

# A Proposal for a FAIR Management of 3D Data in Cultural Heritage

## The Aldrovandi Digital Twin Case

*Sebastian Barzaghi<sup>1</sup>, Alice Bordignon<sup>2</sup>, Bianca Gualand<sup>2,3</sup>, Ivan Heib<sup>2</sup>, Arcangelo Massar<sup>2</sup>, Arianna Moretti<sup>2</sup>, Silvio Peroni<sup>2</sup>, Giulia Renda<sup>2</sup>*

*1 Department of Cultural Heritage, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna, via degli Ariani 1, Ravenna, Italy*

*2 Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna, Via Zamboni 32, Bologna, Italy*

*3 Research Division (ARIC), Research Services and Project Coordination Unit, Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna, Via Zamboni 33, Bologna, Italy*

## Abstract

In this article we analyse 3D models of cultural heritage with the aim of answering three main questions: what processes can be put in place to create a FAIR-by-design digital twin of a temporary exhibition? What are the main challenges in applying FAIR principles to 3D data in cultural heritage studies and how are they different from other types of data (e.g. images) from a data management perspective?

We begin with a comprehensive literature review touching on: FAIR principles applied to cultural heritage data; representation models; both Object Provenance Information (OPI) and Metadata Record Provenance Information (MRPI), respectively meant as, on the one hand, the detailed history and origin of an object, and - on the other hand - the detailed history and origin of the metadata itself, which describes the primary object (whether physical or digital); 3D models as cultural heritage research data and their creation, selection, publication, archival and preservation.

We then describe the process of creating the Aldrovandi Digital Twin, by collecting, storing and modelling data about cultural heritage objects and processes. We detail the many steps from the acquisition of the Digital Cultural Heritage Objects (DCHO), through to the upload of the optimised DCHO onto a web-based framework (ATON), with a focus on open technologies and standards for interoperability and preservation.

Using the *FAIR Principles for Heritage Library, Archive and Museum Collections* as a framework, we look in detail at how the Digital Twin implements FAIR principles at the object and metadata level. We then describe the main challenges we encountered and we summarise what seem to be the peculiarities of 3D cultural heritage data and the possible directions for further research in this field.

**Keywords:** FAIR principles, Cultural Heritage, research data, 3D models, FAIR-by-design, digital twin

# Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Related Works</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. FAIR principles and cultural heritage data	4
2.2. Representation models and crosswalks	6
2.3. Metadata Record Provenance Information and change tracking	8
2.4. 3D models as cultural heritage research data	8
2.4.1. 3D data creation and selection	10
2.4.2. 3D data complexity and formats	11
2.4.3. 3D model publication	13
2.4.4. 3D model archival and preservation	14
<b>3. Proposed Approach: The Aldrovandi Digital Twin Pilot</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4. Methodology</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1. Collecting and storing data about objects and processes	16
4.2. Modelling data about cultural heritage objects and processes	18
4.3. Towards the creation of DCHOs	18
4.3.1. Step 1: Acquisition phase	19
4.3.2. Step 2: Processing phase	19
4.3.3. Step 3: Modelling phase	19
4.3.4. Step 4: Optimisation phase	20
4.3.5. Step 5: Export phase	20
4.3.6. Step 6a: Metadata creation phase	20
4.3.7. Step 6b: Provenance creation phase	21
4.3.8. Step 7: Upload phase	22
4.4. Open technologies and standard formats for interoperability and preservation	22
4.5. Software for human-readable documentation and narratives	23
<b>5. Discussion and Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1. FAIR-by-design digital twin: lessons from the use case	24
5.1.1. Objects – in our case mostly 3D models	24
Findability: objects (physical and digital) have a globally unique persistent identifier and are described with metadata	24
Accessibility: digital objects are permanently accessible by sustainable storage (hardware, storage medium), open universal access protocols, version management, backups	25
Interoperability: digital objects are stored in preferred or acceptable formats	25
Reusability: digital objects have a date-timestamp and a licence for reuse, which is also available in a machine readable form	26
5.1.2. Metadata about the object (elementary level)	26
Findability: metadata specify the global persistent identifier (PID) of the object, which is used in all systems/databases that contain a description of the object in question, and metadata about specific objects are available via one or more searchable online repositories, catalogues, online databases, etc.	26
Accessibility: metadata specify information about an object's availability, obtainability and/or access options	26
Interoperability: metadata are available at least in one metadata schema	

appropriate for the specific type of object, are available in various additional generic standard data formats for other contexts, and contain references to other objects/authority files, by using other global persistent identifiers	26
Reusability: metadata specify the object's rights holder, OPI, and contain licence information referring to the object	27
5.1.3. Metadata records	27
Findability: metadata records have their own global persistent identifier	27
Accessibility: metadata records are machine readable and accessible using open universal protocols	27
Interoperable: metadata records must be of sufficient quality	27
Reusability: metadata specify the metadata record's provenance (MRPI), the entity responsible for the metadata record, the licence for reuse (also available in a machine-readable form)	28
5.2. Main challenges encountered	29
5.3. Peculiarities of 3D data and further research	31
<b>6. Acknowledgments</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7. CRediT authorship contribution statement</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>33</b>

## 1. Introduction

FAIR principles state that research data need to be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable and consist in a list of 15 recommendations that are “related, but independent and separable” [67, p.4]. The authors remain rather generic and leave it to the different research communities to figure out how the principles can be put in practice in the respective disciplines and research workflows [33, pp.3-4].

In 2020, the recommendations of the ALLEA E-Humanities Working Group defined data in the humanities as “all materials and assets scholars collect, generate and use during all stages of the research cycle” [33, p.8]. This definition seems to be increasingly accepted by humanities scholars [31; 35; 64], although some understandable resistance to the use of the term “data” remains [26; 27, p.1; 33, p.8].

The same report also highlights differences within the humanities, recognising that they themselves are diverse and that “data practices and demands vary significantly” [33, p.4]. All the same, many humanities researchers work with data made available by cultural heritage institutions which, while “not per se qualitatively different than data drawn from elsewhere”, present some specific management challenges [39; 65]. The aim of this article is to shed light on some of these challenges, describing how they have been tackled in our use case, which concerns the creation of a *digital twin* of a temporary exhibition (now closed) dedicated to Ulisse Aldrovandi entitled “The Other Renaissance: Ulisse Aldrovandi and the wonders of the world”<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://site.unibo.it/aldrovandi500/en/mostra-l-altro-rinascimento>

The creation of such a digital twin is part of the activities of the Project CHANGES (“Cultural Heritage Active Innovation For Next-Gen Sustainable Society”)<sup>2</sup> and specifically its Spoke 4, which is a line of research of the project dedicated to investigating the use of virtual technologies for the promotion, preservation, exploitation and enhancement of cultural heritage in museums and art collections [7, p.1]. The original exhibition was held between December 2022 and May 2023 in the Poggi Palace Museum in Bologna, Italy, and consisted of a collection of more than 200 objects, largely never exhibited before, mostly belonging to the naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605) and preserved by the University of Bologna [7, pp.3-4].

This exhibition, made up of a large set of different small/medium objects, has provided an ideal experimental ground to define some approaches and methods relating to the acquisition, processing, optimisation, metadata inclusion and online publication of 3D assets, to be subsequently applied to Spoke 4’s “core” case studies, which involve several “cultural institutions as representative of the different museum contexts in Italy” [7, p.2]. In this article we are going to focus on insights we have gained from the Aldrovandi Digital Twin pilot and in particular on the:

- Efforts made to produce cultural heritage data and metadata that are FAIR-by-design;
- Tracking of both the physical and digital Objects Provenance Information (OPI) and their Metadata Record Provenance Information (MRPI), respectively meant on the one hand as the detailed history and origin of an object, and - on the other hand - the detailed history and origin of the metadata itself, which describes the primary object (whether physical or digital);
- Peculiarities of 3D models, e.g. compared to 2D images, as cultural heritage data.

In doing so, this contribution seeks to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** What processes can be put in place to create a FAIR-by-design digital twin of a temporary exhibition?

**RQ2:** What are the main challenges in applying FAIR principles to 3D data in cultural heritage studies?

**RQ3:** From a data management viewpoint, how are 3D models “different from traditional digital images” [37]?

## 2. Related Works

### 2.1. FAIR principles and cultural heritage data

Applying FAIR principles to humanities data, and cultural heritage data in particular, is not necessarily a natural fit [66]. It has been noted how, rather than being domain-independent, these principles “have been implicitly designed according to underlying assumptions about how knowledge creation operates and communicates” [65, p.236]. These assumptions – that there is a wide agreement on the definition of data, that scholarly data and metadata are digital

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://sites.google.com/uniroma1.it/changes/>

by nature and that they are always created, and therefore owned, by researchers – certainly ring truer for traditionally data-driven disciplines than for the humanities.

FAIR principles have also been described as “confusing” in their wording and structure [39]. While the 2016 articles that first presented the principles states that they “apply not only to ‘data’ in the conventional sense, but also to the algorithms, tools, and workflows that led to that data” [67], this is not particularly useful to most researchers in the humanities. It is now generally understood that FAIR principles should apply to all kinds of research objects [4; 5; 33, p.8; 66], but the effort to “translate” the principles to research workflows that are not traditionally data-driven is ongoing.

When considering cultural heritage data, two main obstacles to the application of FAIR principles have been highlighted: the “lack of explicit attention for long-term preservation”, and the “excessive interwovenness of ‘data’ (or objects) and ‘metadata’” [39]. Indeed, in 2018 Koster and Woutersen-Windhouwer published a set of *FAIR Principles for Heritage Library, Archive and Museum Collections* that seeked to emphasise the role of metadata by identifying three different “levels”: the object level (e.g. books, artefacts, datasets), the object metadata level (e.g. title, creator) and the metadata records level (e.g. the body of metadata elements about the object) [39]. We will get back to this formulation of the principles in more detail in the discussion.

If we look at the wider ecosystem, other challenges to the widespread application of FAIR principles emerge, namely the fact that no sustainable data curation workflows have been established, that cultural institutions mostly create siloed and static digital libraries and may need guidance on how to digitise their holding in a way that is useful to contemporary, often computational, research [63, pp.1-2]. It is worth stressing that the availability of digitised cultural objects, even when paired with a download option, is not enough and that collections must be FAIR to be used as research data [39]. A possible solution to hasten innovation is to increase cooperation between galleries, libraries, archives, museums (GLAMs) on the one hand and researchers, data, information and computer scientists on the other [63, p.2]. As stated by the *Santa Barbara Statement on Collections as Data* [50] and, more recently, by the *Vancouver Statement on Collections as Data* [51], treating collections as data means encouraging the computational use of digitised and born digital collections but also committing to “respect the rights and needs of the communities who create content that constitute collections, those who are represented in collections, as well as the communities that use them” [51, p.3]. It entails many decisions relating to the selection, description, and access provision to be documented and shared and an alignment with emerging or established standards and infrastructures. Metadata are pivotal in developing trustworthy and long-lived collections, keeping in mind that it is an “ongoing process and does not necessarily conclude with a final version” [50, p.4].

Finally, the already cited DARIAH Position Paper *Cultural Heritage Data from a Humanities Research Perspective* reminds us that we need to “remain critical of equating virtual and physical manifestations and experiences of cultural heritage” [63]. Indeed, the recent *Cultural Heritage Image Sharing Recommendations Report* by the WorldFAIR Project states that:

*[T]he GLAM [Galleries, Libraries, Archives and Museums] sector has a conceptual problem to overcome in the assumption that digital representations of images are mere surrogates for original objects. The digital files made available on image sharing*

*platforms are unarguably primary research objects in and of themselves, and information about those objects is important to communicate [38, p.16].*

Therefore, the report recommends the adoption of a formal citation model for cultural heritage images [38, p.16]. Circling back to FAIR principles, and to cultural heritage objects in general, interesting work is currently being carried out within RDA, with the support of EOSC Future, to design an interoperable and FAIR-enabler citation model applicable to digital objects in the Cultural Heritage sector [12].

## 2.2. Representation models and crosswalks

As Koster and Woutersen-Windhouwer [39] pointed out, the deep interconnection between the data or objects and the metadata describing them is a substantial trait of cultural heritage collections. In the digital domain, the presence of metadata enables the long-term preservation of cultural heritage collections, as well as the possibility of keeping track of both OPI and MRPI, while ensuring trustworthiness.

