

DATE: <date the ORC package is finalized>
TO: Objective Review Panelists - <program office>
<grant program name>
FROM: <grant program sponsor office>
SUBJECT: 2012 <grant program name (can be shortened)> Objective Review

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the 2012 <program office> <grant program name> application review. The Objective Review (ORC) will begin <ORC start date> and run through <ORC end date>.

This memo provides an update on the overall review process and the timelines required. We will host the ORC application review kick-off call, **which is mandatory for all panel participants on:**

Date: <pre-ORC call date> **Dial-In Number:** <conference call number>
Time: <pre-ORC call time> **Pass code:** <conference call participant code>

Please review the following attached documents prior to the call.

- Instructions for Reviewers
- Panel Member Roles and Responsibilities
- Objective Review Timelines
- Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Form
- Written Agreement/Scope of Work
- Confidential Financial Disclosure Report (OGE-450) for Federal reviewers
- IHS Program Announcement
- Sample Reviewer's Score Sheet
- Sample Reviewer's Critique Template
- Objective Review Roster
- Review Panel Application Assignments
- Helpful Application Review Tips for Reviewers
- Panel Conference Call Discussion Process

<program office>
<grant program name>
<ORC dates>

Reviewer Instructions for the Objective Review Process

The function of the Objective Review is to impartially evaluate the merits of applications against the criteria published in the program announcement. The reviewers serve to make recommendations to the Indian Health Service program office regarding the quality of each application against the criteria published in the program announcement.

- Ensure that the Conflict of Interest form has been completed.
- Familiarize yourself with the program announcement. The announcement will describe the program and list the evaluation criteria you must use when reviewing the application. The Application Review Module review session's criteria are configured based on the criteria published in the announcement.
- Compare the application with the published criteria. If the application did not address the criteria your comments must reflect that finding.
- Provide comments on strengths and weaknesses of each criterion, and if you have comments, note them.
- The comments you make will not only be used in making decisions regarding the fundability of the application, but also in defending those decisions in case protest are made.
- Your comments will be incorporated into the Summary Statement for the application. The Summary Statement outlines the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations noted by the review panel. The Summary Statement is sent to the applicant as feedback on the application and is held in the official grant file for reference. Detailed comments from you will assist the applicant in improving subsequent applications.
- You are required to sign a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality form, affirming you have no vested interest in any application organization that you review. If you have a conflict with an applicant in your panel, you must not participate in the review of that application or discussion of the application as this is a conflict.
- Review materials and proceedings of the objective review are privileged information and are not to be released or discussed outside the review panel.
- Each of the reviewers will be asked to present an overview of the application followed by an overview of the strengths and weaknesses you noted for the each criterion. Overview should be done in the order criteria were published in the announcement.
- After presentation by reviewers, discussion among the panel will take place. Any committee member may seek clarification or ask questions of the objective reviewer, program staff and grant management staff. Committee comments on the budget are appropriate and welcome but should not be considered in arriving at the decision to approve or disapprove the application. Comments that do not pertain directly to the evaluation criteria should not be considered in rating the application.

<grant program name> – 2012 Review

Panel Member Roles and Responsibilities

Goal: To analyze and score applications fairly, objectively, and thoroughly in the most efficient manner possible.

Panel Members Roles: Each panelist is responsible for one of the following roles in regards to the applications assigned to his/her panel: Chairperson, Primary Reviewer, Secondary Reviewer, or Tertiary Reviewer.

The panelists will receive their assignments with the application materials. The various duties for each role is outlined below.

Chairperson Role:

The Chairperson is a key participant in the application review process. The Chairperson coordinates the panel's schedule, leads the panel discussions, and ensures that reviewers follow IHS policies and procedures. The Chairperson also monitors the work of each panel reviewer, answers questions from the reviewers, and reviews scoring forms and critiques. They also develop the panel's Executive Summary Statements, using the ARM system. The Chairperson is a non-voting member.

