeking an off-the shelf online grants management system to which minimal configurations are required to tailor to our portfolio. It is vital that the system is capable of interfacing with systems that we will retain, such as the CRM module of the Access ThankQ system and the SAGE accounting system. Reporting capabilities will be important so that we can use the system to draw down subsets of information. Appendix A details our requirements of the system arranged by grant cycle stage: Scheme set-up, Application, Peer Review, Panel, Award, Financial management, Post-award. Further detailed requirements relating to security and access are detailed in Appendix B; and interface with other systems in Appendix C. Appendix D provides an example calendar of AMS grants activities and expected demand on the system.

Supplier selection

Suppliers are invited to submit tender documents which should include the following. These criteria will be used for short-listing and appointment processes.

- I. Description of your off-the-shelf online grants management system, including:
 - 1) How the system satisfies the specifications in Appendix A:
 - Schemes and rounds set-up as we require.
 - Applicants easily able to access the system and submit an application online.
 - Experts in the field easily able to provide peer review reports online.
 - Panels convened and administered appropriately.
 - Outcomes of panels recorded, authorised and awards made.
 - Award finances managed on the system.
 - Awards managed from application through to end of grant.
 - Support of smooth communication with those involved in application processes.
 - Staff able to report on data within the system as required.
 - 2) Extent of configurations necessary to suit AMS specific usage.
 - 3) Ability to cope with the level of usage throughout the year (as detailed in Appendix D).

- II. Description of data access and security provisions, addressing the key points set out in Appendix B, which include:
 - Controlling access to the system (secure login, levels of access etc).
 - Back-up systems and recovery from downtime.
 - Security around data protection.

- III. Description of how you intend to work with our other system providers as set out in Appendix C:
 - ThankQ, providers of our Contact Relationship Management system.
 - SAGE, providers of our accounting system.

- IV. Description of your approach to project management, including:
 - Your approach to key phases, and the support that will be offered to AMS during each phase:
 - 1) Requirements-gathering stage.
 - 2) Configuring off-the-shelf system to suit AMS' specific needs.
 - 3) Training staff to use system.

- 4) Testing phase.
 - 5) Go Live.
 - 6) Data migration.
 - 7) Ongoing, once system is in place.
- How the relationship with AMS will be managed.
 - Rates of response to queries/issues raised by staff.
 - Approach to assessing and providing training requirements of staff to use the system (NB. AMS outsources for IT support, so we have limited in-house IT skills).
 - Ability to understand the Academy's needs, be proactive and responsive.
- V. Quote, including:
- Cost of off-the-shelf system.
 - Cost of configuring off-the-shelf system.
 - Costs broken down stage by stage (phases 1-6 in IV above).
 - Once system is in place, annual cost of ongoing costs, such as: licensing, support, upgrades, updates etc (phase 7 above).
 - Estimated contractor time and day rates (for each phase).
- VI. Company introduction and details, including:
- Last financial accounts.
 - Expertise of staff.
 - Experience of working on similar projects etc.
- VII. An estimate of when the configured system will be ready to Go Live.
- VIII. Contact details of two existing customers who are using your online grants management system for provision of references.

If you are selected for interview, we will request a presentation, Q&A and demonstration of your off-the-shelf system.

Timeline for tender process

Activity	Description	Date
1	ITT distributed/published	22 December 2015
2	Deadline for clarification questions	19 January 2016
3	Deadline for submission responses	26 January 2016
4	Short-listing for on-site presentations	9 February 2016
5	On-site presentations	23 February 2016
6	Preferred supplier named	1 March 2016
7	Contract signed	15 March 2016
8	Project commences	22 March 2016

Appendix A – Required Specifications of System

Contents:

1. [Scheme and round set-up](#)
2. [Application](#)
3. [Peer Review](#)
4. [Panel](#)
5. [Award](#)
6. [Financial management](#)
7. [Post-award management](#)
8. [Communications management](#)
9. [Reporting](#)

1. Scheme and round set-up

The system should allow Office to set up a scheme and rounds within it, covering the following capabilities.