As we have seen, working with data provided by cultural heritage institutions may present specific challenges. Part of the problem consists of the not-yet fully overcome conception that digital artefacts are just surrogates of the tangible original pieces. In addition, the majority of cultural heritage experts are not used to data-driven approaches and people who are experts on the data models and the information content of the metadata are often not proficient in the use of the technologies needed for metadata exchange, management, and interconnection.

Moreover, the varied nature of the cultural patrimony results in the proliferation of representation models and formats for the representation of digital artefacts. Indeed, because of the variety of materials preserved in archives, museums, and libraries, data and metadata are described with models that are inhomogeneous in purpose, degree of formalisation, and semantic richness, resulting in more complex mappings and exchanges. This condition highlights the need to make resources interoperable, which is the primary condition to exploit the potential joint use of variously formalised data [67].

As of today, projects aimed at enhancing cultural heritage in the digital ecosystem with the goal of producing FAIR data by design are still relatively few and highly complex. The adopted solutions are often ad hoc, and the absence of a generally shared formal workflow makes the process resource-intensive. For example, the challenging crosswalk for the management of photographs of works of art in the Zeri Photographic Archive required the development of two ad hoc ontologies, an RDF mapping of the descriptive elements of the catalogue, the conversion of the data originally described according to the F and OA metadata cards of the ICCD into CIDOC-CRM and the two new models, and the creation of an RDF dataset of the data obtained from the mapping [20]. In similar situations, clear guidelines for sustainable cultural digital artefacts generation and management would reduce costs, timelines, and risk of semantic loss, facilitating the usage of cultural heritage data as FAIR digital objects.

The close interconnection between digital cultural artefacts and their metadata, coupled with complex and heterogeneous forms of metadata creation, makes the issue of interconnection and information exchange between differently modelled knowledge systems a particularly thorny matter. Indeed, creating integrated knowledge systems in this domain often requires

the use of data and metadata in formats other than those in which they originally were structured.

The terminological expression *schema crosswalk* refers to the mapping between conceptualization systems that describe at least partially overlapping domains to identify points of contact and divergence, facilitating exchanges. In this regard, the Interoperability Task Force of the EOSC Executive Board FAIR Working Group produced a report to provide a framework (i.e. the EOSC Interoperability Framework) for internal and external use, including some directives to facilitate cooperation for data exchange [16]. Among the causes of poor metadata quality for describing digital objects, the EOSC Interoperability Framework mentions mismatches between the updates of semantic artefacts, vocabularies, metadata management software components, and administered data; compelled adjustments in metadata conversions; and aggregators that allow the unsupervised inclusion of freely structured metadata. The proposed solution emphasises the key importance of interoperability at various levels: technological, semantic, organisational, and legal, to which is added a syntactic sub-layer to connect the first two. In Appendix I of the paper, a crosswalk of data models, controlled vocabularies, and aggregators' guidelines is presented.

Another remarkable crosswalk between the most common schemas and metadata management guidelines for describing digital objects was published on Zenodo by Milan Ojsteršek [49]. The document maps some basic properties of the most widely used vocabularies and presents relevant classifications for each of the source schemas, including Datacite 4.3<sup>3</sup>, DCAT 2.0<sup>4</sup> and DCAT Application profile 2.0.0<sup>5</sup>, Crossref Schema<sup>6</sup>, Schema.org<sup>7</sup>, OpenAIRE<sup>8</sup>, and Bioschemas<sup>9</sup>.

Both of these works denote a growing awareness of the increasingly perceived importance of metadata systems for digital objects, particularly those related to cultural heritage, which enable their enhancement and, most importantly, interconnection.

As explained in detail later in this article, in the case of the Aldrovandi Digital Twin we had to reshape information structured in tabular format into a Resource Description Framework (RDF) format [17] serialisation or to use systems to query it as if it was structured in RDF to exploit Semantic Web technologies. The tools aimed at accessing information as Linked Open Data rely on different approaches, generally based on format reengineering, SPARQL extensions, or hybrid solutions.

A solution proposed at the very beginning of the state-of-the-art evaluation process was *D2RQ*<sup>10</sup>. It is a system for accessing the contents of relational databases as RDF graphs, thanks to a server in which a conversion of SPARQL query to SQL is implemented [13]. Subsequently, the advent of *Triplify* signalled one of the first steps of an emerging trend of

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://schema.datacite.org/meta/kernel-4.3/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.w3.org/TR/vocab-dcat-2/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/semantic-interoperability-community-semic/solution/dcat-application-profile-data-portals-europe>

<sup>6</sup> [https://data.crossref.org/reports/help/schema\\_doc/4.4.2/schema\\_4\\_4\\_2.html](https://data.crossref.org/reports/help/schema_doc/4.4.2/schema_4_4_2.html)

<sup>7</sup> <https://schema.org/docs/schemas.html>

<sup>8</sup> <https://openaire-guidelines-for-cris-managers.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://bioschemas.org/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://d2rq.org/>

software components that could be integrated into other applications for converting data from relational databases to RDF. It allows preserving semantic content by mapping HTTP-URI requests to SQL queries [3]. Among the direct conversion tools that allow access to the content of other formats as if they were RDF structured, *Any23*<sup>11</sup>, *JSON2RDF*<sup>12</sup>, *CSV2RDF*<sup>13</sup> should be mentioned. However, none of these seeks a unique abstraction for format management [18].

*RDF Mapping Language (RML)*<sup>14</sup> was launched as a forerunner approach for format reengineering according to the RDF model as a consequence of the use of SPARQL. It is a generic mapping language with customizable rules independent of specific implementations, with the advantage of also enabling the querying of relational databases [23]. On the other hand, *SPARQL Generate* extends the SPARQL syntax for generating RDF or textual streams. This is a declarative transformation language, and it can be integrated with mediating query languages such as XPath<sup>15</sup> to handle new sources [41].

One of the latest advancements in the state of the art in Linked Data exploitation is *Facade-x* [19]. It is a generic meta-model to query various resources as if they were structured as RDF format serialisations without extending SPARQL syntax, thanks to the use of wrappers. The process implies automated reengineering to the target meta-model and domain knowledge reframing to the new model by an RDF and SPARQL expert. The approach is instantiated in *SPARQL Anything*<sup>16</sup>, a reengineering system for querying any type of structured data using SPARQL and building knowledge graphs, without the need to acquire expertise in a particular mapping language or an in-depth understanding of formats. At the technical level, it implements a set of transformers mapped to various media types, extendable with Java classes [2].

## 2.3. Metadata Record Provenance Information and change tracking

MRPI, in the context of digital cultural heritage, refers to the documentation of the history and origin of data. This includes information about who created the data, when it was created, and the primary sources [30]. The importance of MRPI lies in its ability to provide a comprehensive history of the data, ensuring its authenticity and reliability. In digital cultural heritage, where accuracy and authenticity are paramount, MRPI offers a way to maintain the integrity of data over time.

One possible way for storing provenance and tracking data changes is the OpenCitations Data Model (OCDM) [21]. OCDM is a framework that facilitates the documentation of the complete history of digital artefacts using Semantic Web technologies. It helps in creating snapshots every time an entity is created, modified, merged or deleted, storing these snapshots within a provenance named graph. These snapshots record the validity dates, responsible agents, primary sources, and a link to the previous snapshot, offering a clear and traceable lineage of data modifications.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://any23.apache.org/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://github.com/AtomGraph/JSON2RDF>

<sup>13</sup> <https://clarkparsia.github.io/csv2rdf/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://rml.io/>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.w3.org/TR/xpath/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://sparql-anything.cc/>



Change tracking complements MRPI by providing insights into the evolution of data. It involves monitoring and recording each alteration made to the digital artefacts. This aspect is crucial in cultural heritage projects where digital representations of artefacts evolve over time, either due to new discoveries or technological advancements in digitisation techniques.

## 2.4. 3D models as cultural heritage research data

Currently, the literature delving into FAIR principles and research data management in the humanities does not devote much attention to 3D models as research data, perhaps because their uptake in the cultural heritage sector is currently low [38]. A recent report suggests that “the purpose and value of 3D imaging [...] will probably be very different from traditional digital images” and may require different policies and technologies to make them accessible and preservable [37].

While it can be argued that 2D digitisation should remain the priority in order to provide full-text access to documental heritage [63], we should keep in mind that content in the form of text is not always the focus of cultural heritage research and 3D models can bring to light different aspects of cultural objects and enable different types of analysis. The Guidelines published by the Italian Ministry of Culture as part of the *Piano nazionale di digitalizzazione del patrimonio culturale* (*National cultural heritage digitisation plan*, in English), for example, move in this direction by including a short section on 3D digitisation, to be developed further in future versions of the document [43].

However, there is certainly still a lack of shared standards for the publication and exchange of digital heritage 3D assets, limiting access and use of published resources. In their study, Bajena & Kuroczyński [6] highlight that metadata accompanying the models often does not allow a full assessment of the relevance of the model for further use scenarios. Additionally, a significant amount of digital assets is not made available to the scientific community as it is stored in private archives on personal computers. Different scientific digital heritage developers have formed smaller groups with different priorities regarding the publication of 3D models, leading to the emergence of various platforms for sharing 3D data. However, the visibility of scientific platforms is currently negligible compared to commercially owned repositories. In their study, Bajena & Kuroczyński document the results from a series of workshops organised to bring together representatives from various 3D repositories to exchange experiences and seek common ground on metadata. The participants in the workshops visualised their metadata schemas and explored the mapping across the repositories, seeking similarities between the structural elements and individual fields. The compilation of multiple documentation schemas was then used to develop an approach for the creation of universal documentation metadata patterns that could guide the work on the standardisation of 3D models of cultural heritage [6].

In fact, there has been a growing recognition of the importance of scientifically publishing 3D models and the crucial role of metadata in standardising such a process. Blundell et al. [14] provide recommendations for metadata practices throughout the digital asset lifecycle, aiding in the organisation, verification, and access of 3D data. In their study, they highlight the need for different metadata requirements in various disciplines and industries that use 3D data, such as reproducibility and privacy concerns, and the use of metadata standards like Dublin Core, PREMIS, and VRA Core to address specific metadata needs for 3D models. While addressing

the limitations of their study (such as the limited number of responses and disciplinary representation in the surveys), they emphasise the need for further community-driven work to develop and refine a metadata standard that is truly cross-disciplinary and widely interoperable. The recommendations in the paper provide necessary categories of metadata for the emerging adaptable and flexible standard, but domain-specific work is still in progress to provide 3D-specific field options.

Fritsch [29] describes the tasks that need to be considered when presenting and publishing 3D data with a web viewer in line with the FAIR data principles, and highlights the importance of well-documented and enriched 3D models of archaeological objects, including real-world coordinates and accurate colours, for the data to be used further. He also emphasises the aim of making 3D data interactive and visible when publishing single 3D models in an article, in accordance with the FAIR data principles. Thus, a 3D web viewer is essential for publishing archaeological data, but additional elements beyond a compressed version of the 3D model must be considered, such as metadata for scientific publication, as well as providing both a “presentation model” and an “archiving model” of the 3D data can be a practical solution. Overall, precise publication guidelines, including file formats and uniform orientation, are needed to bridge the gap between 3D models, web viewer requirements, and compliance with FAIR principles.

Quantin et al. [55] presents a solution aligned with the FAIR principles for long-term archiving combined with online publication of 3D research data in the humanities. The authors have developed a new metadata schema, aligned with standard vocabularies and mapped to the Europeana Data Model (EDM)<sup>17</sup>, that allows for a more precise description of 3D models, greater openness to non-archaeological humanities fields, and better FAIR compliance. Although its limited applicability to completed projects and models, it provides a framework for organising and documenting 3D research data in the humanities, facilitating its long-term archiving and publication.

### 2.4.1. 3D data creation and selection

The practical idea of providing a “presentation model” and an “archiving model” [29] implies the use of different 3D formats, including different ways of managing 3D content. Therefore, there are many 3D file format types with a wide range of capabilities, due to the different methods with which 3D data can be created and the different environments in which it can be used or re-used.