The Chairperson is also responsible for the following:

Before the Review:

- Reviews the ORC materials and the program announcement.
- Participates on the Reviewer Orientation Conference calls.
- Leads the panel process. During the panel's initial meeting, discuss the panel's conference call schedule and establish ground rules. Ensures that all Panel Members have access to all the assigned applications and the appropriate review materials. Make sure that every panel reviewer has completed the Conflict of Interest and the IHS Confidentiality statement forms.

During the Review:

- Before the review panel's final conference call discussions, reviews the comments and scores for each application in ARM and ensures that all critiques are supported by the appropriate scores. Where there are variations in scores and critiques, contacts the reviewer and recommends re-reviewing the application to ensure consistency between the scores and the critique.
- Communicate with Panel Members regularly, answer any questions, and assist with any issues.
- Monitors timelines for submission of scores and critiques and contacts review members to obtain documents needed.
- Maintains communication with IHS staff to facilitate smooth functioning of all panel activities. Alerts IHS staff of any concerns about panelists or the panel process.

- Develop a schedule for discussion of each application assigned to the panel, including an assessment of how much time to allocate for each application, based upon the consistency/variation in scores and comments across the panel.
- Complete the Panel Summary Reports using ARM for each application. Submit reports and revise as requested by PAM.

After the Review:

- At the end of the review, ensure that all Panel Members print and sign the Reviewer Scoring Reports.
- Develop the panel's Executive Summary Statements, using the ARM system and forward them to the PAM.

Panel Members (Reviewers) Role:

The Panel Members who are not Panel Chairpersons have the primary role of reading their assigned applications, writing critiques and providing a score. The IHS Program review uses a three-tier reader process to reduce the burden on each panel reviewer and to ensure that the panel produces thorough and thoughtful comments about the applications. Each application will be assigned a Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Reviewer. All other reviewers become discussion panel members and will be expected to vote and enter scores on the application at the end of the discussion.

The following section highlights the roles of each reviewer:

Primary Reviewer :(Lead Reader)

- Reads the application closely and carefully.
- Makes a careful assessment of how the application responds to each of the criteria.
- Writes detailed and substantive comments and assign scores in ARM.
- Summarizes their analysis of the application in the final panel discussion.

Secondary Reviewer:

- Reads the application closely and carefully.
- Makes a careful assessment of how the application responds to each of the criteria.
- Writes comments and assign scores in ARM.
- Summarizes their analysis of the application in the final panel discussion.

Tertiary Reviewer:

- Reads through the application for general understanding.
- Enters scores into ARM.
- Summarizes their analysis of the application in the final panel discussion.

Objective Review Timeline

<grant program name> (FY2012)	Milestone
<date>	<p>Objective Review Kick-Off Conference Call (Mandatory for all review panelists).</p> <p>Date: <date></p> <p>Time: <time></p> <p>Dial-In Number: <conference call phone number></p> <p>Pass code: <conference call participant code></p>
<date>	<p>Panel members receive objective review memo and guidelines.</p> <p>Panel members receive identifying information about those applications that have been assigned to their panel for review.</p> <p>Panel members review the information and alert Review Manager/PAM of any potential conflicts of interest.</p>
	<p>Panel members return the following three forms by faxing them to (DGM-GMS) (Attn: <GMS>) by 4 PM EST on</p> <p><date> on fax number (301) 443-9602</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) IHS Certification Form Regarding Conflict of Interest, 2) Agreement/Statement of Work Form and, 3) Confidential Financial Disclosure Report (OGE-450) for Federal Reviewers.

<date>	If needed to avoid a potential conflict of interest, the Review Mgr or PAM reassigns applications. Panel members may receive additional information about applications if any panel member reports potential conflicts of interest.
<dates>	Panel members review applications and prepare critiques.
< dates>	<p>Panels meet via conference calls. The pass codes and dial-in number information will be emailed and posted to the <grant program acronym> ARMs information site. Score and Summary Comments must be submitted to the PAM via ARMs by 10 pm EST on the following schedule: <ORC final conference call date></p> <p>Dial-In Number: <conference call phone number> Pass code: <conference call participant code></p> <p>Deadline for completion of a total of <number of> Applications/ <number of> Panels - Score Sheets and summary comments must be submitted to the PAM.</p>
<dates>	<p>Deadline for approval of ORC session all comments by Review Mgr/PAM via the ARMs system.</p> <p>NOTE: All panel members must remain available for additional deliberations and revisions to comments until the scores and comments are submitted via the ARM system and approved by <program office acronym, e.g. OCS>.</p>
<dates>	<p>Deadline for chairpersons to submit all scores and executive summaries to Review Mgr/PAM for review.</p> <p>All reviewers should have submitted their scores and comments to the chair prior to this date.</p>
<date>	<p>Review Mgr/PAM approves all executive summary comments and in the ARM system.</p> <p>NOTE: All panel members must remain available for additional deliberations and revisions to comments until all comments are submitted via the</p>

