

Project Review Guidelines

Version 10, dated April 2014

Foreword

Make sure Make sure that you are using the latest version of the Guidelines & Template: check it on the “Documents & Templates / Guidelines & Templates / Reviews & Results tab” area of the ITEA Community website (<https://community.itea3.org>) and, whenever needed, discard obsolete versions you might have stored and download the up-to-date one. For help on the ITEA Community website, refer to the “How To” document available on the ITEA website (<https://www.itea3.org/call-documents.html>).

1. General principles

1.1. Review objectives

Project reviews are essential to the ITEA Programme Management as they ensure the high quality level of ITEA labelled projects. They are used to monitor the progress of the projects, evaluate their quality and, whenever needed, recommend actions and/or changes: they serve as efficient tool to steer projects and help them to define and meet realistic yet challenging exploitation goals. From a project point of view, ITEA reviews are a supporting tool to achieve a core target: delivering a well thought and high quality innovation to generate a strong impact on the market. The ITEA target is to stick to the market, thus beside the Change Request process the review is also a tool to analyse the continuous required project changes to follow the market evolution.

1.2. Planning and Costs

The review is planned by the ITEA Office, together with the main participants (ie. reviewers, chairman and project partners) to ensure their availability. Date and location are chosen by the Office based on a number of criteria:

- in order to optimise travel costs often two reviews are planned at the same location (city) for two consecutive days; the first review is scheduled at the afternoon of the first day and the second review at the morning of the second day. The exact starting and ending hours are defined by the project coordinator;
- at least one reviewer that followed the project from the beginning is assigned (whenever possible);
- specific location can be set on request of project leader, e.g. in case of specific location dependent demo's.

The review location is initially defined as a geographical area close to the location¹ indicated in the annual ITEA review calendar. Organising and reserving the precise meeting room is the responsibility of the project coordinator.

The costs² of a review are borne by the project consortium. Reviews are usually planned after each year of project advancement, which generates two or three reviews in the lifetime of an ITEA project, including the final review. The intermediate reviews aim at supporting and steering the project towards success, while the final review both evaluates the whole project achievements and supports the consortium with regards to the exploitation opportunities by providing advice and suggestions.

¹ For instance, a review in Paris could take place within Paris intra muros, or at La Défense, while a Stockholm review could take place in Kista, and a Helsinki review in Espoo (these are typical examples). We strongly recommend to select a review location that is both close (or within) the main city and easily accessible from the airport, with accommodation capabilities nearby.

² Reviewers, Public Authorities and ITEA Office members do take care of their own travel costs; all other costs are under the responsibility of the project consortium.

1.3. Confidentiality

All participants who are not member of the project consortium will have signed a Declaration of Non-Disclosure beforehand. Consequently, the ITEA Office will make sure it receives (at the latest two (2) weeks before the review meeting) a Declaration of Non-Disclosure (DND) from the expert assigned by the Public Authorities (PAs). The duly signed DND will entitle the experts to access to all project documents needed for the review.

2. Review organisation

The reviews are organised by the Project Leader (PL)³ with the support of the assigned project mentor. The precise assignment of tasks between the PL and the mentor is not predefined; the PL has yet the responsibility of organising well his/her project reviews and of contacting the project mentor whenever needed.

2.1. Mentorship

Each project has an assigned mentor, selected among STG members. The appointment rules are as follows:

- if ITEA Founding Companies (IFCs) participate in the project, then the STG representative of the most relevant IFC (i.e. the one ensuring the project lead, or with the most significant contribution) is selected;
- if no IFC participates in the project, then the decision is based on expertise or geographic proximity.

The mentor's role is to support and advice the PL in preparing the review meetings (including the rehearsal meetings, cf. §2.3), consolidating the logistics when several reviews take place at the same place at same or consecutive days, and more generally in carrying out the project.

The mentor support has often proved to be essential when the PL is new to the community.