Before discussing the methods used for 3D data preservation and publication, it is crucial to first address the problem of data selection. 3D models are the output of a process that uses several different data acquisition methods, such as scanning and image-based modelling. Depending on the acquisition technique, different data types are obtained. Cultural heritage artefacts’ 3D capturing is today possible due to the accessibility of affordable, precise entry-level techniques that use the principles of Structure from Motion (SfM) or Structured Light Scanning (SLS). Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), computed tomography (CT), and industrial-grade high-resolution SLS are also being used more frequently, depending on the

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://pro.europeana.eu/page/edm-documentation>

task at hand [36]. In all cases, content producers are generally encouraged to provide their data, both raw and final, as much as feasible [44].

The 3D content obtained from the survey generally goes through different phases: an unprocessed, just-captured state; a final, complete version; and a restricted access state. When creating data, it is best practice to periodically save files to prevent data loss during processing. Thus, creators will have different versions of data or derivatives to store, which can be costly, especially for scanner raw data. According to a survey conducted in 2019 by Moore et al. [44] about 3D data management involving creators, repository managers, and creator-managers, 3D data storage and size were reported to be one of the biggest challenges to face. While maintaining two versions of a 3D model ought to be easy, offering raw data long-term archiving presents another difficulty [29]. The preservation of single raw scans and final point clouds for SLS is recommended, and the same goes for the source photos used for SfM (ideally in uncompressed TIFF format). In the digital archive or repository, the project, scans, photos, and registration metadata must also be linked to the data. Despite storage costs<sup>18</sup>, keeping both raw and processed data was reported to be the basic and essential step of data preservation in the scientific field by the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) and the Center of Digital Antiquity both regarding data obtained from laser scans [52] and close-range photogrammetry [9]. Although 3D technology has advanced significantly, it is likely it will improve further. Retaining the raw data may be helpful for future reprocessing, to obtain an even better final 3D model.

#### 2.4.2. 3D data complexity and formats

The processing of raw data will obtain a first full-sized processed model, then optimised to obtain a suitable and performing second version for web publication. Depending on the environment of use and project goals, the selection of the format to use can change. A 3D file stores 3D models' information in a machine-readable format that consists of binary or plain text data [56]. There are currently more than 140 3D formats, but this does not mean that all of them are or will remain popular [15].

When Knazook et al. [38] write that “the purpose and value of 3D imaging” makes it “very different from traditional digital images”, they probably refer to the complexity of 3D data. Therefore, a fundamental understanding of this *complexity* is extremely important, and helps choose the appropriate formats for 3D content archival preservation and dissemination. This choice depends especially on a) how many 3D features can be stored and which ones are lost during the conversion; and b) the interoperability of the format across different software.

Starting from the first aspect, the main key features of a 3D file are *geometry*, *appearance*, *scene* [42], and *animation* [56].

The geometry consists of the surface data (polygons or faces), data points (vertices), and the capacity to modify the geometry after exporting. Storing geometry is the most basic function of any 3D file format. To fully describe a model's appearance, surface properties must be

---

<sup>18</sup> [...] *storage* covers not only the size of the media on which data is stored and backed up, but also encompasses the ongoing periodic process of data refreshment (the movement of datasets to new hardware or software environments). While the cost of physical storage continues to decrease, that of refreshment and long-term curation—key factors in continuing to make data accessible and available—does not. In addition, in order to take advantage of technological advances and decreasing costs in certain areas, archives have to periodically upgrade systems or parts thereof.” [47].

stored in addition to the 3D model geometry. A highly realistic 3D model can be produced by combining material properties, textures, and colour information.

The appearance is the texture that is mapped to a model's surface (including transparency, colour diffusion, and reflection), its environment, and lights (including colour and position). Data about the model's appearance can be encoded in different ways. One of the most used methods is texture mapping, the process through which a 3D model surface is rendered by projecting 2D images (texture) onto it. Texture mapping is supported by the majority of 3D file formats; however, depending on the format, the 2D image containing texture information could be kept in another file, stored commonly in PNG/JPG formats. Attributing a set of properties to each mesh face is another popular method of storing texture data. Colour, texture, and material type are examples of common attributes. Furthermore, a surface may contain a specular component that represents the hue and strength of real mirror reflections from surrounding surfaces and light sources. Materials in this sense can be modelled to give an object the appropriate reflectance quality. For example, a wooden table will have different reflective qualities than a glass table. Parameters are used to describe the refraction and reflection of various types of light (ambient, specular, diffuse, transparent, emissive, etc.). Additional methods for affecting a model's appearance are the application of normal, bump, and transparency maps, which need a parameterization to be defined on the 3D model's surface. As texture, this kind of maps can be stored separately depending on the format used. Finally, in the rendering process, "shaders" implement surface properties. Shaders are essentially collections of instructions that specify how each pixel or vertex should be rendered. A shader can appear to have different surface properties, such as a smooth surface, by using a variety of algorithms and considering different light sources. Modern methods usually focus on a few key physical attributes, such as metallic properties, emissivity, roughness, and albedo, to accurately represent complex materials (also referred to as "PBR" or physically-based rendering models). In some cases, such as 3D printing, the appearance is not essential. However, in 3D artefacts for archeology documentation and visualisation, appearance is considered extremely relevant [29].

The scene includes information about the light sources, the cameras, and, if any, other 3D models. The 3D file itself can store information about the position and characteristics of any cameras as well as the locations, colours, and intensities of light sources. Occasionally, the 3D model's spatial relationship to other models is also stored. This is especially crucial if the model consists of multiple pieces that must be assembled in a specific order to create the scene. It should be noted that scene information is not supported by most 3D file formats. Frequently, this data is superfluous (except for some cases, such as video game design) and would unnecessarily increase the file size.

Similar to scene details, animations are not compatible with all file formats. Nonetheless, several formats do contain animation data for use in applications where it is required, such as films' animated scenes, or video game design. Additional data must be stored for animation and interaction. These factors must be considered when evaluating archiving formats, metadata levels, and documentation requirements.

The second essential aspect affecting the choice of a 3D format is its interoperability across different software. To define a level of interoperability for each format, we have to define first if it is proprietary or neutral. Proprietary formats have been conceived to work on specific software, for example Blender's BLEND file and AutoCAD's DWG file. A neutral 3D format enables collaboration and flexibility, with different people working with different CAD software on the same file. STL, OBJ (ASCII variant), PLY, and 3MF, are examples of neutral formats.

According to the All3DP platform, which is focused on 3D printing, the most common formats updated to 2023 are STL, OBJ, FBX, COLLADA, and 3DS [56]. Also, heritage communities are using glTF and PLY formats more frequently, according to a recent Sketchfab survey [15; 44]. However, 3D data type is now included in the Library of Congress's suggested format standards for 2020–2021<sup>19</sup>: among the most popular formats, OBJ, STL, and PLY are listed as acceptable formats for 3D object outputs from photogrammetry as of September 2020. Many of the mentioned formats, although not all of them, are program-neutral.

To facilitate the collaboration between different institutions and scholars involved in the field, and the long-term preservation of 3D data, the use of open, program-neutral file formats is recommended. Since neutral file formats are more interoperable and reusable, they also align better with FAIR principles. However, proprietary formats of raw data are generally preferred because, when converting raw data to non-proprietary formats, metadata embedded in the file is frequently lost [44]. In this context, choosing neutral formats that allow for structured and customised embedded metadata can facilitate the process (e.g. PLY), while preserving and making accessible the original proprietary files is also recommended. As of this publication, there is not a universally shared file format able to solve all the complexities involved, which makes interoperability even more challenging.

### 2.4.3. 3D model publication

Concerning 3D models publication, as mentioned above, web-based 3D viewers are essential for their larger-scale accessibility in terms of visualisation, interaction, and metadata enrichment. The most widely used commercial software available today is Sketchfab<sup>20</sup>. Users still own their content, but Sketchfab has size restrictions on the hosted models both on free and paid versions [44]. On the other side, self-hosted viewers have been developed, such as Voyager<sup>21</sup> from Smithsonian, 3DHOP<sup>22</sup> from the Visual Computing Laboratory at the Institute of Information Science and Technology (CNR-ISTI), or the ATON<sup>23</sup> framework developed by CNR-ISPC [28]. A self-hosted viewer gives more control over the generated data and avoids size restrictions on the model. However, many models require an optimised or reduced version for distribution to meet hardware requirements or make loading times reasonable. Yet, if high-poly versions of a model are available and downloadable for close examination, measurement, or detailed comparison, desktop programs like MeshLab<sup>24</sup> or CloudCompare<sup>25</sup> for scanned and photography-based models are needed.

Champion and Rahaman [15] analysed the most popular available commercial and institutional platforms for downloading, trading, sharing, and hosting 3D models, defining some useful features in the scholarly field of 3D digital heritage. Despite the growing number of 3D models, there are still few online libraries and accessible platforms on which the GLAM sector can rely on. Moreover, the functions offered are still limited and under development. Since institutional platforms usually do not have links to external websites or portals, finding specific 3D models and related information can be very challenging. On the other side, commercial platforms offer some consistent protocols and formats, and finding and accessing their 3D

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/design3D.html>

<sup>20</sup> <https://sketchfab.com/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://smithsonian.github.io/dpo-voyager/>

<sup>22</sup> <https://3dhop.net/>

<sup>23</sup> <https://osiris.itabc.cnr.it/aton/>

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.meshlab.net/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.cloudcompare.org/>

models is becoming easier than in institutional options. Moreover, the public is usually not allowed to upload 3D material to institutional platforms, unlike in commercial platforms. Alternatively, they provide limitless free downloads with restrictions on file formats. However, most of both commercial and non-commercial portals fail to offer pertinent data and links to additional resources for usage and research. Most commercial model platforms, including TurboSquid<sup>26</sup>, CGTrader<sup>27</sup>, and ShareCG<sup>28</sup>, generally lack both OPI and MRPI. Surprisingly, neither institutional nor commercial options typically have integrated 3D viewers: in most cases, a 2D image or video preview is provided before downloading any 3D content. Finally, aside from Europeana<sup>29</sup>, Sketchfab, and P3D<sup>30</sup>, there seem to be no other initiatives for giving persistent identifiers (e.g. DOIs) to the hosted 3D digital model [15].

#### 2.4.4. 3D model archival and preservation

Regarding the availability of infrastructures for the long-term preservation of 3D cultural heritage data, a search on Re3Data<sup>31</sup>, an internationally recognised registry of research data repositories, shows a total of only 23 results. The search has been carried out by typing the string “3D” in the search bar – as there is no suitable filter in the “Content Type” list – and by selecting “Humanities and Social Sciences” from the available subject areas in order to filter out infrastructure dedicated to 3D data in the natural science, medicine, engineering and more.

Of the 23 repositories found on Re3data:

- Three have a specific focus on 3D data. They are Open Heritage 3D<sup>32</sup>, MorphoSource<sup>33</sup>, and the French National 3D Data Repository<sup>34</sup>.
- Three are institutional repositories dedicated to different types of research data, including 3D. They are linked to cultural heritage institutions in two cases, the Smithsonian<sup>35</sup> and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek<sup>36</sup>, and to Washington University<sup>37</sup> in the other.
- Three repositories focus on open data from specific cities or regions of the World (Coquitlam Open Data<sup>38</sup>, Thunder Bay Open Data Portal<sup>39</sup>, Open Data DK<sup>40</sup>) and seem to include 3D among many other types of data and only on the condition they are published under open licences.

---

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.turbosquid.com/it/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.cgtrader.com/>

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.sharecg.com/>

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.europeana.eu/it>

<sup>30</sup> <https://p3d.in/>

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.re3data.org/>

<sup>32</sup> <https://openheritage3d.org/>

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.morphosource.org/>

<sup>34</sup> <https://3d.humanities.science/>

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.si.edu/openaccess>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/>

<sup>37</sup> <https://data.library.wustl.edu/>

<sup>38</sup> <https://data.coquitlam.ca/>

<sup>39</sup> <https://opendata.thunderbay.ca/>

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.opendata.dk/>

- Two have a disciplinary scope, specialising in geographical and archaeological data, including in 3D format. They are ArcGIS Living Atlas of the World<sup>41</sup> and the Archaeological Map of the Czech Republic<sup>42</sup>.
- Two can be considered generalist repositories, without a specific disciplinary or institutional mission: Open Science Resource Atlas<sup>43</sup> and PAC - Archiving Platform CINES (currently unavailable).
- Finally, nine repositories are linked to research projects and host the relative research data, including 3D. These all belong to the publisher Topoi Edition<sup>44</sup>, which has its own entry on the list of results, bringing them to 23.

