

D 3.2.3

INTERNAL QUALITY CHECK OF STATUS QUO ANALYSES OF PARTNERS

D 3.2.3 - INTERNAL QUALITY CHECK OF STATUS QUO ANALYSES OF PARTNERS

The reports on the status quo of underwater cultural heritage were properly carried out by all the partners, with high-quality in-depth analysis and detailed studies of the different topics required and illustrated in the index on page 2. As listed in the table on page 3, all requests were fulfilled, and the questions were exhaustively answered.

Topics have been addressed by all PPs as a function to the different management approaches, different archaeological conditions and number of archaeological recoveries or different availability of cultural heritage archaeological findings in the four regions. This dissimilarity did not impact in the exhaustiveness of all the reports that will allow to adequately carry out the comparative study report foreseen by the deliverable D. 3.2.4

The accessibility and valorisation of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH), an essential issue to be analysed by all the reports to structure the next project activities, was completely answered by all the partners; the enumeration and description of the wrecks in the four areas are complete. The difference between the regions is evident from the numerous answers, due to different history and possibilities. Topics have been addressed by all PPs as a function to the different management approaches, different archaeological conditions and number of archaeological recoveries or different availability of cultural heritage archaeological findings in the four regions. This dissimilarity did not impact in the exhaustiveness of all the reports that will allow to adequately carry out the comparative study report foreseen by the deliverable D. 3.2.4. Topics have been addressed by all PPs as a function to the different management approaches, different archaeological conditions and number of archaeological recoveries or different availability of cultural heritage archaeological findings in the four regions. This dissimilarity did not impact in the exhaustiveness of all the reports that will allow to adequately carry out the comparative study report foreseen by the deliverable D. 3.2.4. A comparative study will benefit from these differences since it is from differences that it will be possible to reach a very high-level exploitation of the UCH in the regions, following an univocal idea that will be diversified for every situation. For example, Croatia has

better underwater protection of wrecks, as shown by the large table of the report, from which it is possible to take inspiration, while Italy has a better enhancement of the UCH by the cultural point of view in museums, especially with temporary exhibitions.

The exhaustive answers on virtual and multimedia arguments are really useful and interesting since the innovative technological solution is an essential topic and an important objective of the UnderwaterMuse project. In both areas, Italy and Croatia, virtual enhancements are still missing; the reports show this tangible lack but, at the same time, the necessity to create new virtual accessibility of the UCH.

Index

1. General premises and state of art
 - 1.a. The UCH in the region: brief history of the research
 - 1.b. The submerged sites of the region
 - 1.c. Museums and recent exhibitions
 - 1.d. Brief list of the GIS/portal/websites/social networks devoted to the UCH (if any)
and considerations about the availability of the information
 - 1.e. Schematic indications regarding the regional UCH

2. Data collection
 1. Underwater Cultural Heritage significance assessment
 2. UCH status of knowledge
 3. UCH in situ valorization and accessibility
 4. UCH Virtual Reality /Augmented Reality valorization
 5. UCH Museum and exhibition valorization
 6. UCH protection
 7. UCH vulnerability assessment
 8. UCH local involvement
 9. UCH fundraising
 10. UCH management
 11. Underwater tourism context and sustainability

3. Heritage community awareness

	LP FRIULI VENEZIA GIULIA	PP1 VENETO	PP2 RERA - KASTELA	PP4 PUGLIA
1.a - History	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.b - Submerged sites	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.c - Museums	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.d - GIS-portal/websites	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.e - Managment	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.1 - significance assessment	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.2 - UCH status of knowledge	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.3 - UCH in situ valorization and accessibility	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.4 - UCH Virtual Reality /Augmented Reality valorization	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.5. - UCH Museum and exhibition valorization	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.6. - UCH protection	✓	✓	✓	✓

2.7. - UCH vulnerability assessment	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.8. - UCH local involvement	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.9. - UCH fundraisin	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.10. - UCH management	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.11. - Underwater tourism context and sustainability	✓	✓	✓	✓
3 - Heritage community awareness	✓	✓	✓	✓