

	Minimal performance - 1	Basic performance - 2	Sufficient performance - 3	Outstanding performance - 4
A. Capacity to assess the potential of a data holder or community to become a GBIF data publisher.	Has difficulty finding existing, substantial connections between the community's work and GBIF's. Based on a description, can identify data types that align with a few, very typical GBIF use cases. (e.g. natural history collections) Always needs external help to do any evaluation of the technical capacity of a data holder.	Can only find few generic connections between a given community and GBIF. Based on a description, can identify data types that align with most typical GBIF use cases. Frequently needs external help to do any evaluation of the technical capacity of a data holder.	Successfully identifies key needs or areas of interest of a community that GBIF can contribute to. Based on a description of the data produced, can successfully identify if it can potentially be mapped to one of GBIF accepted standards. Can successfully assess if a person/team has the technical skills to prepare their dataset for publishing and connect the data without major support.	Can identify opportunities in new communities for expansion of GBIF coverage. Can actively make targeted questions that will allow a better evaluation of the suitability for publishing of the data. Can identify areas of technical expertise that will need to be reinforced to capacitate the data holder to publish data, and ways to address them.
B. Capacity to identify the relevant barriers that may hamper data publishing by a given holder.	Can identify generic barriers that would apply to any data holder or community.	Can identify barriers in an opportunistic way. A few of the barriers identified are applied to the context of the data holder.	Uses a systematic approach to identify significant barriers in different categories. Most of the barriers identified are applied to the context of the data holder.	Uses a systematic approach to produce a comprehensive, realistic list of barriers in all categories considered. All barriers identified are applied to the context of the data holder.
C. Capacity to develop strategies and arguments that address the barriers detected.	Has identified strategies for only a few of the key barriers. The arguments used are very generic. The barriers addressed are only covered partially.	Half of the barriers are addressed by strategies or arguments. Only some of the arguments are specific for the community.	Can find suitable arguments to address at least 75% of the barriers identified. The arguments are convincing and personalized for the community.	Can find suitable arguments to address every barrier identified. Otherwise can find sources of information that will address those barriers.
D. Capacity to produce targeted, engaging resources promoting data publishing within a given community.	The resources generated are generic rather than targeted at the specific data holder/community. The resources are difficult to understand. The resource is visually attractive but lacks substantial content.	The resources are personalized for the community, but in their visual presentation rather than their content. The resource is based on facts but not very engaging. Some of the barriers are addressed in the resource, but in a way that highlights the issues at the same time.	The resources build on the areas of interest detected for the community. They use the arguments developed to address barriers in a smart way, without bringing unwanted attention to the barriers.	The resources are attractive, unconventional, engaging and/or uses alternative communication channels. The design of the resource is clear and simple.
E. Capacity to build an oral discourse and defend a position in a discussion around open data publishing within a given community.	Uses a defensive tone in all the conversation/discourse. The issues addressed are generally relevant but disconnected. Completely relies on support material.	Only some of the topics addressed are relevant for the community. Takes a defensive tone as a response to someone highlighting shortcomings. Relies on support material poorly designed which will most likely steal the attention from the discourse.	Builds an engaging and realistic discourse. Can convey the key benefits for the community in a simple manner. Can answer most of the critical questions or refer them to resources/people who can answer them. Can make connections between different parts of the discourse. Uses support materials in a smart way, guiding and supporting the discourse without taking too much attention from it.	Presents GBIF as a (potential) partner aligned with the community rather than an external influence. Has no difficulty answering any questions or refers to people/resources to answer them. Can use real examples from the community to illustrate the discourse. The discourse has reasoned structure connecting all the elements in it.