This short survey is of course partial and does not necessarily depict a precise picture of the current situation. On the one hand, these repositories do not necessarily host actual 3D models, they just include somewhere in their documentation the term “3D”. However, the lack of a suitable content type that can be used to reliably filter the results is probably a sign of how marginal 3D content still is. On the other hand, although Re3data is a reliable tool<sup>45</sup>, there may be many more data infrastructures that have the technical capacity of hosting 3D models and are simply not (yet) listed on Re3data. The same search repeated of FAIRsharing however does not seem to yield noticeably different results.

### 3. Proposed Approach: The Aldrovandi Digital Twin Pilot

The original list of FAIR principles [67] has in time been customised to adapt to other research objects – one well known example being research software [8]. Indeed, a few years earlier, Koster and Woutersen-Windhouver [39] had proposed their own version of the principles for library, archive and museum collections, summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. FAIR principles customised for library, archive and museum collections [39].

	<b>Objects</b>	<b>Metadata about the object (elementary level)</b>	<b>Metadata records</b>
<b>Findable</b>	Objects (physical and digital) have a globally unique persistent identifier.  Objects are described with metadata.	Metadata specify the global persistent identifier (PID) of the object. This PID is used in all systems/databases that contain a description of the object in question.  Metadata about specific objects are available via one or more searchable online repositories,	Metadata records have their own global persistent identifier.

<sup>41</sup> <https://livingatlas.arcgis.com/en/home/>

<sup>42</sup> <https://digiarchiv.aiscr.cz>

<sup>43</sup> <https://zasobynauki.pl/>

<sup>44</sup> <https://www.re3data.org/repository/r3d100012470>

<sup>45</sup> For example, it has recently been used, alongside FAIRsharing (<https://fairsharing.org/>), in a study commissioned by the European Research Council Executive Agency on the readiness of research data repositories.

		catalogues, online databases, etc.	
<b>Accessible</b>	Digital objects are permanently accessible by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainable storage (hardware, storage medium)</li> <li>• Open universal access protocols</li> <li>• Version management</li> <li>• Backups.</li> </ul>	Metadata specify information about an object's availability, obtainability and/or access options.	Metadata records are machine readable.  Metadata records are accessible using open universal protocols.
<b>Interoperable</b>	Digital objects are stored in preferred or acceptable formats.	Metadata are available at least in one metadata schema appropriate for the specific type of object.  Metadata are available in various additional generic standard data formats for other contexts.  Metadata contain links/references to other objects/authority files, by using other global persistent identifiers.	Metadata records must be of sufficient quality.
<b>Reusable</b>	Digital objects have a date-timestamp.  Objects have a licence for reuse, which is also available in a machine readable form.	Metadata specify the object's rights holder.  Metadata contain licence information referring to the object.  Metadata specify the object's provenance.	Metadata specify the metadata record's provenance.  Metadata specify the entity responsible for the metadata record.  Metadata records have their own licence for reuse, which is also available in a machine-readable form.

In this article we discuss the application of this extended version of the FAIR principles to 3D cultural heritage data through the lens of the Aldrovandi Digital Twin introduced in [Section 1](#). The next section describes the workflow for the creation of the digital twin with special attention to the creation, reuse and management of cultural heritage data and to the application of FAIR principles throughout. In it, we try to follow the chronological order as much as possible. In [Section 5](#), we answer our research questions, highlight the challenges that emerged in the process and we suggest some directions for future work.



## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Collecting and storing data about objects and processes

The digitisation workflow started with the creation of two tabular datasets: one for storing bibliographic and catalogue data (*bibliographic data* from now on) about the physical *cultural heritage objects* (CHOs from now on) included in the temporary exhibition, and another for data concerning the acquisition and digitisation process (*process data* from now on). Process data were eventually instrumental to the creation of the metadata accompanying 3D models representing the *digital cultural heritage object* (DCHO from now on) created in the digitisation process.

The table structure was conceptualised, defining column names, expected cell data, and controlled values for specific columns (e.g. object type). To facilitate the process of data entry in terms of technical skills, timing, and collaborative needs, both tables were hosted on Google Spreadsheet. The two tables were populated in parallel, paying great attention to consistency. Official sources – such as the official exhibition catalogue, preliminary unstructured notes created by exhibition curators as drafts of the exhibit organisation, and other museum cataloguing records – were used to collect bibliographic data, while the collection of process data was performed during the acquisition and digitisation activities.

Process data column names were structured according to the various steps of the acquisition and digitisation process and included all the relevant attributes to track each step. In particular, as summarised in Figure 1, the *Acquisition phase* (step 1) aimed to capture CHOs and the raw material needed to create the related DCHOs. The information related to the acquisition phase included: the *unit* responsible for addressing a CHO; the *people* responsible for carrying out its acquisition; the *technique* used to capture the raw material of the CHO; the *tools* used to perform the acquisition activity; and the *dates* when the acquisition process was initiated and completed.

The acquisition phase was then followed by a series of software activities (steps 2-7), i.e. the phases that involved various software tools and applications to process, transform, and publish the digital versions of the raw material acquired in the previous phase. Although the software activities can vary depending on the nature of the materials being digitised and the intended use of the digital files, our tracked work included the following phases in the digitisation process of all objects: *Processing phase* (step 2), to manipulate the raw material produced during the acquisition phase, obtaining a first processed raw model; *Modelling phase* (step 3), to fix possible topological issues of the processed raw model, obtaining the high-poly DCHO; *Optimisation phase* (step 4), to optimise the high-poly DCHO for specific purposes or use cases, obtaining an optimised DCHO; *Export phase* (step 5), to convert the DCHO into a specific format; *Metadata creation phase* (step 6a), to create structured information of bibliographic and process data of the CHO and DCHO; *Provenance creation phase* (step 6b), focused on the creation of MRPI to track the agent responsible for bibliographic/process data creation, the time of data creation, and the primary source of the data; *Upload phase* (step 7), to the optimised DCHO from a local device or storage location to a Web-based framework (e.g. ATON).




Fig. 1: The acquisition and digitisation process (described in more detail below).

The DCHO created and the related metadata were pivotal in creating an exhaustive record of the entire digitisation process, facilitating monitoring of each CHO/DCHO status and evaluating the project's overall success. Additionally, they ensure the long-term preservation and accessibility of DCHOs and allow for in-depth analysis of the acquisition and digitisation dynamics, which can vary significantly in duration, depending on the project scope and the unique characteristics of each CHO.

## 4.2. Modelling data about cultural heritage objects and processes

As information was entered in both bibliographic and process data tables, a further effort was made to prepare them to be published as machine-actionable data [22] compliant with FAIR principles, adopting a formal, accessible, shared, and broadly applicable language for knowledge representation [67].

To exploit the bibliographic and process data tables, the information structured in tabular format had to be converted into a Resource Description Framework (RDF) format [17]. Moreover, to maximise data reuse and interlinking to other existing resources, certain data values were aligned with terms of existing knowledge graphs (such as WikiData<sup>46</sup>) and identifiers defined by authority lists (e.g. VIAF<sup>47</sup> and ULAN<sup>48</sup>). Thus, starting from the information used to populate the table cells, a OWL ontology called *Cultural Heritage Acquisition and Digitisation Application Profile* (CHAD-AP)<sup>49</sup> was developed for describing cultural heritage digitisation data and processes [11]. More precisely, CHAD-AP can be logically split into two separate abstract modules:

<sup>46</sup> <https://www.wikidata.org/>

<sup>47</sup> <https://viaf.org/>

<sup>48</sup> <https://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/ulan/>

<sup>49</sup> <https://w3id.org/dharc/ontology/chad-ap>

- an Object Module (OM) based on the CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model (CIDOC CRM)<sup>50</sup> [24] and designed from the bibliographic data to describe the CHO's characteristics and contextual information;
- a Process Module (PM) based on both CIDOC CRM and its extension CRM Digital (CRMdig)<sup>51</sup> [25] for describing the process data.

CHAD-AP was developed with the Simplified Agile Methodology for Ontology Development (SAMOD) [54], an iterative process for developing fully documented and tested ontologies, thus ensuring that both the model and the development process itself are accountable and reproducible. Moreover, the reuse of CIDOC-CRM as a foundational framework provided a well-founded and shared structure, largely adopted in cultural heritage projects, to standardise the semantics of both the CHOs and the process for creating the related DCHOs, represent their nuances, and promote their interoperability with other existing models in the cultural heritage domain.

### 4.3. Towards the creation of DCHOs

In this section, we describe the main activities of all the phases, introduced in Figure 1, that characterise the acquisition and digitisation process.

#### 4.3.1. Step 1: Acquisition phase

During this step, raw material of each CHO is captured using photogrammetry or structured light scanner (SLS) acquisition techniques.

Many objects of the exhibition have been acquired through SLS, “a high-precision survey methodology based on a very tight light pattern projection of non-coherent and diffuse radiation onto the objects’ surface” [7]. In this case, the raw material obtained is a 3D point cloud stored in PLY format (Polygon File Format).

The remaining CHOs were acquired using digital photogrammetric techniques, employing different configurations and instrumentation depending on the CHO's size, materials, and conditions. Photographs have been shot in RAW format. Camera Raw<sup>52</sup> and RawTherapee<sup>53</sup> were used to process the images, then exported in TIFF format using LZW compression, able to maintain the information quality by reducing the file size [7].

#### 4.3.2. Step 2: Processing phase

The raw materials obtained in the previous step are manipulated and processed using software tools. As concerns scanned data, the 3D point cloud obtained is then cleaned through a noise removal algorithm and consequently densified through a fusion algorithm to obtain a solid 3D mesh. Some limits were applied during the process to manage the complexity and weight of scanned 3D data: a range of 500,000 to 1,000,000 polygons was defined, and a maximum resolution of 16,384x16,384 pixels for the PNG/JPG textures applied onto the

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.cidoc-crm.org/cidoc-crm/>

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.ics.forth.gr/isl/CRMdig/>

<sup>52</sup> <https://helpx.adobe.com/camera-raw/using/supported-cameras.html>

<sup>53</sup> <https://www.rawtherapee.com/>

model. The photogrammetry data processing, on the other side, includes the extraction of homologous points, camera orientation, the scale of the object, the creation of the dense point cloud, mesh generation, and final projection of texture images onto the model using Structure from Motion (SfM) software. The main software used was Agisoft Metashape<sup>54</sup> and 3DF Zephyr<sup>55</sup>, while the concrete use of the open-source Meshroom based on the AliceVision<sup>56</sup> network is under test. The file weight of the processed raw model obtained from photogrammetric techniques is significantly smaller than that obtained by structural laser scanner: depending on the object complexity, a maximum amount of polygons is defined directly in the SfM software, the same as the number of textures. In the case of structured light acquisitions, the final weight of each processed raw model is a maximum of 800MB.

### 4.3.3. Step 3: Modelling phase

In this step, the high-poly DCHO is created using software tools. In our case, Blender<sup>57</sup> was the main software used to manually fix some geometry issues in the processed raw model obtained from the processing phase. Such geometry problems that need to be fixed depend on several factors: the survey environment conditions, the tools and methodologies with which the acquisition was carried out, and the precision and accuracy of the processed data obtained, among others. In some cases, once the topology issues have been fixed, a re-meshing is performed to give a regular topology to the reconstructed parts of the mesh. The final result is a *high-poly* DCHO, ready to be optimised to perform in real-time contexts.

### 4.3.4. Step 4: Optimisation phase

High-poly DCHOs are optimised through different software tools for specific purposes or use cases to produce a new *optimised* DCHO. To achieve interoperability, one of the primary goals of optimisation is to create realistic and performant models that work across different devices. Depending on the different cases and 3D model sizes, the geometry and texture of each model have been optimised using automatic and manual approaches. The main software used have been Instant Meshes<sup>58</sup>, Blender, and Photoshop<sup>59</sup>/Gimp<sup>60</sup>. In some cases, especially in photogrammetric case acquisition, SfM software has been used for texture building and mapping based on the new UV – see [7] for further information about the process.