2.2. Attendees

The review meetings imply the participation of core project partners, i.e. at least the project coordinator (PL), all relevant work package (WP) leaders and all key members of the project consortium. For evaluation and support purposes, a set of reviewers is also selected for each review:

- a review chairman: he/she is either the ITEA Vice-Chairman or the ITEA Chairman;
- two (2) reviewers from the STG, and from companies not participating in the project⁴; at least one of the two reviewers has followed the project from the start and participated in the initial FPP evaluation and/or earlier project reviews; a third reviewer, called spare reviewer, is also assigned, in case one of the two main reviewers would have to cancel his/her participation; his/her availability is guaranteed until one month before the review;
- an optional external expert, assigned by the ITEA Authorities Committee (ITAC), and acting on behalf of the Public Authorities (PAs) of all the countries funding the project; the external expert is a full member of the review team with a neutral and public visibility to the process; his/her comments flow in the ITEA review process (it is taken into account as for all other reviewers)⁵;
- one of the two ITEA programme coordinators, acting as secretary of the meeting;

³ A.k.a. project coordinator.

⁴ This is done to avoid conflicts of interest. As a consequence, a mentor cannot act as reviewer.

⁵ The ITAC may still (or may not) request to the external expert a specific report for further details and analysis; it is then a private communication between the assigning Public Authority (or the whole ITAC) and the external expert.

- the local⁶ PA representative, if available, and if local partners are funded; as all funding PAs cannot attend, the ITEA Office contacts before reviews all the relevant funding agencies and collects thereby potential country specific questions that will be asked to the project partners at the appropriate time during the review.

The project mentor is also invited to attend the review meetings.

The precise list of reviewers' names is available in the review calendar item on the ITEA Community website, and will also be provided by the assigned programme coordinator. Email addresses will be provided sufficiently in advance to send the review invitations (cf. §4.2).

2.3. Schedule

To allow the reviewers to optimise their travel schedule, morning reviews should end at 1pm latest, while afternoon reviews should start at 1:30pm earliest.

A review shall typically last up to four (4) to five (5) hours, including breaks and questions during or after the presentations.

An appropriate time management is essential, with no drift in the meeting agenda: since some of the reviewers might have time-critical journeys, it is essential to start and end the meeting according to the schedule agreed upon beforehand. The consortium needs to take into account some additional time for the reviewers' questions, and not only the sole presentation time: we recommend considering not less than thirty (30) minutes of additional time due to the reviewers' questions and the corresponding answers. The presentations should be adapted accordingly, by avoiding an inadequate number of slides; it is usually recommended to count a minimum of two (2) minutes per slide – as a consequence, a 195 slides presentation would typically take close to 6.5 hours (breaks excluded), should every slide be sufficiently well presented – and the overall presentation time would reach 7 hours when considering the diluted⁷ 30 minutes for the reviewers' questions. As a consequence, a typical 4.5 hours meeting should last 225 minutes until the reviewers' private session⁸, including a 15 minutes break and a maximum of 90 slides⁹.

To ensure the review works flawlessly, it has always proved to be beneficial to plan a rehearsal meeting, with the mentor support, at best one week before and at worst the day before the review: it provides a great help in checking the overall timing and clarity of the core messages.

The main content of the slides should not be an extensive description of what the project has done on a daily basis but rather a presentation of the actual results on innovation and potential business impact.

⁶ I.e. from the country where the review takes place. Please note that a PA from another country may still join if he/she expresses the wish to attend the review.

⁷ The agenda should not contain a specific timeslot for the reviewers' questions, as these questions may be asked at any moment during the presentations and demonstrations: therefore, the 30 minutes for reviewers' questions and corresponding answers have to be integrated in the whole presentation time of the meeting agenda.

⁸ Leaving 30 minutes for the reviewers' private session, 10 minutes feedback and 5 minutes for final words, cf. §3.1.10 to §0.

⁹ When considering 30 minutes of reviewers' questions (and associated answers), 180 minutes of presentations are remaining.

2.4. Conveniences

The meeting room should be chosen so as to fit the number of expected attendees and to provide the appropriate features: big visible screen for the presentations projection, beamer with at least VGA (and at best VGA and HDMI) input, sufficient power line sockets for laptops¹⁰, etc.

The PL will make sure that the meeting room is ready and open in due time (at least 30 minutes in advance), the beamer connected and working, the power line sockets available and actually powered, and that enough adjacent seats are kept free for the attending reviewers. Besides, it is a courtesy to the reviewers to provide them a wireless internet access so that they can synchronise their emails before travelling back or check-in for their flights.

The presence of refreshments is appreciated. The availability of a prior / posterior lunch is at the full discretion of the project coordinator.

¹⁰ The PL needs to consider that there might be up to six reviewers seating closely in the meeting room, each one potentially requiring a power line socket at maximum 2 meters from his/her laptop.

3. Presentations

Most of the review is based on partner presentations and demonstrations that aim at illustrating the key achievements, the key success factors and the exploitation strategy of the consortium.