- 1.1. Set up parameters for a scheme, such as scheme name, which can be amended at a later date if necessary.
- 1.2. Set up parameters for a round, such as open date, application deadline date, deadline for approval of application by host institution, panel date etc, and deadlines only visible to office, not applicant (e.g. absolute deadline). It should be possible to amend these parameters at a later date, e.g. in case we extend a deadline.
- 1.3. Set up selection stages within a round such as pre-application stage (assessed by Academy staff), application stage (potentially in two stages, the first being a triage stage, assessed by a virtual panel, to reduce the number of applications that go through to the second stage, assessed by peer review), panel stage (assessed by panel members) etc.
- 1.4. Duplicate parameters from the previous round within a scheme, with the option to amend dates and add/delete stages (either duplicate from a previous round, or set the parameters at the scheme level such that it filters down to each new round).
- 1.5. Assign a round to a particular member of staff (ability to edit the member of staff it is assigned to).
- 1.6. Run more than one grants scheme and round at a time and allow overlapping rounds of the same scheme e.g. a second round opens before the first closes.
- 1.7. Ability to attach documents to round that users can see, e.g. guidance notes for applicants at application stage.

2. Application

The system should allow an applicant to access the system online and submit an application, covering the following capabilities.

- 2.1. Applicant should be able to:
 - 2.1.1. Preview blank or completed application as printable PDF before submitting.
 - 2.1.2. Attach various file formats (e.g. GIF images and PDF figures) to application.

- 2.1.3.** Use non-English characters, such as the Greek alphabet, as well as superscript/subscript characters, i.e. it should be possible to copy and paste Word formatting into the system.
 - 2.1.4.** Delegate completion of selected sections of the application form to other users, (e.g. budget to finance department; proposal to a co-applicant) and select whether that person has read-only or editing rights, and whether that person has the ability to submit on their behalf - defaulting to not have the ability to submit).
 - 2.1.5.** Apply for a grant easily and intuitively, i.e. have a positive user experience.
 - 2.1.6.** Save and return to applications as often as required.
 - 2.1.7.** Users and office able to see their/applicant's previous applications.
- 2.2.** Office should be able to:
- 2.2.1.** Submit an application for an applicant if requested by the applicant (for example, if they are unable to submit from their end for some reason), without needing to gain approval from the applicant's institution.
 - 2.2.2.** Restrict access to rounds to specific applicants in some cases.
 - 2.2.3.** Extend the application submission deadline for selected applicants and request resubmissions with amendments.
 - 2.2.4.** Easily create and edit forms using a repository of typical questions and a variety of question types (e.g. conditional/binary/date requests), and be able to enforce a particular format in which budgets are provided (e.g. breakdown annually, into categories such as salary, equipment, consumables etc).
 - 2.2.5.** Test forms before they go live.
 - 2.2.6.** Add and maintain help text and guidance question by question.
 - 2.2.7.** Manage the application process easily and intuitively, i.e. have a positive user experience.
 - 2.2.8.** Add notes to applications for the Panel/peer reviewers to see.
- 2.3.** The system should:
- 2.3.1.** Interface with our CRM system (ThankQ) to detect whether applicant is a new or existing contact (See Appendix B for more information on interface with existing systems).
 - 2.3.2.** Have features to help ensure the quality and standardisation of data at the point of entry such as date controls (e.g. automatically detect when a date supplied by the applicant is too late/early compared with a key date associated with the round, such as PhD date should be before the panel date), use of drop-down lists for institution, mandatory questions and word limits. Should be able to set a pop-up message to appear when such a rule is broken. Should be easy for staff to edit a drop-down list.
 - 2.3.3.** Allow the application to be approved by multiple parties, e.g. applicant, supervisor, finance department representative etc).
 - 2.3.4.** Keep an audit trail of activity on an application.

- 2.3.5. Apply a grant number to each application in the format currently used by the Academy.
- 2.3.6. Automatically default to sterling pounds for budget, automatically subtotal budget line entries, and enforce maximum amounts for budget lines and grand total.
- 2.3.7. Automatically assign the status of a new application as 'submitted'. When the Grants Team has confirmed the eligibility of an application, they should be able to update the status as eligible/ineligible.
- 2.3.8. Pre-populate data within a form, e.g. from stage 1 to stage 2, or from contact record.

3. Peer Review

The system should allow the applications to be peer reviewed by experts in the field, covering the following capabilities.