### 4.3.5. Step 5: Export phase

Optimised DCHOs are exported in a specific format or for a specific purpose. The high-poly DCHO is exported from Blender in OBJ or FBX format, maintaining the highest resolution possible for the final texture obtained. On the other side, the optimised DCHO is finally exported from Blender exclusively in the glTF format, an appropriate format for the sharing and navigation of each 3D object in the exhibition through Web3D applications. Specific

---

<sup>54</sup> <https://www.agisoft.com/>

<sup>55</sup> <https://3dflow.net/it/software-di-fotogrammetria-3df-zephyr/>

<sup>56</sup> <https://alicevision.org/#meshroom>

<sup>57</sup> <https://www.blender.org/download/>

<sup>58</sup> <https://github.com/wjakob/instant-meshes>

<sup>59</sup> <https://www.adobe.com/products/photoshop.html>

<sup>60</sup> <https://gimp.org/>

instructions created especially for the Web3D platform used in this project<sup>61</sup> were followed while performing the export.

#### 4.3.6. Step 6a: Metadata creation phase

To exploit Semantic Web technologies on the information structured in bibliographic and process tables, it was necessary to reshape it into a Resource Description Framework (RDF) format [17] serialisation.

In our case study, we decided to reuse tools available in the literature to accomplish the non-trivial task of schema crosswalks from the spreadsheet documents into RDF [46]. In particular, after considering the alternatives in the literature, we opted to use RML [23], which enabled meeting the specific requirement imposed by the structure of the input data by extending the mapping rules with custom functions in Java and Turtle. In more detail, we exported the bibliographic and process data tables to CSV and then converted them into N-triples serialisations using RML and YARRRML (i.e., the YAML-based human-readable textual representation of RML rules designed to guide the user in the production of linked data) [34]. Concretely, two ad hoc mapping files were created with YARRRML based on the structure of the bibliographic and process data tables and the CIDOC-CRM-based data models devised for describing, in machine-actionable format, bibliographic and process data. The YARRRML mapping files were then converted to RML files by the use of the official parser [59]. The obtained mappings were used to automate the creation of the N-triples files, using the aforementioned tables exported in CSV format as input.

From a technical point of view, we selected a set of libraries and software for generating Linked Data by the use of RML. Among those, the official tool is the Java RMLMapper [58] which has the limitation of loading data in memory, thus being inefficient when working with large datasets. In addition to that, for extending the conversion rules, a good mastery of Java and Turtle is required. To enhance usability, the yarrml-rmlmapper-docker [60], a software for directly generating RDF from YARRRML with a docker container, which coordinates the joint use of the YARRRML official parser and the RMLMapper. Anyhow, to meet the necessity to customise and extend the mapping rules in an easily replicable way, we identified some Python alternatives. At first, we considered some software developed for case-specific purposes, such as ods-yarrml-toolkit [45], in view of possible extensions. The aim of the library is transforming the OpenDataSfot API results from JSON into RDF, so to query it with SPARQL. Then, to increase the direct reuse potential, we analysed some alternatives with a more general scope, directly allowing for conversion from tabular formats. Thus, the analysis shifted to pyRML library [48] to Morph-KGC<sup>62</sup> [1].

---

<sup>61</sup> <https://osiris.itabc.cnr.it/aton/index.php/tutorials/creating-3d-content-for-aton/exporting-3d-models-from-blender/>

<sup>62</sup> pyRML library [48] provides an RMLConverter class, enabling the specification of a path to an input RML file, from which an RDF graph is generated as output. However, the choice eventually fell on Morph-KGC [1], a general-purpose tool for building RDF graphs from heterogeneous input data sources. Beyond providing tutorials, user support and detailed documentation, the codebase is frequently improved. In addition to the aforementioned benefits, the pivotal aspect determining the decision was the possibility to extend the transformation rules in Python.

#### 4.3.7. Step 6b: Provenance creation phase

MRPI is systematically mapped via the OpenCitations Data Model (OCDM) [21]. In this framework, every time an entity is created or modified, a detailed record known as a "snapshot" is captured and preserved within a designated provenance graph. A snapshot acts as a historical marker, encapsulating the state of an entity at a specific point in time. Each snapshot, classified as `prov:Entity`, is linked to its corresponding entity via the `prov:specializationOf` property. These snapshots record specific timestamps: the dates of their creation (`prov:generatedAtTime`) and when they become invalid, when applicable (`prov:invalidatedAtTime`). The individuals responsible for the creation or modification of the entity's data are recorded using the `prov:wasAttributedTo` property, ensuring accountability and transparency. Additionally, the `prov:hasPrimarySource` property is employed to establish a clear lineage and source of information, tracing back to the primary sources of the data. Continuity in the historical evolution of each entity is maintained by connecting each snapshot to its previous version using the `prov:wasDerivedFrom` property.

The OCDM framework further extended the capabilities of the Provenance Ontology (PROV-O) [40] by introducing the `oco:hasUpdateQuery` property [53]. This addition plays a key role in recording additions and deletions from an RDF graph through SPARQL INSERT and DELETE queries, thereby facilitating the restoration of entities to specific snapshots by reversing operations from all subsequent updates.

The integration of the *Provenance creation* phase into the Metadata creation process has significantly bolstered the FAIR management of DCHOs and their bibliographic and process data. This robust mechanism for tracking the history and changes of DCHOs ensures their authenticity and reliability, and therefore their reusability in various contexts, especially in research.

#### 4.3.8. Step 7: Upload phase

In this step, optimised DCHOs are transferred from local to storage location supported by an open access web-based framework, i.e. ATON, the open-source framework created by the CNR-ISPC in 2016 [28]. ATON is built on large open-source ecosystems such as Three.js<sup>63</sup> and Node.js<sup>64</sup> and solid web standards to provide accessible alternatives for organisations, labs, researchers, developers, and museums looking to design and implement cross-device Web3D/WebXR applications specifically for the Cultural Heritage sector.

Every 3D scene (a descriptor) in the ATON framework can refer to one or more objects in a collection (like a 3D model), which makes them ideal for 3D galleries in online virtual museums. Within the currently running instance of the framework, every scene is given a unique alphanumeric identifier, known as the scene ID. Any web application developed using ATON can access or use particular published 3D scenes thanks to this identifier.

---

<sup>63</sup> <https://threejs.org/>

<sup>64</sup> <https://nodejs.org/>



## 4.4. Open technologies and standard formats for interoperability and preservation

Our aim has been to use open technologies and software at every stage of the process to maximise the workflow's re-adoption in different scenarios, both internally or externally to Spoke 4. While metadata did not present challenges from this point of view, working with 3D models did. A selection of open-source software was performed for all the steps of the process. However, proprietary software was needed for some specific tasks, where open-source software does not provide satisfying results.

To avoid being restricted to any proprietary software applications we used as many standard formats as possible for all the different types of research data we produced. These include 3D models (glTF, GLB, obj, mtl, png, jpg, tiff, e57), images (png, tiff, raw, jpg,), video (mov, mp4), and audio (mp3). These choices were recorded and in some cases guided by the project's Data Management Plan [32].

We pushed for the adoption of glTF for 3D formats, an open standard that is interoperable and aimed at interactive Web3D applications, to ensure high interoperability with current 3D platforms and services, as well as re-use and integration of licence data within the format [7; 61].

The final steps of the projects are still ongoing. As we write, the 3D models and accompanying data and metadata have not yet been deposited in a repository for long term preservation, although the team has selected to use the general-purpose Zenodo<sup>65</sup>, at least until a more suitable platform is developed. Zenodo is not a disciplinary infrastructure and does not offer any specific function for 3D data or for cultural heritage data and metadata. However, this repository assigns a DOI to all deposited items, allows the inclusion of generic, high-level metadata (DataCite Metadata Schema, Dublin Core) and is otherwise well known and supported by the research community. We chose Zenodo because, in addition to be compliant with Open Science principles, it is already well known to all the partners of the project, is independent from the various institutions involved in the project while being available for all, and allowed us to create a community for the CHANGES - Spoke 4 project to group all the project outcomes under the same umbrella, instead of distributing them in a plethora of different repositories.

## 4.5. Software for human-readable documentation and narratives

To quantitatively analyse and visualise aggregated data, we use MELODY, an online dashboarding system for creating web-ready data stories that leverage Linked Open Data [57]. In particular, MELODY allows users to explore one or more Linked Open Data sources via SPARQL queries. Query results are attached to User Interface components (e.g. charts, maps, graphs, text searches, tables) which can be selected, added, moved, and displayed in a canvas according to the data story creator, who can also alternate components with curated text, therefore contextualising charts and providing their interpretation of data. The final data story, as well as each user interface (UI) component, can be exported and embedded in other web pages, therefore enriching the catalogue of Aldrovandi's exhibition with figures on

---

<sup>65</sup> <https://zenodo.org/>

relevant, quantitative insights. Data storytelling options are available to both data curators, who can select appropriate (dynamic) visualisations to be included in the digital library, and to end users, who can explore Aldrovandi's dataset via MELODY online platform<sup>66</sup> and publish their own data stories in a dedicated catalogue<sup>67</sup>.

The reasons that guided us in the choice of this tool is the fact that it is an online open software, whose code and documentation are available online<sup>68</sup>, developed using standard technologies and frameworks that make it easily extendable and allow the reuse in several contexts. In particular, it is developed as a Python application using Flask framework<sup>69</sup> configured with a configuration file in JSON format. This file contains background information and the SPARQL queries necessary to retrieve data to show in the data stories. These data stories are presented in a web interface served through routing as a set of HTML pages. Each data story is composed of a set of React components<sup>70</sup> that can be mixed on the page as the user desires during the creation flow of the data story.

For addressing the need of our pilot study, we are currently extending MELODY to include a new API. This API will take configuration specifications via a configuration file and return a piece of HTML filled with information that can be included in any other HTML page through an <iframe> tag. In particular, such a configuration file will contain information about the HTML that should be filled with data contained in an RDF triplestore we make available with all the RDF statements generated at step 6 by using one or more SPARQL queries to retrieve data. While we are in the process of developing and testing this API for our pilot, it is worth mentioning that it is already designed to be reusable in any context that enables accessing a SPARQL endpoint for retrieving data to build narratives.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

### 5.1. FAIR-by-design digital twin: lessons from the use case

In the previous section we have described in detail the process followed in digitising the temporary exhibition "Ulisse Aldrovandi and the Wonders of the World". This provides a good starting point to answer RQ1 ("What processes can be put in place to create a FAIR-by-design digital twin of a temporary exhibition?").

Before looking in more detail at how and why we consider our approach to be FAIR-by-design, it is worth stressing the importance of the preparatory work that went into conceiving and modelling the two tabular datasets (i.e. bibliographic data and process data), and especially the latter. Indeed, the results of this research project would be far less compliant with FAIR principles if the workflow had not been modelled in advance, and information regarding responsibilities (institutional and personal), important dates, tools and techniques used, had not been systematically and collaboratively collected and then converted and made available as Linked Open Data. This approach puts emphasis on research transparency, openness and

---

<sup>66</sup> <https://projects.dharc.unibo.it/melody/>

<sup>67</sup> <https://melody-data.github.io/stories/>

<sup>68</sup> <https://github.com/polifonia-project/dashboard>

<sup>69</sup> <https://flask.palletsprojects.com>

<sup>70</sup> <https://react.dev/>



accountability through the careful documentation of data collection and management techniques [10].

If we go back to the *FAIR Principles for Heritage Library, Archive and Museum Collections* we can look in turn at each of the three levels they have identified: the object level, the object metadata level and the metadata records level [39]. For each, we can assess how the Aldrovandi Digital Twin has met the relevant principles, if and how that has been done “by-design”, and discuss the potential challenges encountered.

### 5.1.1. Objects – in our case mostly 3D models

**Findability:** objects (physical and digital) have a globally unique persistent identifier and are described with metadata

We have described in the previous section the use of RDF to represent the metadata of both CHO and DCHO, using standard disciplinary data models like CIDOC-CRM (see [Section 4.2](#)). In this context, IRIs are assigned to both CHO and DCHO. In addition, the optimised DCHO is assigned a unique alphanumeric identifier when uploaded into ATON (the web-based framework chosen for this project) and will be assigned a DOI when uploaded into Zenodo.

Findability is designed into the system as the metadata of the CHOs were immediately collected, while the DCHOs were assigned relevant metadata, including an IRI, from the very beginning of the digitisation process. The choice of schema was carefully planned and, wherever possible, preceded the beginning of data collection.

