#### Text clarifying the scope of the proposed terms and vocabularies:

The Functional role of a Minimal Vocabulary

...to be used together with the CIDOC-CRM

The policy of the CRM is to restrict classes to those that appear as specific domains or ranges of CRM properties, because those properties structure the knowledge base and frequently appear hard-coded in the control-software, i.e., data entry, storage and access tools. Therefore they are of much higher priority for system interoperability than the classes without properties, which we model as instances of E55 Type, i.e. as data, as usual in conceptual modelling of databases since their conception.

Nevertheless, in certain cases the CRM makes important and non-obvious ontological distinctions of specialization of CRM classes without assigning specific properties to them. These may differentiate and specialize even substance and identity criteria in a way that has a bearing on the use of properties, as in the case of E10 Transfer of Custody: The kind of transfer of custody, i.e., either field collection, transfer from one keeper to another or loss, can be specified by E55 Type, and consequently the property associating the donor or the receiver will not be used.

These distinctions normally appear in the scope notes with a hint about the need for respective vocabularies. They further appear in examples. Finally, a series of classes have been deprecated because they did not need specific properties, but backwards compatibility would require that they be turned into clearly recommended instances of E55 Type.

Over the past 30 years attempts to harmonize and integrate vocabularies in the cultural heritage (CH) domain have widely failed. Rather, some vocabularies play a more important role, but specialized needs are too abundant to allow for a systematic integration, and volatile vocabularies are an important tool of research in all sciences and humanities.

Therefore, the CRM-SIG will recommend in a document separate from the CIDOC CRM definition only those terms that are regarded to be important for the above mentioned ontological distinctions, and unambiguous enough to be fixed as standard. These may be linked or integrated as broader or narrower terms into vocabularies of the user's choice, in a way compatible with the meaning of the classes of the CRM where they will be used together.

The CRM-SIG may exemplify this on the base of the Art & Architecture Thesaurus (AAT) or the Backbone Thesaurus (BBT).

Further, CRM will recommend the use of some standard vocabularies for cases in which a good and comprehensive international practice exists, such as measurement units, country codes etc.

**TODO:** SdS needs to proof-read this text. We need to decide where in the CRM introduction this text can go.

**Proposal:** to add this section in the CRM introduction after “About types”.