Data Synergy Call - Evaluation Questions

| Interest & | How would you judge the cultural relevance and preservation need of the |
|---------------|---|
| Reusability | real-world heritage assets? |
| neusability | 1 - not very relevant and not important to preserve |
| | 5 - extremely relevant and important to preserve |
| Interest & | How important are the heritage assets for different stakeholders and |
| | _ |
| Reusability | relevant to focus areas (i.e. <u>young people</u> , <u>Eastern Partnership</u> , <u>disaster</u> |
| | management, health, democracy) of the European Commission? |
| | 1 - not very important 5 - very important |
| Impost | |
| Impact | What is the potential information and accessibility gain when publishing |
| | the digitized assets? |
| | 1 - very low (due to already existing, public assets) |
| Overtity | 5 - very high (due to new, potentially concealed assets) |
| Quantity | Which amount and variety of 3D assets will be contributed? |
| | 1 - few similar assets |
| 0 1' | 5 - many different assets |
| Quality | How would you judge the appearance of the 3D assets in general? |
| | 1 - very unalluring |
| 0 1' | 5 - very appealing |
| Quality | How would you judge the technical quality of the 3D assets in terms of |
| | accuracy and detail? |
| | [for reality-based assets] |
| | 1 - The accuracy is very low and only one level of detail has been produced. |
| | 5 - The accuracy is very high and multiple level of details have been |
| | produced. |
| | [for source-based assets] |
| | 1 - The accuracy and details are much lower than the underlying sources |
| | allow it. |
| | 5 - The accuracy and details are as high as the underlying sources allow it. |
| Scientificity | How clear has the digitization process been described in general? |
| Scientificity | 1 - not very comprehensible |
| | |
| Scientificity | 5 - very comprehensible How would you evaluate the digitization process in terms of technical and |
| Scientificity | scientific soundness? |
| | |
| | 1 - The applied methods are outdated and not very appropriate.5 - The applied methods are state-of-the art and very appropriate. |
| Feasibility | How would you judge the capacity and experience of the applicant and |
| reasibility | project partner to fulfil the requirements of the call? |
| | 1 - not very adequate and not very qualified |
| | 5 - very adequate and very qualified |
| Feasibility | How well can the applicant and project partner manage any potential risks |
| 1 Gasibility | and obligations? |
| | 1 - The project has high risks/many obligations that likely cannot be |
| | addressed. |
| | |
| | 5 - The project has either no risks/obligations or small risks/few obligations |
| Misoellanseus | that can easily be addressed. |
| Miscellaneous | Do you have any other comments on the project? |
| | Free text |