**Accessibility:** digital objects are permanently accessible by sustainable storage (hardware, storage medium), open universal access protocols, version management, backups

A vast range of technologies and procedures are used in the development and/or collection of 3D data. During the process, different versions of the same item are created, and it becomes difficult to define what is crucial to preserve and make accessible to others. In our case study, along with the raw material obtained by the acquisition step, we decided to keep three different derivative versions for each 3D model:

- Processed Raw Model: the rough result of the photogrammetry or scanner software obtained by data processing excluding interpolation and geometry fixing;
- High-poly DCHO: the model obtained by interpolation and resolution of the geometry issues.
- Optimised DCHO: the 3D model is optimised for real-time online interaction.

The processed raw model and the high-poly DCHO are stored in OBJ or FBX format, some of the most common formats for 3D models [44]. Each OBJ is exported together with the Material Texture Library (MTL) that defines the material specifics and the texture associated with the 3D model, stored in PNG or JPG format. Instead, optimised DCHOs are stored in glTF format and published on ATON.

Processed raw models, high-poly DCHOs, and optimised DCHOs will be made accessible through deposit on a trusted data repository, most likely Zenodo [32], that makes metadata

openly available online and displays a clear, machine-readable licence for the data (see later under *Reusability*).

Accessibility by-design is ensured through version management, open and standard formats, and a streamlined plan to deposit objects in a trusted data repository.

**Interoperability:** digital objects are stored in preferred or acceptable formats

This point has mostly been addressed in the paragraphs above. It is worth adding that glTF is an interoperable open standard targeting interactive Web3D applications that guarantees high interoperability with existing 3D platforms/services, re-use and integration of licensing information.

While open-source software was preferred, proprietary software was needed for specific tasks. To avoid being bound to any proprietary software application, we used as many standard formats as possible for all the types of research data produced (see [Section 4.4](#)).

Interoperability has been achieved by-design through the use of open-source software, when available, and the systematic export into standard and open file formats. Every step of the workflow was preceded by a comprehensive review of the technologies currently in use in this fast-evolving field.

**Reusability:** digital objects have a date-timestamp and a licence for reuse, which is also available in a machine-readable form

The acquisition step and the software activities that produced the various digital objects have all been assigned timestamps in the form of time intervals with a start date and an end date (see [Section 4.3.7](#)).

Establishing the licence of each digitised object required a prompt and direct dialogue with the source institution, especially for the exhibition objects on loan, hence not directly held and managed by the University of Bologna. The licences currently in use for the majority of the digitised objects range from extremely permissive to more restrictive (e.g., Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial<sup>71</sup>) [32].

Reusability, while somehow limited by elements outside of our control, is implemented through the systematic inclusion of licensing information in a machine-readable form (see also next section).

---

<sup>71</sup> <https://creativecommons.org/licences/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

### 5.1.2. Metadata about the object (elementary level)

**Findability:** metadata specify the global persistent identifier (PID) of the object, which is used in all systems/databases that contain a description of the object in question, and metadata about specific objects are available via one or more searchable online repositories, catalogues, online databases, etc.

As explained above, each CHO and DCHO is assigned from early on its own PID (IRI) included into its own descriptive metadata record. Each CHO or DCHO may have additional “external” identifiers, such as those assigned by the holding institution, or by a third-party.

Following deposit in a trusted data repository, each DCHO will also be assigned a DOI, which will be also specified in their metadata. Indeed, the deposit in an infrastructure of this kind adds a further layer of generic metadata that, while not adding particularly useful information for data re-use in research, ensures wider discoverability through online registries and search engines.

**Accessibility:** metadata specify information about an object’s availability, obtainability and/or access options

Through the use of a data repository, information about an object’s availability and access options will be clearly stated in the metadata, in a machine-readable form (Creative Common licence, see above).

**Interoperability:** metadata are available at least in one metadata schema appropriate for the specific type of object, are available in various additional generic standard data formats for other contexts, and contain references to other objects/authority files, by using other global persistent identifiers

This condition is certainly met – see [Section 4.2](#) for a description of the management of object metadata as Linked Open Data (LOD). CIDOC-CRM and CRMdig have been used as main schemas to describe both physical and digital objects, and authority lists such as VIAF and Getty ULAN have been used as controlled terminology sources by referring to their terms through their own identifiers.

In addition to this disciplinary schema, appropriate for the specific type of object, the upload on Zenodo will add a further layer of generic metadata.

**Reusability:** metadata specify the object’s rights holder, OPI, and contain licence information referring to the object

Metadata specify the right holder of the CHO and DCHO and contain licence information. As mentioned, the licence of each DCHO has been decided in agreement with the holding institution, while descriptive metadata have been made openly available (i.e. licenced using the CC0 waiver<sup>72</sup>).

OPI has been rigorously recorded for both CHOs and DCHOs. This includes detailed information of the institution holding the CHO and the people involved in the production of the

---

<sup>72</sup> <https://creativecommons.org/public-domain/cc0/>

DCHO. This ensures accountability and provides a comprehensive historical record of the DCHO, in particular, enhancing its reuse potential (see [Section 2.2](#)).

### 5.1.3. Metadata records

**Findability:** metadata records have their own global persistent identifier

Each metadata record is represented as an RDF named graph and has its own IRI as a persistent identifier, specified through metadata.

**Accessibility:** metadata records are machine readable and accessible using open universal protocols

Metadata are published as machine-actionable Linked Open Data. They are converted from an initial tabular format into a Resource Description Framework (RDF) format following specific community standards, i.e. CIDOC-CRM and related data models (see [Section 4.2](#)). Eventually, the Linked Open Data are made available in an RDF triplestore equipped with a SPARQL endpoint for programmatic queries.

**Interoperable:** metadata records must be of sufficient quality

From the standpoint of an external researcher who wants to reuse the data (and therefore looks for as much information in the metadata as possible), the quality and completeness of the metadata records content is enough to describe the data and support its reuse. The metadata records include descriptive and contextual metadata of both CHOs (titles, identifiers, descriptions, people and roles involved in their creation and management, techniques, types, etc.) and DCHOs (contextual information about their digitisation processes, like dates, responsibilities, inputs and outputs, etc.), thus ensuring a focused yet comprehensive representation of the information a researcher seeks in the context of cultural heritage acquisition and digitisation (the CHO, its historical and cultural context, how it was digitised, when, how, by whom, and the various DCHOs produced during the process).

**Reusability:** metadata specify the metadata record's provenance (MRPI), the entity responsible for the metadata record, the licence for reuse (also available in a machine-readable form)

MRPI has been rigorously recorded for both metadata describing CHOs and DCHOs. This includes detailed tracking of the agent responsible for data creation, the time of data creation, and the primary source of the data. This ensures accountability and provides a comprehensive historical record of the data, enhancing its reuse potential (see [Section 4.3.7](#)).

Table 2. Summarising three levels in one table. Adapted from [39].

	<b>Objects</b>	<b>Metadata about the object (elementary level)</b>	<b>Metadata records</b>
<b>Findable</b>	RDF is used as a data model to represent the metadata of both CHOs and DCHOs, requiring the assignment of IRIs to each. Additionally, the description of these objects is facilitated through the use of CIDOC-CRM (via an application profile developed for the project)	Each DCHO and CHO has its own PID (IRI) specified through metadata (see Objects Findability on the left). Additionally, each DCHO or CHO may have other external identifiers. Metadata also specify institutions responsible holding the CHOs	Each metadata record is represented as a named graph and has its own IRI as a Persistent Identifier, specified through metadata
<b>Accessible</b>	Ensured through version management, open and standard formats, and a streamlined plan to deposit objects in a trusted data repository (Zenodo), accompanied by clear and machine-readable metadata.	Through the use of a data repository (Zenodo), information about object availability and access options will be clearly stated in the metadata, in a machine-readable form	Each metadata record is encoded as an RDF graph and made available in a triplestore equipped with a SPARQL endpoint for programmatic queries
<b>Interoperable</b>	Open-source software is used whenever possible and objects are systematically exported into standard and open file formats (e.g., glTF, an interoperable open standard targeting interactive Web3D applications)	CIDOC-CRM and CRMdig are used as schemas to describe both physical and digital objects, and authority lists such as VIAF and Getty ULAN have been used as controlled terminology sources by referring to their terms through their own identifiers	Metadata records include descriptive and contextual metadata of both CHOs (titles, identifiers, descriptions) and DCHOs (contextual information about their digitisation processes), ensuring a comprehensive representation in the context of cultural heritage acquisition and digitisation.
<b>Reusable</b>	The acquisition step and the software activities that produced the various DCHOs have all been assigned timestamps in the form of time intervals with a start date and an end date. The choice of licences of the objects is outside of our control but is implemented through the systematic inclusion of licensing information in a machine-readable form.	OPI has been rigorously recorded for both CHOs and DCHOs. This includes detailed information of the institution holding the CHO and the people involved in the production of the DCHO	MRPI has been rigorously recorded for the metadata of both CHO and DCHO. This includes detailed tracking of the agent responsible for data creation, the time of data creation, and the primary source of the data. This ensures accountability and provides a comprehensive historical record of the data, enhancing its reuse potential

## 5.2. Main challenges encountered

Our second research question investigates the main challenges in applying FAIR principles to 3D data in cultural heritage studies. Many of them were touched upon in the literature review, where we highlighted a number of gaps identified in previous studies.

It has been noted that metadata accompanying 3D models often do not allow a full assessment of the relevance of the model for further use scenarios [6]. Blundell et al. [14] call for community-driven work to develop and refine truly cross-disciplinary and widely interoperable metadata standards, together with further work on documenting and standardising the production of 3D models of cultural heritage in general.

Worryingly, a significant amount of digital assets is not made available to the scientific community but remains stored in private archives on personal computers, while the visibility of scientific platforms remains negligible compared to those that are commercially owned [6].

The multiplicity and complexity of 3D data certainly plays a role in their relative marginality in the cultural heritage sphere. Depending on the acquisition technique, different data types are obtained. In addition, 3D content generally goes through different phases and creators will have different versions of data or derivatives to store. This in turn entails:

- A multiplicity of file formats: there are currently more than 140, but this does not mean that all of them are or will remain popular [15]. Also, key features like scene details and animations are not compatible with all file formats, and these factors must be carefully considered when evaluating archiving formats.
- Data storage space, and related costs, reportedly one of the biggest challenges to date [44]. Indeed, preserving both raw and processed data is considered essential for the scientific reuse of 3D models, but can be extremely costly.

We have described previously our internal policy regarding the conservation of three different versions for each 3D model (processed raw model, high-poly DCHO, optimised DCHO) and the respective formats (glTF for optimised DCHO, OBJ or FBX for the others). The choice of formats, as already explained, has been guided by a review of the most common and suitable formats, and a desire to stick to standard and non-proprietary formats.

At the time of this publication, we have not filled half of the available storage space (33% out of 1 TB). Although not all project data have been uploaded yet, the selection of data and its format proved to be efficient. Regarding data types, the results are consistent with past literature: raw material, which have been defined as the most expensive data in 3D data preservation [44], occupy 46% of the storage space already in use, followed by the processed raw models obtained by processing operations (43%). The aforementioned raw data are therefore much more expensive than finished models: the high-poly DCHOs occupy 7%, while the optimised DCHOs do not even reach 1% of occupied space. The remaining 4% is occupied by project documentation, including photos and videos of the acquisition activity. However, as mentioned above, while maintaining two versions of a 3D model ought to be easy, offering raw material long-term archiving presents another difficulty [29]. In our case, the large amount of storage space still available is the right prerequisite for correctly managing the resources that will be uploaded in the next months, leaving room for possible future file updates.

As previously mentioned, it is not always possible to stick to open-source software when working with 3D data (see [Section 4.4](#)). Converting data to standard formats is helpful but

when converting raw material to non-proprietary formats, metadata embedded in the file can be lost and for this reason proprietary formats are often preferred [44]. In this context, choosing neutral formats that allow for structured and customised embedded metadata can facilitate the process (e.g. PLY). As of this publication, there is not a universally shared file format able to solve all the complexities involved, which makes interoperability even more challenging. See also [Section 4.4](#) for a description of which formats and software tools were used in our case study.

Regarding 3D data publication, and despite the growing number of models available, there are still few online libraries and accessible download platforms. Additionally, commercial and non-commercial portals often fail to offer unique IDs or DOIs, provenance information or other pertinent metadata, links to additional resources, or even integrated 3D viewers (2D image or video preview is provided instead). These platforms should probably consider including the possibility to: create connections between models and historical records (as well as links for social media sharing and citation); create a DOI for each published 3D model; offer a customised and platform-integrated 3D model viewer; accurately track website traffic considering, if possible, offline and online usage [15].