3.1. Meeting structure and content

This chapter presents a typical¹¹ project review meeting agenda. It also details what the reviewers expect to get as information, and how the consortium should focus its presentations.

The consortium is invited to check the feedback (remarks and recommendations) of all previous reviews, including the Full Project Proposal (FPP), Change Requests (CRs) and Project Progress Reports (PPRs) evaluations as well as the Conclusions & Actions (C&A) of previous reviews if there was any. The consortium should try to implement the recommendations, and to illustrate implicitly during the review how, i.e. which actions have been made to steer the project accordingly. Previous actions and recommendations that are ignored will pop up again and will be reinforced.

3.1.1. Introduction

After a quick pre-introduction by the PL, indicating that the review starts, and which may include a very brief introduction of main attendees, the review chairman makes a five (5) minutes introduction speech, summarising the main expectations and targets of the review.

3.1.2. Overview of the project

The consortium should provide a brief overview of ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes recalling the main project objectives and challenges with reference to the State-of-the-Art (SotA), the work plan and key results of the project achieved so far as well as those targeted for the upcoming period. What refers to the past, the current and the upcoming periods should be clearly stated.

It is also recommended to include here a synthetic presentation of each key partner, indicating its size, its main markets and customers (when needed by focusing on what's relevant to the project scope, esp. for large industries targeting various markets). Key partners include the project leader and work package leader entities, as well as potential end-users and exploitation-oriented partners (vendors, service providers, etc.).

Profit from the overview to introduce the acronyms that will be mentioned in the presentations; do not make the assumption that projects or even domain specific acronyms are known by all reviewers (especially as some acronyms can have several meanings).

3.1.3. Managerial topics

All potential management issues should be mentioned here, incl. any evolution in the consortium, in the funding status or in the costs and efforts. The Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) status (in discussion / signed) must be clearly indicated. The PCA is expected to be signed before the

¹¹ The consortia are free to propose a different structure as long as all aspects are sufficiently covered. For instance, §3.1.5 and §3.1.6 could be reverted, with first a short introduction of the demonstrations, then striking demonstrations showing the latest achievements, and finally a presentation of how this results have been achieved and which market and technology opportunities it opens.

first review takes place. In case the PCA is not yet signed, a clear explanation for the delay should be provided, as well as an expected date for the PCA signature.

The level of cooperation within the consortium may be underlined and clarified: in particular, the level of international collaboration should be clearly presented and underlined. The cooperation with other projects (EUREKA, IST, FP7, national, etc.) should be mentioned.

3.1.4. Global picture, key objectives and impact on quality of life

The consortium must present a convincing global picture, which presents what the main goals are, why it is relevant, how it will be achieved, how far the consortium is from achieving it. Whenever possible, progression measures and estimations should be provided.

The global picture integrates an up-to-date (i.e. whenever relevant: an updated) market and economic relevance analysis, together with an up-to-date competition analysis. Summarise shortly if anything has changed since the last review; it is suggested to allocate from ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes for the market analysis.

Besides, consortia are strongly encouraged to present as part of the global picture the impact on quality of life they expect from the project, as it represents a strong value within the ITEA Programme. This impact can be on improving healthcare, proposing entertainment, facilitating various daily burdens, increasing security, promoting a sustainable economy, optimising resource and energy management, reducing the ecological impact of human activities, widening the access to knowledge, improving wealth, etc.

3.1.5. Key achievements

Among the main objectives of ITEA reviews are the presentation and evaluation of key achievements of the consortium. The consortium should focus on quantified achievements and on innovation; a clear difference between what comes from the SotA (use the ITEA SotA Database as a reference and complete it when necessary), what is an off-the-shelves component (third party contribution, e.g. open source components developed outside of the consortium) and what is a contribution of the project should be ensured. For follow up projects, it is essential to position the new project deliveries in front of the ones delivered during the previous project(s).

The results may typically be presented per WP. Details on each and every technical progress do not need to be provided: the focus should be on every key achievement that brings the consortium closer to its exploitation objectives. A presentation of a few highlights of the most relevant deliverables is appreciated, but the focus on key results should be maintained. Besides, it can sometimes be relevant to illustrate the innovation and contributions on clear (and if needed, simplified) examples, e.g. problems it can solve that couldn't be solved easily before, or optimisation it provides, etc.