	<p>ARM system and approved by the Review Mgr/PAM.</p> <p>Review Closeout Period</p> <p>After the Review Mgr/PAM approves all the collective scores and comments in ARM, panel members do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Print and sign their score sheets (please see, "Instructions for getting signed score sheets.")2) Email/scan score sheets with a signature to DGM/GMS at <GMS email address>.3) Original signed IHS certification from ARMs.4) Signed Honorarium Payment forms and IRS Form W-9. This should be sent to the Review Mgr/PAM.
--	--

<program office>
<grant program name>
<ORC dates>

**IHS CERTIFICATION FORM REGARDING
CONFLICT OF INTEREST, CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON-DISCLOSURE
FOR REVIEWERS OF GRANT APPLICATIONS**

Reviewers are individually responsible for evaluating their own affiliations and financial interest, and those of their close relatives and professional associates that relate to their duties as reviewers before they review any applications.

Conflict of Interest is defined as: Any action by a reviewer in the grants review or awarding process which would affect, or could appear to affect, the reviewer's financial interest, or would cause the reviewer's impartiality in the grants process to be questioned. Specific situations include, but are not limited to, the following: a reviewer may not participate in the review or award of a specific grant application in which any of the following has a financial interest:

- (1) the reviewer, the reviewer's spouse, parent, child, or partner;
- (2) any organization (including a parent or subsidiary) in which the reviewer, the reviewer's spouse, parent, child, or partner serves as officer, director, trustee, partner or is otherwise similarly associated;
- (3) any organization (including a parent or subsidiary) in which the reviewer, the reviewer's spouse, parent, child, or partner is negotiating for or has an arrangement concerning prospective employment or other similar association; or
- (4) any organization (including a parent or subsidiary) in which the reviewer, the reviewer's spouse, parent, child, or partner has an interest with respect to any pending grant application competing under the same program as any other grant application to be reviewed by the same committee or group of field researchers;
- (5) reviewer is not a member of the applicant tribe; and
- (6) reviewer is not from the same IHS Area as the applicant

I have read and understand the above definition of conflict of interest and have examined the attached list of applications to be reviewed, and hereby certify that, based on the information provided to me, I do not have a conflict of interest in any of them. If during the review there is an appearance or actual conflict of interest, I will recuse myself from the review of the application or will obtain an appropriate waiver.

In addition, I fully understand the confidential nature of the evaluation and agree: (1) to destroy or return all materials related to the evaluation; (2) not to disclose or discuss the materials associated with the review, my evaluation, or the review meeting outside of that meeting or with any other individual except as authorized by the grants management officer; and (3) to refer all inquiries concerning the review to the grants management officer.

Application Reviewer

Signature: _____

Date _____

Attachment:

List of ___ Application(s) to be reviewed:

<program office>
<grant program name>
<ORC dates>

SCOPE OF WORK (No Conflict of Interest)

The undersigned field reader shall:

- (a) Before reviewing or scoring any grant application pursuant hereto, carefully read the evaluation priorities and criteria, the explanation hereof, and the instructions for scoring, all of which are attached hereto.
- (b) Carefully review the whole of each grant application assigned to him/her pursuant to this agreement.
- (c) In accordance with the priorities and criteria, explanations and instructions attached hereto, solely on the basis thereof and of the content of the grant application, score each grant application on each priority or criterion, according to his/her best judgment of the degree to which the grant application meets the priority or criterion, or if so instructed, submit an overall assessment regarding the scientific or technical merit or other relevant aspects of the application.
- (d) Correctly indicate the score given by him/her pursuant to paragraph (c) above to each grant application on each priority and criterion in the Application Review Module (ARM) at <https://extranet.acf.hhs.gov/ar/>; make a written explicative assessment of the application in the ARM's comments area (this is automatically forwarded to the Chair for compilation); print the ARM Score Report, sign and date it; and return the Score Report to **<GMS for the grant program>**, the Division of Grants Management, Indian Health Service.