For the publication of the models of the Aldrovandi Digital Twin (i.e. optimised DCHO) we could rely on the open access web-based framework ATON, created by the CNR-ISPC in 2016 for the cultural heritage sector and built on open-source software and solid web standards [28].

Moving on to the availability of infrastructures for the long-term preservation of 3D cultural heritage data, we have described in [Section 2.4.4](#) the results of a quick search on the Re3Data registry. It suggests that the availability of infrastructures for this purpose is patchy, perhaps because the long term archiving of cultural heritage 3D data is not yet a widespread practice in the arts and humanities research community. In our list of results, repositories devoted specifically to 3D data are exceedingly rare (three in total), as are institutional data repositories accepting 3D models (also three).

In selecting a repository, we preferred a widely-used but general-purpose infrastructure for the deposit of all data and metadata (see [Section 4.4](#)). Zenodo offers the needed guarantees in terms of FAIRness and machine actionability, including displaying a clear reuse licence. It is possible that this choice might change in the future, should a discipline specific repository arise, for example in the context of the H2IOSC Project - Humanities and cultural Heritage Italian Open Science Cloud<sup>73</sup>.

A very interesting point affecting Reusability – that we do not have the space to address in detail here – is whether it is possible to claim that DCHOs depicting real-world cultural heritage objects are not reproductions of these objects but rather new intellectual works in their own right. This discussion is not new to cultural heritage but remains extremely important as its results affect licensing decisions. Creating 3D models, in our view, requires craftsmanship and a high degree of interpretation, as it entails the reconstruction and juxtaposition of many different individual elements in order to build something that approximates reality but also adds something to it.

---

<sup>73</sup> <https://www.h2iosc.cnr.it/>



### 5.3. Peculiarities of 3D data and further research

We will conclude by summarising the new challenges that 3D models present for the cultural heritage sector and addressing the third and last research question: how are they different from traditional digital images from a data management perspective?

Although several cultural heritage institutions have been experimenting with 3D data creation and dissemination, it has not yet been widely embraced and supported in the GLAM sector. Among the museums that have been experimenting with making 3D data and multimedia available to the public we find the Smithsonian<sup>74</sup>, the British Museum<sup>75</sup>, the Naturhistorisches Museum Wien (NHMW)<sup>76</sup>, the Museum für Naturkunde Berlin<sup>77</sup>; among other institutions, it is worth mentioning the University of Amsterdam's 4D Research Lab<sup>78</sup>.

According to Moore et al. [44], although the form and requirements of the preserved items have changed, the addition of 3D data archiving does not affect the primary goals of digital repositories. Some of the data management challenges are indeed common to all disciplines and data types. They include choosing the most suitable file types, metadata standards, storage, licensing and rights, and making long-term curation decisions, taking into account technology potential and limits.

Looking at 3D model scientific publishing specifically, the crucial role of metadata is gaining recognition but the lack of shared standards for the publication and exchange of digital heritage 3D assets limits the access and use of published resources. The multiplicity of 3D data does not facilitate standardisation, which may indeed prove even longer and more complex to achieve than for 2D data. Furthermore, due to the different 3D data creation methods and environments of usage, there is no shared file format for 3D model preservation and interoperability between different software is a long way to go. To exploit 3D data potential for the analysis of cultural heritage objects, efforts are needed in terms of technology and process standardisation to make data sustainably accessible.

The storage size of 3D content is one of the biggest challenges concerning the long-term preservation of raw material (see [Section 5.2](#)). Finally, the functions offered both by public and commercial 3D platforms for 3D model retrieving, access, and analysis are still limited and under development (see [Section 2.4.3](#)) while very few data repositories for long-term archiving seem to be available (see [Section 2.4.4](#)). In this context, research-based on 3D digital heritage projects still lacks critical insights and cooperative decision-making processes to design data curation in a FAIR-compliant way.

A first step in this direction could be the creation of a FAIR Implementation Profile (FIP) within the cultural heritage community working with 3D data. FIPs register implementation choices

---

<sup>74</sup> [https://3d.si.edu/explore?edan\\_local=&edan\\_q=&edan\\_fq%5B0%5D=media\\_usage%3ACCO](https://3d.si.edu/explore?edan_local=&edan_q=&edan_fq%5B0%5D=media_usage%3ACCO) and <https://sketchfab.com/>

<sup>75</sup> <https://sketchfab.com/britishmuseum/models> and <https://www.bmimages.com/3d-scans.asp>

<sup>76</sup> [https://www.nhm-wien.ac.at/en/museum\\_online/3d](https://www.nhm-wien.ac.at/en/museum_online/3d). Interestingly, the institution also has a Data Repository run by the museum's own publishing arm in collaboration with the NHMW Central Research Laboratories and IT department: <http://datarepository.nhm-wien.ac.at/>. This archive contains datasets, images and textual sources, but not the aforementioned 3D models

<sup>77</sup> <https://portal.museumfuernaturkunde.berlin/> and <https://sketchfab.com/VisLab>

<sup>78</sup> <https://4dresearchlab.nl/>



made to adopt FAIR principles and can accelerate the adoption of community-driven and community-specific consensus around FAIR by-design data production and management practices [62].

## 6. Acknowledgments

This work has been partially funded by Project PE 0000020 CHANGES - CUP B53C22003780006, NRP Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.3, Funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU.

## 7. CRediT authorship contribution statement

Authors' contribution according to CRediT (<https://credit.niso.org/>):

**Sebastian Barzagli:** Data curation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

**Alice Bordignon:** Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

**Bianca Gualandi:** Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**Ivan Heibi:** Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**Arcangelo Massari:** Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**Arianna Moretti:** Methodology, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

**Silvio Peroni:** Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review & editing

**Giulia Renda:** Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

## References

1. Arenas-Guerrero, Julián, David Chaves-Fraga, Jhon Toledo, María S. Pérez, and Oscar Corcho. 2024. 'Morph-KGC: Scalable Knowledge Graph Materialization with Mapping Partitions'. *Semantic Web* 15 (1): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-223135>.
2. Asprino, Luigi, Enrico Daga, Aldo Gangemi, and Paul Mulholland. 'Knowledge Graph Construction with a Façade : A Unified Method to Access Heterogeneous Data Sources on the Web'. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology* 23, no. 1 (28 February 2023): 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555312>.
3. Auer, Sören, Sebastian Dietzold, Jens Lehmann, Sebastian Hellmann, and David Aumueller. 'Triplify: Light-Weight Linked Data Publication from Relational Databases'. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 621–30. Madrid Spain: ACM, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1526709.1526793>.
4. Avançaço, Karla, Ana Balula, Marta Błaszczczyńska, Anna Buchner, Lorena Caliman, Claire Clivaz, Carlos Costa, et al. 'Future of Scholarly Communication . Forging an Inclusive and

- Innovative Research Infrastructure for Scholarly Communication in Social Sciences and Humanities'. Zenodo, 29 June 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.5017705>.
5. Avanço, Karla, Elena Giglia, and Arnaud Gingold. 'OPERAS-P Deliverable D6.3: Report on Innovative Approach to SSH FAIR Data and Publications', 30 April 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4817525>.
  6. Bajena, Igor, and Piotr Kuroczyński. 'Metadata for 3D Digital Heritage Models. In the Search of a Common Ground'. In *Research and Education in Urban History in the Age of Digital Libraries*, edited by Sander Münster, Aaron Pattee, Cindy Kröber, and Florian Niebling, 45–64. Communications in Computer and Information Science. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38871-2\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38871-2_4).
  7. Balzani, Roberto, Sebastian Barzaghi, Gabriele Bitelli, Federica Bonifazi, Alice Bordignon, Luca Cipriani, Simona Colitti, et al. 'Saving Temporary Exhibitions in Virtual Environments: The Digital Renaissance of Ulisse Aldrovandi – Acquisition and Digitisation of Cultural Heritage Objects'. *Digital Applications in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage* 32 (March 2024): e00309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.daach.2023.e00309>.
  8. Barker, Michelle, Neil P. Chue Hong, Daniel S. Katz, Anna-Lena Lamprecht, Carlos Martinez-Ortiz, Fotis Psomopoulos, Jennifer Harrow, et al. 'Introducing the FAIR Principles for Research Software'. *Scientific Data* 9, no. 1 (14 October 2022): 622. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01710-x>.
  9. Barnes, Adam. 'Close-Range Photogrammetry. Archiving Close-Range Photogrammetric Data'. In *Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice*, edited by Kieron Niven. University of York, UK: Archaeology Data Service, 2011. <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/help-guidance/guides-to-good-practice/data-collection-and-fieldwork/close-range-photogrammetry/archiving-close-range-photogrammetric-data-2/preparing-to-archive/>.
  10. Barzaghi, Sebastian, Alice Bordignon, Bianca Gualandi, and Silvio Peroni. 'Thinking Outside the Black Box: Insights from a Digital Exhibition in the Humanities', 2024. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2402.12000>.
  11. Barzaghi, Sebastian, Ivan Heibi, Arianna Moretti, and Silvio Peroni. 'Developing Application Profiles for Enhancing Data and Workflows in Cultural Heritage Digitisation Processes'. arXiv, 18 April 2024. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.12069>.
  12. Bettella, Cristiana, Mauro Apostolico, Linda Cappellato, Yuri Carrer, Achille Felicetti, and Giulio Turetta. 'A4 Schema Extension Development', 8 August 2023. <https://zenodo.org/records/8224167>.
  13. Bizer, Christian, and Andy Seaborne. 'D2RQ – Treating Non-RDF Databases as Virtual RDF Graphs', 2005. <http://iswc2004.semanticweb.org/posters/PID-SMCVRKBT-1089637165.pdf>.
  14. Blundell, Jon, Jasmine L Clark, Katherine E DeVet, and Juliet L Hardesty. 'Metadata Requirements for 3D Data', 2020
  15. Champion, Erik, and Hafizur Rahaman. 'Survey of 3D Digital Heritage Repositories and Platforms'. *Virtual Archaeology Review* 11, no. 23 (8 July 2020): 1. <https://doi.org/10.4995/var.2020.13226>.
  16. Corcho, Oscar, Magnus Eriksson, Krzysztof Kurowski, and Milan Ojsteršek. EOSC Interoperability Framework: Report from the EOSC Executive Board Working Groups FAIR and Architecture. Univerza v Mariboru, Fakulteta za elektrotehniko, računalništvo in informatiko, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2777/620649>.
  17. Cyganiak, Richard, David Wood, and Markus Krötzsch. 'RDF 1.1 Concepts and Abstract Syntax'. W3C Recommendation. World Wide Web Consortium, 25 February 2014. <https://www.w3.org/TR/rdf11-concepts/>.
  18. Daga, Enrico, Luca Panziera, and Carlos Pedrinaci. 'BASIL: A Cloud Platform for Sharing and Reusing SPARQL Queries as Web APIs'. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, edited by

