|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | WP Leader | Peer reviewer(s) | Project Coordinator |
|  | NAME | NAME | NAME |
| 1. Do you accept this Deliverable as it is?
 | Yes / No (elaborate) | Yes / No (elaborate) | Yes / No (elaborate) |
| 1. Is the Deliverable complete?
* All required chapters?
* Use of relevant templates?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the Deliverable correspond to the DoA?
* All relevant actions preformed and reported?
 | Yes / No (elaborate) | Yes / No (elaborate) | Yes / No (elaborate) |
| 1. Is the Deliverable in line with the IDEALFUEL objectives?
* WP objectives
* Task Objectives
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the technical quality sufficient?
* inputs and assumptions correct/clear?
* Data, calculations, and motivations correct/clear?
* Outputs and conclusions correct/clear?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is created and potential IP identified and are protection measures in place?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the Risk Procedure followed and reported?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the reporting quality sufficient?
* Clear language
* Clear argumentation
* Consistency
* Structure
 |  |  |  |

All deliverables must show that they have followed the effective quality management by indicating persons responsible for the quality review.

1. Due date (D) is the day at which a deliverable has to be forwarded externally, be it to the project officer or other bodies. Formal due dates for ANIONE deliverables are the last day of the month specified in the ANIONE deliverables table (Table 1.3.2 of Annex 1 (part A)).
2. The author(s) of the deliverable shall use the latest deliverable template (can be found on the ANIONE Mett platform, section ‘Templates and Manuals’) for creating the deliverable.
3. The WP Leader takes the initiative to contact the SC members in advance if he/she fears that a part of the deliverable is at risk of non-completion.
4. The lead beneficiary responsible for a deliverable suggests reviewer(s) for the deliverable four weeks before the deliverables’ due date. The reviewer is independent from the authors and is ideally from at least one other ANIONE consortium partner, preferably one of the WP participants. If no reviewers are assigned, the WP leader and Coordinator automatically become reviewers.
5. The internal review shall be completed no later than one week after the review request.
6. The reviewer uses a standard review form (reported in section 2.2.3 of this document) to document his/her review findings. The review form is maintained throughout the reviewing procedure until submission of the deliverable. The review form will be stored on the ANIONE project platform for archive purposes.
7. The reviewer reviews the deliverable and sends his/her completed comments to the WP Leader and to the authors of the deliverable. The possible results of the review process are:
	1. ACCEPT: The deliverable is acceptable in its current form and the ANIONE coordinator should submit it to the Commission.
	2. ACCEPT w. REVISION: The deliverable is in principle acceptable. However, some minor changes are needed. The author(s) should revise the deliverable. No further WP internal reviewing is required.
	3. REVISE: The deliverable is not acceptable in its current form. The author(s) proceed to implement required improvements.
8. The author(s) revise the deliverable according to the review result within a maximum of five days after receiving the request for quality improvement and inform the WP Leader which will request a new review, preferably by the same reviewer.
9. The WP Leader checks the review and ensures that the requested improvements are implemented by the author(s).
10. When the deliverable is accepted, the WP Leader informs the Project Management Team.
11. The Project Management Team checks the deliverable and the review form. He/She may issue a request for further improvement to the author(s) and the WP Leader. This procedure makes it highly likely that the two-fold improved deliverable is ready for submission. If not, the author(s) must implement the final corrections as requested immediately.
12. Once the review and approval procedure is completed, the Project Coordinator submits the deliverable to the Commission in electronic form (PDF) via the SyGMa portal. The Project Management Team stores the PDF of submitted deliverables on the ANIONE Mett platform (section Documents / Deliverables/ Submitted to EC Deliverables / Dx.x).

The final version of the deliverable must be submitted to the FCH JU before the due date. If this is not possible for any reason the project Coordinator must be informed well in advance of the due date. To ensure deliverables will be met, reviewing and revising must be performed as early and as fast as possible in case multiple review-revise cycles are necessary.