



D1.1 Report on Quality Control Procedure

Work package:	WP1	Management
Author(s):	Dirk Pleiter	JUELICH
Authorized by:	Dirk Pleiter	JUELICH
Dissemination Level	public	

Date	Author	Comments	Version	Status
30.07.17	Dirk Pleiter	Initial version	V0.1	Draft
31.07.17	Dirk Pleiter	Editorial updates	V1.0	Final

Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to define the quality control processes and provide the templates for internal verification and document review for all project results and deliverables.

Contents

1. Quality review process.....	1
a) Authors.....	1
b) Internal reviewers	2
c) Final approval and submission	2
2. Template for PPI4HPC deliverables.....	2
3. Internal review form template	2
4. Appendix.....	2

1. Quality review process

a) Authors

The Leader of a Work Package, which is in charge of providing a particular deliverable, is responsible for defining the authors in time. These authors should follow the latest version of the templates for deliverables (see below), which are available in the following folder of the collaborative work space of the PPI4HPC project: <https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2346413>. The authors have to make sure that a draft for internal

review is available for the internal reviewers no later than 4 weeks before deadline for submission of the deliverable. Draft versions of the deliverable will be uploaded in an appropriate sub-folder of the following folder: <https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2346400>. After having uploaded the draft deliverable, the authors will notify the internal reviewers. In case of delays, both, the Coordinator, the Work Package Leader as well as the internal reviewers assigned for this deliverable should be informed as early as possible to establish a mitigation plan.

b) Internal reviewers

The list of internal reviewers is maintained in a document on the collaborative work space: https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/d2346421-2/*/*Reviewers%20assignment.html.

The internal reviewers will within 2 weeks provide a review report based on the internal review form template using the latest version as available on the aforementioned folder in the collaborative work space: <https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2346413>. After completing the review the reviewers will upload the review forms to the same folder where the draft deliverable had been placed and notify the Coordinator.

c) Final approval and submission

After being recommended by the internal reviewers the Coordinator will upload the final versions of the deliverables to the EC portal as well as the folder for uploaded versions of the deliverables in the collaborative work space: <https://bscw.zam.kfa-juelich.de/bscw/bscw.cgi/2346406>.

2. Template for PPI4HPC deliverables

This template should be used by the authors of any of the deliverables. It comprises the following mandatory parts:

- Table with the main document information including information on the review process
- Table with the document history
- Executive summary
- Table of contents
- Section “Introduction”
- Section “Concluding remarks”

3. Internal review form template

This template must be used by the internal reviewers of a deliverable to assure a consistent way of how deliverables are being reviewed. It must, in particular, include a recommendation to the Coordinator on whether to submit this deliverable to the EC.

4. Appendix

The following pages provide a copy of the following documents:

- Template for PPI4HPC deliverables
- Internal review form template



**<Insert Document Reference from DoA>
<Insert Document Title from DoA>**

Work package:	<number>	<name>
Author(s):	<name>	<organisation>
Authorized by:	<name>	<organisation>
Reviewer #1	<name>	<organisation>
Reviewer #2	<name>	<organisation>
Dissemination Level	<public confidential>	

Date	Author	Comments	Version	Status
mm.dd.yy	<name>		V0.1	<Draft Final>

Executive Summary

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. <section title>.....	1
3. Concluding remarks	1
4. References	2

1. Introduction

2. <section title>

a) <subsection title>

3. Concluding remarks

4. References

[<ref number>] <reference>

Internal Review Form



No. and title of the deliverable	
Version no.	
Author (organisation)	
Reviewer (organisation)	
Date of receipt	
Date of review	
Submission to EU recommended?	

Does the Deliverable comply with its description provided in the DoA?

Is the content sound or have shortcomings been identified?

Is the deliverable self-explanatory or does it provide necessary references to related documents?

Is the language and style of the Deliverable clear and sound?

Which parts of the Deliverable require improvement?

Does the Deliverable correspond to the project templates?

General comments

In cases where the review process takes multiple iterations, previous iterations should be documented in the following table:

Deliverables version	Date of review	Comments