3.1. Office should be able to:

- 3.1.1. Add peer reviewers to an application.
- 3.1.2. Associate a status with each peer reviewer (such as approached/agreed/declined/provided), with subcategories for some statuses (e.g. declined: too busy / conflicted / out of expertise) and parameters for some statuses (e.g. date agreed / date for receipt of review / date review received / unavailability date range).
- 3.1.3. Report on current peer review status of a given round, including information such as - number of applications with 0/1/2/more reviewer(s) agreed; list of applications with name, institution & status of each reviewer approached; list of reviewers approached across schemes within a defined time period.
- 3.1.4. Submit review on behalf of reviewer if they are technophobic and cannot manage the system.
- 3.1.5. Send review-request email to peer reviewers containing selected parts of an application (e.g. applicant name, institution and lay summary), or multiple applications.
- 3.1.6. Change the status of an application to 'out to review' when the correct number of reviewers have been secured, and then 'all reviews received' at the appropriate point in time.

3.2. The system should:

- 3.2.1. Automatically identify (but allow Office to override) 'hard' conflicts of interest (e.g. when the institution of a reviewer matches the institution of the applicant; when the proposed peer reviewer is the applicant's mentor) and 'soft' conflicts of interest (e.g. when the institution of a reviewer matches the institution of a collaborator on the application).
- 3.2.2. Flag when a reviewer is being used in real-time (approached, agreed or declined) more than once during a specified time period for any round across the Academy, but allow Office to override.
- 3.2.3. Automatically remind peer reviewers the week before a review is due, on the day of review deadline and if necessary after the review deadline. But

have the ability to override reminders so as not to bother someone who has already submitted their review.

- 3.2.4.** Bring together all scores provided by reviewers and provide an average score for each application.

- 3.3.** Peer reviewers should be able to:

- 3.3.1.** Easily access the application (selected parts) as a professional-looking PDF.
- 3.3.2.** Complete and submit their review online easily and intuitively, i.e. have a positive user experience, without necessarily needing to create an account (for non-fellows).
- 3.3.3.** Score applications within a pre set score range (which may differ between schemes, rounds and stages within rounds).

4. Panel

The system should facilitate convening of a panel meeting to assess the applications, covering the following capabilities.

- 4.1.** Putting together tailored, professional and printable panel packs for each panel member, including selected applications (with certain sections removed), reviews associated with those applications) and a cover letter.
- 4.2.** Allow allocation of applications to panel members.
- 4.3.** Automatic identification (but allow Office to override) 'hard' conflicts of interest (e.g. when the institution of a panel member matches the institution of the applicant; when the proposed panel member is the applicant's mentor) and 'soft' conflicts of interest (e.g. when the institution of a panel member matches the institution of a collaborator on the application).
- 4.4.** Change the status of an application to 'awaiting pre-panel score' when the papers have been sent to panel, then 'pre-panel score received', then 'approved for funding' or 'rejected at panel' following the panel, with date attached.
- 4.5.** Facility for panel members to score applications before and at panel meeting.
- 4.6.** Ability to create a new document detailing the minutes of the panel, including confirmation of awards made, to be approved by senior management.

5. Award

The system should allow outcome of Panel meetings to be recorded, covering the following capabilities.

- 5.1.** Create an editable duplicate of peer review report to allow redacting/editing.
- 5.2.** Field to enter staff notes on panel feedback.
- 5.3.** Create an application outcome pack for applicants consisting of redacted peer review reports, panel feedback and an outcome letter, generated from a template and personalised with information drawn from application (such as applicant name, address and project title).
- 5.4.** Automatic generation of contract documents, award letters etc for Grants Team to approve and send out.
- 5.5.** See Financial management section for more on Award.

6. Financial management

A separate system will be used to manage finances of awards, however the system should facilitate the following capabilities.