- Serena Villata, Jeff Z. Pan, and Mauro Dragoni, Vol. 1486. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 2015. <https://oro.open.ac.uk/45430/>.
19. Daga, Enrico, Luigi Asprino, Paul Mulholland, and Aldo Gangemi. 'Facade-X: An Opinionated Approach to SPARQL Anything'. In *Studies on the Semantic Web*, edited by Mehwish Alam, Paul Groth, Victor De Boer, Tassilo Pellegrini, Harshvardhan J. Pandit, Elena Montiel, Víctor Rodríguez Doncel, Barbara McGillivray, and Albert Meroño-Peñuela. IOS Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SSW210035>.
  20. Daquino, Marilena, Francesca Mambelli, Silvio Peroni, Francesca Tomasi, and Fabio Vitali. 'Enhancing Semantic Expressivity in the Cultural Heritage Domain: Exposing the Zeri Photo Archive as Linked Open Data'. *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage* 10, no. 4 (26 October 2017): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3051487>.
  21. Daquino, Marilena, Silvio Peroni, and David Shotton. 'The OpenCitations Data Model', 2020. <https://doi.org/10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.3443876.V7>.
  22. David, Romain, Kurt Baumann, Yann Le Franc, Barbara Magagna, Lars Vogt, Heinrich Widmann, Thomas Jouneau, et al. 'Converging on a Semantic Interoperability Framework for the European Data Space for Science, Research and Innovation (EOSC)'. Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8102786>.
  23. Dimou, Anastasia, Miel Vander Sande, Pieter Colpaert, Ruben Verborgh, Erik Mannens, and Rik Van de Walle. 'RML: A Generic Language for Integrated RDF Mappings of Heterogeneous Data'. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Linked Data on the Web (LDOW 2014)*, edited by Christian Bizer, Tom Heath, Sören Auer, and Tim Berners-Lee, 1184:5. Seoul, Korea, April 8, 2014., 2014. [https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1184/ldow2014\\_paper\\_01.pdf](https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1184/ldow2014_paper_01.pdf).
  24. Doerr, Martin, Christian-Emil Ore, and Stephen Stead. 'The CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model - A New Standard for Knowledge Sharing.', 51–56, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1420.6400>.
  25. Doerr, Martin, and Maria Theodoridou. 'CRMdig: A Generic Digital Provenance Model for Scientific Observation', 2011.
  26. Drucker, Johanna. 'Humanities Approaches to Graphical Display'. *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 005, no. 1 (10 March 2011). <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/5/1/000091/000091.html>.
  27. Edmond, Jennifer, and Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra. 'Open Data for Humanists, A Pragmatic Guide', 10 December 2018. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.2657248>.
  28. Fanini, Bruno, Daniele Ferdani, Emanuel Demetrescu, Simone Berto, and Enzo d'Annibale. 'ATON: An Open-Source Framework for Creating Immersive, Collaborative and Liquid Web-Apps for Cultural Heritage'. *Applied Sciences* 11, no. 22 (22 November 2021): 11062. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app112211062>.
  29. Fritsch, Bernhard. 'Challenges of Publishing 3D Data in Archaeology'. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on 3D Web Technology*, 1–4. Web3D '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485444.3507686>.
  30. Gil, Yolanda, James Cheney, Paul Groth, Olaf Hartig, Simon Miles, Luc Moreau, and Paulo Pinheiro da Silva. 'Provenance XG Final Report'. W3C, 2010. <http://www.w3.org/2005/Incubator/prov/XGR-prov-20101214/>.
  31. Gualandi, Bianca, Luca Pareschi, and Silvio Peroni. 'What Do We Mean by "Data"? A Proposed Classification of Data Types in the Arts and Humanities'. *Journal of Documentation* 79, no. 7 (12 December 2022): 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-07-2022-0146>.
  32. Gualandi, Bianca, and Silvio Peroni. 'Data Management Plan: Second Version', 29 February 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.10727879>.
  33. Harrower, Natalie, Maciej Maryl, Timea Biro, Beat Immenhauser, and ALLEA Working Group E-Humanities. 'Sustainable and FAIR Data Sharing in the Humanities: Recommendations of the ALLEA Working Group E-Humanities', 2020. <https://doi.org/10.7486/DRI.TQ582C863>.

34. Heyvaert, Pieter, Ben De Meester, Anastasia Dimou, and Ruben Verborgh. 'Declarative Rules for Linked Data Generation at Your Fingertips!' In *The Semantic Web: ESWC 2018 Satellite Events*, edited by Aldo Gangemi, Anna Lisa Gentile, Andrea Giovanni Nuzzolese, Sebastian Rudolph, Maria Maleshkova, Heiko Paulheim, Jeff Z. Pan, and Mehwish Alam, 213–17. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98192-5\\_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98192-5_40).
35. Hofelich Mohr, Alicia, Josh Bishoff, Carolyn Bishoff, Steven Braun, Christine Storino, and Lisa R. Johnston. 'When Data Is a Dirty Word: A Survey to Understand Data Management Needs Across Diverse Research Disciplines'. *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 42, no. 1 (2015): 51–53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bul2.2015.1720420114>.
36. Homburg, Timo, Anja Cramer, Laura Raddatz, and Hubert Mara. 'Metadata Schema and Ontology for Capturing and Processing of 3D Cultural Heritage Objects'. *Heritage Science* 9, no. 1 (December 2021): 91. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40494-021-00561-w>.
37. Knazook, Beth, and Murphy, Joan. 'WorldFAIR Project (D13.1) Cultural Heritage Mapping Report: Practices and Policies Supporting Cultural Heritage Image Sharing Platforms', 22 February 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7659002>.
38. Knazook, Beth, Murphy, Joan, Barner, Keren, Cassidy, Kathryn, Claeysens, Steven, Cortese, Claudio, Manchester, Eileen J., et al. 'WorldFAIR Project (D13.2) Cultural Heritage Image Sharing Recommendations Report', 19 May 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7897244>.
39. Koster, Lukas, and Saskia Woutersen-Windhouwer. 'FAIR Principles for Library, Archive and Museum Collections: A Proposal for Standards for Reusable Collections'. *The Code4Lib Journal*, no. 40 (4 May 2018). <https://journal.code4lib.org/articles/13427>.
40. Lebo, T., S. Sahoo, and D. McGuinness. '04 30). PROV-O: The PROV Ontology', 2013. <http://www.w3.org/TR/2013/REC-prov-o-20130430/>.
41. Lefrançois, Maxime, Antoine Zimmermann, and Noorani Bakerally. 'A SPARQL Extension for Generating RDF from Heterogeneous Formats'. In *The Semantic Web*, edited by Eva Blomqvist, Diana Maynard, Aldo Gangemi, Rinke Hoekstra, Pascal Hitzler, and Olaf Hartig, 10249:35–50. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58068-5\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58068-5_3).
42. McHenry, Kenton, and Peter Bajcsy. 'An Overview of 3D Data Content, File Formats and Viewers'. *Technical Report*, 31 October 2008. <https://www.archives.gov/files/applied-research/ncsa/8-an-overview-of-3d-data-content-file-formats-and-viewers.pdf>.
43. Ministero della Cultura. 'Linee guida per la digitalizzazione del patrimonio culturale | Piano nazionale di digitalizzazione del patrimonio culturale'. Agenzia per l'Italia Digitale, 2022. <https://docs.italia.it/italia/icdp/icdp-pnd-digitalizzazione-docs/it/v1.0-giugno-2022/index.html>.
44. Moore, Jennifer, Adam Rountrey, and Hannah Scates Kettler. *3D Data Creation to Curation: Community Standards for 3D Data Preservation*. ALA, 2022. <https://www.alastore.ala.org/content/3d-data-creation-curation-community-standards-3d-data-preservation>.
45. Moreau, Benjamin. 'ODS-YARRRML-Toolkit'. Python, 2020. Software Heritage. <Swh:1:dir:9b33367cc3a320abc1bc4d5c3473c6894e968bef>.
46. Moretti, Arianna, Ivan Heibi, and Silvio Peroni. 'A Workflow for GLAM Metadata Crosswalk'. arXiv, 3 May 2024. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.02113>.
47. Niven, Kieron. 'The Project Archive: Storage and Dissemination'. In *Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice*. University of York, UK: Archaeology Data Service, 2011. <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/help-guidance/guides-to-good-practice/the-project-lifecycle/the-project-archive-storage-and-dissemination/>.

48. Nuzzolese, Andrea Giovanni. 'pyRML'. Python, 2024. Software Heritage. [Swh:1:dir:7c7daa4e9e44e40be9b69b90130ed2c675df0cf6](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4420115).
49. Ojsteršek, Milan. 'Crosswalk of Most Used Metadata Schemes and Guidelines for Metadata Interoperability'. Zenodo, 5 January 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4420115>.
50. Padilla, Thomas, Laurie Allen, Hannah Frost, Sarah Potvin, Elizabeth Russey Roke, and Stewart Varner. 'Santa Barbara Statement on Collections as Data --- Always Already Computational: Collections as Data', 20 May 2019. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3066209>.
51. Padilla, Thomas, Hannah Scates Kettler, Stewart Varner, and Yasmeen Shorish. 'Vancouver Statement on Collections as Data', 13 September 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8342171>.
52. Payne, Angie. 'Laser Scanning for Archaeology'. In *Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice*, edited by Kieron Niven. University of York, UK: Archaeology Data Service, 2011. <https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/help-guidance/guides-to-good-practice/data-collection-and-fieldwork/laser-scanning-for-archaeology/introduction/scope-of-this-guide/>.
53. Peroni, Silvio, David Shotton, and Fabio Vitali. 'A Document-Inspired Way for Tracking Changes of RDF Data. The Case of the OpenCitations Corpus'. In *Detection, Representation and Management of Concept Drift in Linked Open Data*, edited by Laura Hollink, Sándor Darányi, Albert Meroño Peñuela, and E. Kontopoulos, 26–33. Bologna: CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 2016. [http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1799/Drift-a-LOD2016\\_paper\\_4.pdf](http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1799/Drift-a-LOD2016_paper_4.pdf).
54. Peroni, Silvio. 'A Simplified Agile Methodology for Ontology Development'. In *OWL: Experiences and Directions – Reasoner Evaluation*, edited by Mauro Dragoni, María Poveda-Villalón, and Ernesto Jimenez-Ruiz, 55–69. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54627-8\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54627-8_5).
55. Quantin, Matthieu, Sarah Tournon, Valentin Grimaud, Florent Laroche, and Xavier Granier. 'Combining FAIR Principles and Long-Term Archival of 3D Data'. In *Proceedings of the 28th International ACM Conference on 3D Web Technology*, 1–6. Web3D '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611314.3615913>.
56. Kelly, Rachel, and Dibya Chakravorty. 'The 10 Most Popular 3D File Formats'. All3DP, 17 August 2023. <https://all3dp.com/2/most-common-3d-file-formats-model/>.
57. Renda, Giulia, Marilena Daquino, and Valentina Presutti. 'Melody: A Platform for Linked Open Data Visualisation and Curated Storytelling'. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media*, 1–8. HT '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3603163.3609035>.
58. RMLio. 'RMLMapper'. Java. 2018. RDF Mapping Language (RML). Software Heritage. [Swh:1:dir:bc91cd466746b8e6ae65d183589501dfafeb5df2](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4420115).
59. ———. 'YARRRML Parser', 2018. Software Heritage. [Swh:1:dir:b2a545fb1ca9a8e42898db5413bdb2cd98af909b](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3066209).
60. ———. 'Yarrmml-Rmlmapper-Docker'. Shell. 2019. RDF Mapping Language (RML). Software Heritage. [Swh:1:dir:11304eb2ff96c906a2b6a0401ef686ce21285812](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8342171).
61. Robinet, Fabrice, Re'mi Arnaud, Tony Parisi, and Patrick Cozzi. 'glTF: Designing an Open-Standard Runtime Asset Format'. In *GPU Pro 5*, 1st Edition. A K Peters/CRC Press, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b16721-30>.
62. Schultes, Erik, Barbara Magagna, Kristina Maria Hettne, Robert Pergl, Marek Suchánek, and Tobias Kuhn. 'Reusable FAIR Implementation Profiles as Accelerators of FAIR Convergence'. In *Advances in Conceptual Modeling*, edited by Georg Grossmann and Sudha Ram, 138–47. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65847-2\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65847-2_13).



63. Tasovac, Toma, Sally Chambers, and Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra. 'Cultural Heritage Data from a Humanities Research Perspective: A DARIAH Position Paper', 2020. HAL. <https://doi.org/hal-02961317>.
64. Thøgersen, Jennifer L. "'Yeah, I Guess That's Data": Data Practices and Conceptions among Humanities Faculty'. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 18, no. 3 (2018): 491–504. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2018.0030>.
65. Tóth-Czifra, Erzsébet. 'The Risk of Losing the Thick Description: Data Management Challenges Faced by the Arts and Humanities in the Evolving FAIR Data Ecosystem'. In *Digital Technology and the Practices of Humanities Research*, edited by Jennifer Edmond, 235–66. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0192.10>.
66. Tóth-Czifra, Erzsébet, Marta Błaszczczyńska, Francesco Gelati, Femmy Admiraal, Mirjam Blümm, Erik Buelinckx, Vera Chiquet, et al. 'Research Data Management for Arts and Humanities: Integrating Voices of the Community'. Zenodo, 30 August 2023. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8059626>.
67. Wilkinson, Mark D., Michel Dumontier, IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Gabrielle Appleton, Myles Axton, Arie Baak, Niklas Blomberg, et al. 'The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship'. *Scientific Data* 3 (15 March 2016): 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>.