In order to focus the review on actual innovation- and/or market-oriented achievements, the PL is free to decide to skip a whole WP, typically if everything has already been presented at the previous review: repetitions from a review to the next one should be avoided, esp. on the technical level. As a consequence, a detailed task-listing can often be avoided and saves time, e.g. for the demonstrations or exploitation perspectives.

3.1.6. Demonstrations

Demonstrations are the most striking way to illustrate the achievements: the consortium should showcase them well, and leave enough room in the planned agenda for both the demonstrations themselves, and their introduction (e.g. with explanation slides, before running the demonstrations) – a demonstration only exploits its full potential when all attendees perceive what is at stake and which contributions are shown.

Demonstrations are very welcome at the first review, and are mandatory for following reviews. Besides, it is essential that the consortium prepares well its demonstrations and makes the required adjustment during the rehearsal meeting, in order to avoid the so-called “demo-effect”.

3.1.7. Progress status

A short summary of the overall work plan progress must be presented, including the evolution of the consortium positioning with regards to the current (evolving) SotA, the status of all project milestones and deliverables, as well as a table indicating the actual human resources consumption figures in persons-years (PY), per partner and per year, with a comparison between what has been spent and what was initially planned. Note that the PY consumption figures must compare what has been spent until the review with what was initially planned¹² at that same date (not the whole project), so as to be able to identify any drift both in the agenda (which gives an indication on when the final results might be achieved) and in the workload (i.e. efforts, which indicate if the planned work has been under-, well or over-estimated).

3.1.8. Exploitation

As core target of any ITEA project, the exploitation perspectives and the associated dissemination and standardisation strategies and actions have a central role and should be underlined in detail, yet in a realistic way, by project partners.

Dissemination and standardisation must be seen as exploitation enablers (not as objectives on their own¹³) and should consolidate a larger exploitation strategy. The consortium must present its strategy, as well as the activities carried out in the past period and planned in the coming one. Fast, mid-term and long-term exploitation opportunities must be differentiated.

The kind of results that may be exploited encompasses new products, product upgrades, software packages, methodologies, patents applications or Intellectual Property Rights, licences, new standards, published APIs, open source software, etc.

The presentation related to exploitation should last at least fifteen (15) minutes, and provide whenever possible quantified results, activities and targets, i.e. (realistic) figures. A synthetic sheet with quantified progress should be presented, including the current number of exploitations¹⁴ (new products, upgrades, packages, etc.), standardisation actions, disseminations

¹² I.e. what was planned when the latest review took place, or what was planned when the project kick-off took place, if there is no previous review.

¹³ Some (rare) projects can have standardisation as a core goal, but this goal aims at achieving a greater goal (e.g. enabling a market to take off by ensuring all key players are interoperable, which enables the end-user adoption) which should be presented.

¹⁴ It usually is at zero at the first review, and ideally is strictly positive at the final review.

(customer-oriented actions, conference talks, papers, webinars, etc.), patents, spins-offs and start-ups, and public SotA documents¹⁵.

3.1.9. Synthesis: consortium's conclusions

The consortium is invited to present a short conclusion, stressing in particular the innovation of the project results and their expected impact on the market.

3.1.10. Reviewers' private session

The reviewers' private session aims at enabling reviewers to share their evaluations and recommendations: they meet in the meeting room without any project consortium member to share their comments and jointly prepare the Conclusions & Actions (C&A) document to be presented as common comprehensive and synthetic feedback to the project consortium, in the concluding session.

The review chairman has the responsibility to get to the consensus among all reviewers (incl. the external expert); in case no consensus could be reached and a discrepancy remains, this output will be written down in the reporting document (C&A).

The project mentor is allowed to participate in the reviewers' private session, but has a limited and constrained role: his main role consists in providing additional information to the reviewers in case of questions or uncertainties, and in explaining later on the feedback outputs to the project consortium. He/she shall not and will not by any means influence the review outputs and will keep confidential the personal position of each reviewer.

This agenda item should have a blocked timeslot of thirty (30) minutes.

3.1.11. Reviewers feedback session

The reviewers' feedback session, which lasts ten (10) minutes, summarises the draft C&A by underlining the main outputs of the project review. The presented C&A may be updated after the meeting by the attending reviewers, esp. with regards to deliverables. The final C&A document is typically sent to the PL one to two weeks after the review¹⁶.

3.1.12. Final words

The review ends with some final words from the review chairman, stressing the main advices and future challenges for the project consortium.