- 6.1. Although budgets within applications should default to sterling pounds, it should be possible to record the paying out of awards in various currencies, as we fund overseas.
- 6.2. Set up payment schedule for awarded applications – should have option to pay in a single payment upfront, instalments in arrears, distinguish between grants payments and salary payments, etc.
- 6.3. Once a panel is complete, and payment schedule entered by Grants Team, status of award should be changed to 'approved for payment' (with date) by senior members of Academy Grants Team only, to indicate to Academy Finance team that payments can be made. Should be levels of approval, such that larger amounts of money require more senior member of staff to approve.
- 6.4. Before or after a grant has started, should be possible to amend payments from a particular date, (e.g. if award holders switches from full-time to part-time; goes on maternity leave; or terminates their award early), so that salary payments can be amended. Should be the option to apply a certain rule to all payments from a chosen date onwards (i.e. should not have to manually change every single payment, but ask system to recalculate from FTE to 0.5 FTE for example).
- 6.5. Status associated with each instalment: e.g. requires invoice / awaiting invoice / payment due / paid (each associated with a chosen date).
- 6.6. When the award has ended, the award holder should be prompted to submit a final expenditure report on the system, which the Office should have the facility to approve.
- 6.7. If the final expenditure report indicates that a refund to the Academy is due (unspent funds at the end of the grant), it should be possible to send an email alert from the system to the Academy's Finance mailbox and to the award holder, detailing the refund process.
- 6.8. Report various data in a format that can imported into SAGE (see appendix B for more detail on interface with our existing systems).
- 6.9. As the Academy does not deal with finances at all for some schemes, it should be possible for the finance section to be left blank with a note that another organisation manages the finances.

7. Post-award management

The system should manage the award from when it is awarded to when it finishes, covering the following capabilities.

- 7.1. Prompts to award holder to report on scientific progress via our reporting system (Researchfish), usually annually and for several years after the award has ended.
- 7.2. Online forms to log changes and amend grant record for changes such as change of institution, supervisor, no-cost extensions etc, which prompts automatic update of corresponding fields: 'host institution', 'supervisor' and 'end date' fields respectively.
- 7.3. Report on: awards due to end after/before/between selected dates; awards which are due to report but have not yet reported; open/closed awards.
- 7.4. Be able to manage peer review of progress reports where necessary.
- 7.5. Change the status of an application to 'grant closed' at appropriate point in time.

8. Communications management

In addition to the specific emails referred to in the other sections, at each stage the system should allow various communications with those involved in the application process, covering the following capabilities.

- 8.1.** Send template-based emails, but with ability to personalise.
- 8.2.** Send all emails via the system, but from an Academy staff member's email address, or a mailbox.
- 8.3.** Add emails sent off-system to the applicant's record.
- 8.4.** Add notes (e.g. record of a phone call) to the applicant's record.
- 8.5.** Ability to email a group, e.g. all applicants that have submitted to a particular round, all panel members of a particular scheme.
- 8.6.** Various automatic notifications to Academy staff.
- 8.7.** Emails sent within the system should be saved as a record.

9. Reporting

In addition to the specific reporting requirements mentioned in the other sections, the system should cover the following capabilities.

- 9.1.** All data should be reportable.
- 9.2.** Reporting tools to build reports should be easy to use and intuitive.
- 9.3.** Dashboards and status screens should be available, and it should be possible to report data as graphs as well as the raw data.
- 9.4.** Export data in a variety of formats including to Excel and formats that can interface with the other systems we use such as SAGE and ThankQ (see Appendix C for expectations of interfacing with other systems).

Appendix B: Access & Security Requirements

Access

- General:
 - The system should be fully online, accessible via any browser and operating system, in the UK and internationally.
 - All users should be able to access the system online from anywhere, free of charge, including the Academy office, academic institutions, home, internet cafes etc.
 - Access should be via the Academy website.
 - The system should be Academy-branded on every page, clearly labelled as the Academy's grants management system and easily distinguishable from our fellowship election system (eLect).
 - Specified levels of uptime and downtime, and stated procedures for managing recovery from downtime.
 - New users should create a login (username should be their email address), which is then validated by Academy staff.
- Levels of access:
 - There should be user categories: e.g. admin, fellow, reviewer.
 - There should be levels of access: read-only access, read-only access to selected sections, full editing rights, editing rights for selected sections of applications, financial approval rights etc. These will be associated with user types.
 - Login should be particularly easy for peer reviewers – Academy Staff can enter information manually if necessary to ease access for peer reviewers.
 - It should be possible for applications to be authorised by multiple parties.
- Back-up
 - Back-up systems in place.
 - Specified recovery objective time of the system.
 - Specified robust data backup policy (e.g. tiered system, server based or Cloud, backup managed by a 3rd party).
 - Specified backup frequency.

Security

- Security of information preserving data protection.
- Security provisions.
- Password policy (e.g. password have to have 1 capital letter, 1 number, 8 characters long etc).
- HTTPS secure login.