Signature

Date

<program office>
<grant program name>
<ORC dates>

SCOPE OF WORK (For Individual with a Conflict of Interest)

The undersigned field reader shall:

- (a) Before reviewing or scoring any grant application pursuant hereto, carefully read the evaluation priorities and criteria, the explanation hereof, and the instructions for scoring, all of which are attached hereto.
- (b) Except as stated in paragraph (e) below, carefully review the whole of each grant application assigned to him/her pursuant to this agreement.
- (c) In accordance with the priorities and criteria, explanations, and instructions attached hereto, solely on the basis thereof and of the content of the grant application, score each grant application on each priority and criterion according to his/her best judgment of the degree to which the grant application meets the priority or criterion, or, if so instructed, make an overall assessment regarding the technical or scientific merit or other relevant aspects of the application.
- (d) Correctly indicate the score given to him/her pursuant to paragraph (c) above to each grant application on each priority and criterion in the Application Review Module (ARM) at <https://extranet.acf.hhs.gov/ar/>; make a written explicative assessment for that grant application in the ARM's comments area (this is automatically forwarded to the Chair for compilation); print the ARM Score Report, sign and date it; and return the Score Report to **<GMS for the grant program>**, the Division of Grants Management, Indian Health Service.
- (e) Not review, score, or submit an explicative assessment of any application with respect to which he/she has a conflict of interest. For purposes of this agreement, the undersigned reader will be considered as having a conflict of interest with respect to an application if that person or his/her spouse, parent, minor child, or partner:
 - (1) Serves as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee of the applicant, its parent, or subsidiary organization.
 - (2) Is negotiating (or has an arrangement concerning) prospective employment (or other similar association) with the applicant, its parent, or subsidiary organization.
 - (3) Has a financial interest, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 208, in the application or in the applicant, its parent, or subsidiary organization.

As used in (1), (2), and (3) above:

- (i) "Parent organization" includes a holding company, trust, or other entity in a higher-level organizational relationship with the applicant.
- (ii) "Subsidiary" means an entity under effective control--by ownership or otherwise--of another organization; and it includes a sub-subsidiary or co-subsidiary of the same parent organization.

Please list applications for which you have a conflict:

Signature of Field Reader

CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORT

Executive Branch

- Why Must I File?** The duties and responsibilities of your position require you to file the Confidential Financial Disclosure Report to avoid involvement in a real or apparent conflict of interest. The purpose of this report is to assist employees and their agencies in avoiding conflicts between official duties and private financial interests or affiliations. The information you provide will only be used for legitimate purposes, and will not be disclosed to any requesting person unless authorized by law. (See the Privacy Act Statement at the bottom of this page.) Please ensure that the information you provide is complete and accurate.
- When Must I File?** **New Entrants:** The report is due within 30 days of your assuming a position designated for filing, unless your agency requests the report earlier or your agency grants you a filing extension. **Annual Filers:** The report is due no later than February 15, unless your agency grants you a filing extension.
- What is the Reporting Period?** **New Entrants:** Report the required information for the 12 months preceding your filing of this form. **Annual Filers:** Report the required information for the preceding calendar year (January 1 – December 31).
- What if I Have Questions?** If you have any questions about how to complete this form, please contact your ethics official or go to the Office of Government Ethics web site at www.oge.gov and select **OGE Form 450: Confidential Financial Disclosure Report** under **Forms Library**.

PENALTIES

Falsification of information or failure to file or report information required to be reported may subject you to disciplinary action by your employing agency or other authority. Knowing and willful falsification of information required to be reported may also subject you to criminal prosecution.