3.2. General recommendations

In terms of content, the consortium is advised to focus on key and quantified elements, both for objectives, results, overall progress and market perspectives.

In terms of form, the slides must be reviewed internally (i.e. by the project consortium) to ensure their clarity: they fundamentally aim at supporting the oral presentation, not necessarily at reporting or being read as independent deliverables, meaning overloaded slides and dense texts

¹⁵ These SotA documents should be finalised and uploaded on the ITEA Community website as WP deliverables.

¹⁶ This C&A will be the only written feedback provided by the reviewers. Yet, the PL and project partners can also recontact the reviewers for further details or recommendations.

should be avoided as much as possible: schemes, graphs and other visual representations often provide an improved clarity for attendees as well as a much better support for the presenter him/herself.

The rehearsal meeting should be used to ensure the key messages are clearly identified and well transmitted to the audience that the presentation length is appropriate so as to ensure a strict time management, and that demonstrations are well mastered¹⁷. Teleconference solutions (via professional systems or via consumer-software like Skype) must be avoided as much as possible¹⁸.

Besides, in order to have a good overview of the evaluation criteria, the consortium may have a look at the latest Conclusions & Actions template, available in the “Documents & Templates/Guidelines & Templates / Evaluation Templates tab” area of the ITEA Community website <https://community.itea3.org>)

¹⁷ For instance, for real-time demonstrations, the partners need to ensure the robustness is sufficient and the repeatability is good enough; for video-based demonstrations, appropriate codecs and video players must be installed to avoid that computers need to be switched, that videos are not displayed on the projector, and that they are not played in full-screen mode.

¹⁸ Unless full HD video and sound, as well as clear signal quality and connection robustness, can be guaranteed, which requires a large and stable bandwidth as well as a high quality installation on both ends. Exceptions can be considered for partners from outside Europe: the PL should then contact the programme coordinator assigned to the review, for advice.

4. Review preparation period

This chapter presents all the tasks and actions the PL (together with the assigned mentor) should take into consideration in the months to weeks before a given project review. All mentions of online data (or webpage) directly refer to the ITEA Community website, and more particularly to the project review agenda item webpage. This review page is accessible by clicking on the review item in the online calendar, on the ITEA Community website. For any question or difficulty to access this page, please contact the assigned programme coordinator.

All indicated dates (e.g. “two weeks in advance”) are deadlines, i.e. the corresponding actions should be taken at the latest at that date. It is yet recommended not to take these actions way too early with regards to these deadlines.

In any case, project partners (and in particular the PL) should check online on the ITEA Community website the latest version of these review guidelines and discard obsolete versions that may have been downloaded and stored.

For any other aspect as those listed in this document, or any additional question, the PL should contact the ITEA programme coordinator assigned to the review.

4.1. Project conformance: two months before

The PL has the responsibility to check two months in advance (at the latest) the conformance of the project data on the ITEA Community website (incl. the latest validated FPP available online), including:

- the list of active partners (some partners may have left or may have integrated the project),
- the start and end dates of the project,
- the costs and efforts per partner, WP and year,
- the funding status per partner (to be checked with the programme coordinator in charge of funding statuses),
- the milestones,
- the detailed scope of the project (which could be impacted by some partners leaving or entering the consortium),
- etc.

In other words, the latest submitted FPP (incl. updated FPP through a CR) must exactly describe the project as it currently is. In case of discrepancy, the PL should prepare a CR to update the reference FPP and should submit it latest one month before the review. This will help the reviewers to apprehend the changes in the project, and the consortium to focus on achievements and targets during the review.

The necessity of submitting a CR may be discussed with the assigned programme coordinator, who will confirm or remove this obligation.

4.2. Invitation: one month before

In order to facilitate flight and hotel bookings, the PL (or the assigned mentor) should send an invitation for the review, latest one month in advance, to all attendees, and in particular to the reviewers (cf. §2.2).

The invitation should include:

- within the email text (i.e. not only in attached files) the exact start and end hours of the meeting, as well as the exact place (detailed address);
- travel and location information: access maps, distance and transportation time from / to the airport / train station, etc.;
- suggested hotels, e.g. if a block-booking has been made / planned, if a discount price is available, and more generally a support on where to book a hotel room.

The PL is highly encouraged to upload on the webpage (under Tab “Documents”, section “Calendar docs”), at the same time, all relevant documents related to the invitation, as for example access maps.