Appendix C: Required Interface with other systems

This system will *not* be replacing our finance system (SAGE) or our CRM system (ThankQ), so we would like this online grants management system to interface with those systems as described below.

Interface with ThankQ

ThankQ is the Academy's CRM system, provided by The Access Group (<http://www.theaccessgroup.com/solutions/crm-for-nfp/>). The Supplier is expected to be willing and able to work with a project manager from the Access Group (identified by the Academy) to ensure flow of information between the systems. The system should regularly synch with ThankQ. The following points should be covered.

- User login:
 - When users create a login (whether an applicant, award holder, peer reviewer or panel member etc), system should interface with ThankQ to detect whether a new or existing contact in ThankQ. Duplication should not be possible.
 - If an existing contact, then ThankQ serial number for that contact should be pulled through to system. If not an existing contact, a new ThankQ record should be automatically created and then the serial number pulled through to the system.
 - When new ThankQ records are created, should note date and give user option to not be contacted.
 - Users should only need to enter minimal information to create a login – sufficient to identify them as a contact on ThankQ or otherwise – we don't want to replicate information that we have already on ThankQ.
- Peer review:
 - The majority of peer reviewers will be on the ThankQ database, listed as 'Fellows'. When Grants Team staff select a peer reviewer for an application, it should be from a drop down menu of these 'Fellows', having recently been pulled through from ThankQ.
 - There should also be the option of selecting 'Non-fellow' and selecting a contact not listed as a 'Fellow', after creating the new record manually if necessary.
- Award:
 - When awards are confirmed following Panel, system should tell ThankQ that 'profile value' is 'starter grant award made [start & end date]' (equivalent to 'elected to fellowship' status) and 'primary category' should be changed to 'Academy grant holder'.

Interface with SAGE

Once awards have been approved with the system, should interface with SAGE in the following way:

- Ability for system to communicate information to SAGE via CSV file report.
- Ability for SAGE report to feed information into system.
- Examples of information to be communicated between systems: which grant payments should be paid; which grant payments have been paid; timings of payments; refund details; details of any pausing of award, e.g. to take account of maternity leave.
- System should flag to finance staff when a grant has ended so it can be closed on SAGE.

Appendix D: AMS Grants Activities Calendar & System Demand

All numbers are approximates only
 *Rounds with asterisks are not confirmed

	Approximate total no of people on system
Jan	160
Feb	300
Mar	90
Apr	180
May	20
Jun	80
Jul	0
Aug	0
Sep	350
Oct	1000
Nov	10
Dec	20

	Springboard			Daniel Turnberg Travel Fellowships			Scottish Senior Clinical Fellowships			Starter Grants for Clinical Lecturers		
	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system
Jan	Closes	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	120 applicants 300 peer reviewers	Closes	eligibility checks papers to panel finalise minutes	40 applicants 0 peer reviewers 7 panel members	Opens			Opens	make awards from previous round	
Feb												
Mar				Panel	make awards					Closes	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	60 applicants 120 peer reviewers 9 panel members
Apr	Panel		11 panel members									
May		make awards					Closes	no eligibility checks peer review	10 applicants 60 peer reviewers	Panel		
Jun										Opens	make awards from previous round	
Jul												
Aug												
Sep	Opens						Panel	papers to panel	6 panel members	Closes	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	60 applicants 120 peer reviewers 9 panel members
Oct				Opens								
Nov												
Dec								make awards		Panel		

	Newton Advanced Fellowships*			Newton International Fellowships*			Winter Science Meeting			Spring Meeting		
	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system	Stage	Activity	expected # people on system
Jan	Open			Open						Meeting		
Feb												
Mar	Closes	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	10 applicants 30 peer reviewers min	Closes	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	10 applicants 20 peer reviewers						
Apr												
May	Panel		8 panel members	Panel		8 panel members						
Jun												
Jul	Open			Open*			Opens			Opens		
Aug												
Sep	Closes	eligibility checks peer review	10 applicants 30 peer reviewers min	Closes*	eligibility checks peer review papers to panel	10 applicants 20 peer reviewers	Closes	eligibility checks peer review	70 applicants 140 peer reviews no panel	Closes	eligibility checks peer review	200 applicants 600 peer reviews no panel
Oct												
Nov							Meeting					
Dec	Panel	papers to panel	8 panel members	Panel*		8 panel members						