Privacy Act Statement

Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), Executive Order 12674 (as modified by Executive Order 12731), and 5 CFR Part 2634, Subpart I, of the Office of Government Ethics regulations require the reporting of this information. The primary use of the information on this form is for review by Government officials of your agency, to determine compliance with applicable Federal conflict of interest laws and regulations. Additional disclosures of the information on this report may be made: (1) to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency if the disclosing agency becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation; (2) to a court or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the Government is a party or in order to comply with a judge-issued subpoena; (3) to a source when necessary to obtain information relevant to a conflict of interest investigation or decision; (4) to the National Archives and Records Administration or the General Services Administration in records management inspections; (5) to the Office of Management and Budget during legislative coordination on private relief legislation; (6) to the Department of Justice or in certain legal proceedings when the disclosing agency, and employee of the disclosing agency, or the United States is a party to litigation or has an interest in the litigation and the use of such records is deemed relevant and necessary to the litigation; (7) to reviewing officials in a new office, department or agency when an employee transfers from one covered position to another, (8) to a Member of Congress or a congressional office in response to an inquiry made on behalf of an individual who is the subject of the record, and (9) to contractors and other non-Government employees working for the Federal Government to accomplish a function related to an OGE Governmentwide system of records. This confidential report will not be disclosed to any requesting person unless authorized by law. See also the OGE/GOVT-2 executive branchwide Privacy Act system of records.

Public Burden Information

It is estimated that completing this form, including reviewing the instructions and gathering the data needed, takes an average of one hour. No person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number as printed in the top right-hand corner of the first page of this form. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Deputy Director for Administration and Information Management, U.S. Office of Government Ethics, Suite 500, 1201 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005-3917. Do not send your completed OGE Form 450 to this address.

IHS
Program
Announcement

Department of Health and Human Services
 Indian Health Service
 <program office>
 <grant program name>
 <ORC Dates>

Reviewers Scoring Reference Sheet

Scoring Range Chart

Evaluation/Scoring Rating Key

Outstanding	100 – 95	Very strong proposal, high likelihood of success
Very Good	94 – 85	Strong proposal with likelihood of success
Good	84 – 75	Proposal has potential strength but several weaknesses
Fair	74 – 65	Proposal has many strengths but several weaknesses
Poor	64 – 01	Not fundable
Unacceptable	0	

Sample Score Report

IHS-001 IHS-001													
Indian Health Service June 15 2011 Training Session FINAL SUMMARY OF CRITERION SCORES													
Application Number: <u>IHS-001</u>	Panel: <u>1</u>												
Application Name: <u>IHS-001</u>													
State: <u>MD</u>	City: <u>Rockville</u>												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;">Criteria</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Impact on Community</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Job Creation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Need for the Funds</td> <td style="text-align: center;">23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Budget Justification</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">90/100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Criteria	Score	1. Impact on Community	25	2. Job Creation	22	3. Need for the Funds	23	4. Budget Justification	20	Total:	90/100
Criteria	Score												
1. Impact on Community	25												
2. Job Creation	22												
3. Need for the Funds	23												
4. Budget Justification	20												
Total:	90/100												
Reviewer#5054: Ihs Sayed	Date												

SAMPLE
Indian Health Service
Reviewer's Critique Template
FY 2012 <grant program> Program Review
<ORC date>

OBJECTIVE REVIEW OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

(Reviewer's Name)

CRITERION 1: (TITLE) (Points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

CRITERION 2: (TITLE) (Points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

OBJECTIVE REVIEW OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES (con't)
FY 2012 <grant program> Program Review

CRITERION 3: (TITLE) (Points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

CRITERION 4: (TITLE) (Points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

CRITERION 5: (TITLE) (Points)

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Department of Health and Human Services
Indian Health Service
<program office>
<grant program name>

Objective Review Roster
<ORC dates>

Chair Person:

Name: <name>
Title: <title>
Address: <street address>
<city, ST zip code>
Phone: <area code and phone number>
E-mail: <e-mail address>

Panel Members <panel number>:

Name: <name>
Title: <title>
Address: <street address>
<city, ST zip code>
Phone: <area code and phone number >
E-mail: <e-mail address>

[add reviewers as needed]