Besides, the PL should start to update on the webpage the online attendees list, which is pre-filled with the names of the reviewers, mentor and project coordinator. All the review attendees should be registered on that list, if necessary by requesting considered people to create an account on the ITEA Community website. This procedure is requested to guarantee confidentiality measures.

4.3. Submission of deliverables: two weeks before

Two weeks before each review, the PL should send a second email to the confirmed reviewers, including:

- a draft agenda for the review meeting (start and end hours should not change since the original invitation) and, if necessary, an update on the location details (e.g. meeting room – the address should not change since the original invitation);
- the notification that all relevant documents and deliverables are available for download on the ITEA Community webpage (these documents should be uploaded¹⁹ to the website before sending this email, at least in pdf version²⁰); it includes public documents as well as consortium-confidential ones;
- the clear identification of which documents are public (within the ITEA Community); if there is no public deliverable, then it should be clearly stated;
- the clear identification of which deliverables are SotA documents; if there is no SotA document, then it should be clearly stated.

The PL will have to provide per email to the assigned programme coordinator a delay justification for each deliverable which should be available on the webpage two weeks before the review, and which actually is not.

¹⁹ NB: adding a deliverable to the review can be done in two steps: first upload the deliverable in the appropriate work package, from the project webpage, and then add it in the review page by picking it from the list of available documents (use button “select project documents”).

²⁰ Ideally in both pdf and docx formats.

Providing the deliverables in time is essential to avoid any misjudgement by the reviewers due to lack of information.

Reviewers will analyse the deliverable during these two weeks, and during the following week. If a public SotA document is considered as significantly valuable for the ITEA Living Roadmap, an official notification will be provided after the review.

Simultaneously, the ITEA Office should have received the requested signed DND from the external expert, allowing him to access the deliverables. The project mentor may check with the ITEA Office for confirmation.

Uploaded documents have clear confidentiality rules:

- documents uploaded as public documents (box checked) can be accessed through the ITEA website by a large audience;
- documents uploaded as non-public (default state: box uncheck) can only be accessed by project partners and ITEA Office members: the confidentiality is thus guaranteed as other members of the ITEA community won't be able to see these documents;
- documents attached to a review (calendar item on the ITEA Community website) can only be downloaded by review attendees as defined by the online attendees list, i.e. project partners and reviewers (incl. invited PAs and ITEA Office members).

4.4. Draft presentations: one week before

A last email should be sent by the project coordinator to the confirmed reviewers, one week before the review, to provide:

- if necessary, an updated agenda (start and end hours should not change);
- the link(s) to download the draft presentation(s) from the ITEA Community webpage²¹; the presentation(s) should be close to their final state, but enhancements can naturally be added, typically thanks to the feedback from the rehearsal meeting;
- in the specific case of the final review: the final (or almost final) update of the dissemination & exploitation overview, and the actual resources consumption figures, i.e. efforts in PY; check the PPR template & guidelines for further explanations.

Providing the presentations in time is essential to avoid any misjudgement by the reviewers due to lack of information.

This last email can be used to ask the expected attendees for attendance confirmation: attendance can be confirmed with the appropriate button at the bottom of the "Attendees" tab of the review page.

4.5. Updated online data: two days before

A final check-list should be considered two days before each review:

²¹ The presentation(s), in pptx or pdf formats, should first be uploaded as meeting binder.

- check the attendees list is up-to-date on the review webpage; if required, ask partners to register to the ITEA Community website;
- ensure attendees confirm their presence on the website;
- update the slides available on the review webpage; besides, make sure that when the meeting starts, the online version fits exactly with the presented one; it is essential that reviewers can download the presentations two days²² before the review, in case the Wi-Fi connection is unavailable or drops before or during the review meeting itself;
- prepare a USB key for attending reviewers, which contains the latest versions of both the deliverables and the presentations; it might be of great help in case the internet connection is not available (or in case it's down); however, the PL should take into account that most reviewers may not have the right to plug a USB key to their laptops, explaining why a Wi-Fi connection is valuable, and why it is required to provide access to a sufficiently finalised version of the slides before the meeting date.

The PL can and should use the Community website to share documents, like deliverables and presentations, among reviewers and project partners, as all meeting attendees (even those who are not present) have access to the meeting binder.

²² The two days deadline is linked to the review pairing: a reviewer may have two reviews in a row, on consecutive days, without any internet connection since he/she left his/her office (cf. also restrictions on USB keys).