Program Official:

Name: <name>
Title: <title>
Address: <street address>
<city, ST zip code>
Phone: <area code and phone number>
E-mail: <e-mail address>

Grant-related and business management information:

Name: <name>
Title: <title>
Address: <street address>
<city, ST zip code>
Phone: <area code and phone number>
E-mail: <e-mail address>

Department of Health and Human Services
Indian Health Service
<program office>
<grant program name>
<ORC dates>

Panel <#> Application Assignments
[Add pages as necessary for your ORC]

Reviewer Name _____

PANEL <#> [add columns and rows as needed]						
Name of Applicant	<reviewer>	<reviewer>	<reviewer>	<reviewer>	<reviewer>	<reviewer>
<applicant>						
<applicant>						
<applicant>						
<applicant>						
<applicant>						
<applicant>						

P = Primary Reviewer

S = Secondary Reviewer

T = Tertiary Reviewer

<grant program name> – 2012 Review

Helpful Application Review Tips for Reviewers

All reviewers must read and score each application according to the official review criteria published in the IHS Funding Announcement.

Below are recommended steps that will assist you with reviewing, analyzing, and scoring an application according to the review criteria, and writing helpful comments that reflect your score:

- Review information about the <grant program acronym> Program to refresh your understanding of the intricacies of the program.
- Read the official published program announcement.
- Read the proposal. Pay close attention to locating information directly relevant to the official review criteria.
- Score each application review criteria.
- Compose thorough and helpful comments that convey your analysis and your score. Include comments about the strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate for the applicant's responses to each review criteria. Use these questions to frame your analysis:
 - Does the applicant include a complete and thorough discussion of the key factors of the evaluation criterion?
 - Are the applicant's intentions clear and specific, logical and realistic?
 - Did the applicant address all the required guidelines of the funding announcement?
 - Is the proposal internally consistent? Does it present consistent information throughout, from section to section?

TIP: *It is a good idea to budget your time, and be as efficient as possible in reading and analyzing the proposals. Many panelists establish an informal maximum timeframe for their review of each application. It is important that each application receive the same amount of scrutiny.*

<grant program name> – 2012 Review

Panel Conference Call Discussion Process (per application)

Panel conference calls are confidential and open only to members of the review panel and key IHS staff such as the Grants and Program staff.

This is a suggested step-by-step process for the panel discussion.

The Chairperson announces the application to be reviewed, calls for a scoring range (not actual numerical score) from the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Reviewers. Then facilitates the ensuing discussion and monitors the time as he/she turns the discussion over to the Primary Reviewer.

The Primary Reviewer summarizes the application, highlighting its major purpose/objectives, target audience and locale, strategies, and key/unique features. Goes over the scoring criteria, highlighting major strengths and weaknesses, primarily focusing on areas that merit further discussion.

The Secondary Reviewer responds to the presentation, particularly focusing on the areas of variation. The Secondary Reviewer should NOT comment on areas where there is agreement with the Primary Reviewer.

The Tertiary Reviewer provides any additional overall comments, particularly on areas of disagreement or areas not mentioned by the Primary and Secondary Reviewers that relate to the scoring criteria or merits of the application relating to the guidelines.

The panel is then open to all members for discussion on the areas of variation or questions or concerns relating to any clarity from the information presented by the Primary, Secondary or Tertiary Reviewers, or any questions needing to be answered on the merits of the application until all panel members are satisfied they have heard all details of the application and come to a consensus. Once a consensus is reached, a panel member makes a motion to approve or disapprove the application.

The Chairperson calls for a second to the motion to approve or disapprove the application. Once the motion is seconded by another member, all panel members will vote on the motion and then submit their final scores reflecting their levels of approval for the application as required in ARMs.

The Chairperson then announces the next application to be reviewed.

Suggested Guidance for Length of Discussion (per application):

- For applications where the scoring ranges from the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Reviewers and comments are closely consistent for all criteria: **Minimal discussion.**
- For applications where the scoring range and comments from the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Reviewers have some areas of disparity/variation: **Some discussion.**
- For applications where there is substantial disagreement among reviewers: **Full discussion.**