CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meetings

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 22/06/2020

Participants:
Martin Doerr
Christian Emil Ore
George Brueseker
Chrysoula Bekiari
Thanasis Velios
Steve Stead
Eleni Tsoulouha
Chair: Christian Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 8th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: June 22nd 2020, 14.00-16.00 CEST
Join Zoom Meeting

NEXT MEETING:

1) Acceptance of the agenda

2) Minutes/notes from meeting 15/6/2020

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DQPpDuFXuzy1ZCJJD3ozEBMqOCAxrxaw9mKWjmupK6w/edit

Decision: Accept

3) Result of e-votes

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1zKdw4fI6myNtAHLhb54vI1ofi3fElcNmR8kNkw8l4Cs/edit#responses

12 sig members participated in the evote to change the symbols for logical operators. They unanimously accepted the proposal by CEO.
1.   Adopt the use of ⇒ for representing implication (instead of ⊃) in FOL
2.   Adopt the use of ⇔ for representing equivalence / if and only(instead of ≡) in FOL
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LzH2oLGMBfDaGPIuxUGVaNZsEKPLnmEiTlEDfHPbDx4/edit

Make a universal find and replace to change the logical operators to the new symbols

GB will announce results of the vote to the SIG list

4) List of participants for the SIG meeting this week

Google formm https://docs.google.com/forms/d/185_TIoY2COrL_omggbM-DbX7EMJ7xSwwXaXLE0kfu7s/edit?usp=drive_web

Spreadsheet
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Gmvj4QKPMMr06tdYTm08WuivQ4WwCBNb6ucadkp827M/edit#gid=343709875

Maybe move the issues Rob is involved in later on in the afternoon, so that he can actually participate in them.

Clicking on the link does not lead to the url if you only have right to view.

George proposed that we only allow sig members rights to view the running issues list, but they should also be allowed to edit the working documents etc.

Decision: make back-up copies before every session. We must make sure that the running issues document is set to 'read only'.

George: will Email the running issues list as a view only link to the participants. Update access rights for the working documents (set to edit) for all participants. Also change the format of the list to google spreadsheet, not .xlsx, it would work better like that.

5) The list of issues for the SIG meeting

The list of running issues can be shared through google docs (set to view, not to edit)
Martin: wants to add to the issues how to represent the Allen Operators.
It is part of the changes effected over the 46th sig meeting (move Allen Operators to CRMarcheo). The master document for CMRarcheo can be made available shortly after, PIN must be contacted if there is an rdf for archeo containing the allen operators.

There should be a specific document for CIDOC CRM v.7.0 dealing with backwards incompatibility problems (like *migration instructions from v6.2.9 to 7.0*).
A new issue will be formed and addressed over the 47th sig meeting.
References to issue 474 also need be made, and also check whether said properties have been added to CRMarcheo.
Missing working documents for issues:
489, 462, 450, 442 (Martin)
468 (Thanassis)
426 (Rob)

491: not yet ready, but has no time-slot anyway.

If we have finished with a large number of issues by Wednesday afternoon, then we can move up issues from the ones that have not been assigned a time slot

6) Who does what, assignment of tasks Wednesday 24/6/2020 and Friday 26/6/2020

Session facilitators: additional tab (sessions) mark the information there.

D1_session1: Thanasis Velios
D1_session2: Chrysoula Bekiari
D1_session3: George Bruseker
D2_session1: Stephen Stead
D2_session2: Thanasis Velios
D2_session3: Christian Emil Ore

Overall meeting chair: Christian Emil Ore / he's the host after all.
Meet and greet session: Martin (president of the CIDOC CRM sig by ICOM).

Session facilitator: should have open at all times
- CRM 7.0 version
- Issue list on website
- Minutes of previous meetings // but Chrysoula can override session facilitators when it comes to figuring out when the issue was discussed (which meeting/ what decision)

Issue facilitator: should have open at all times the working document of the issue he's promoting.

7) AOB

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 15/06/2020

Participants:
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore
Chrysoula Bekiari
Thanasis Velios
George Bruseker
Eleni Tsouloucha

Chair: CEO

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 7th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: June 15th 2020, 14.00-16.00 CEST
Join Zoom Meeting

NEXT MEETING: Monday, 22nd June 2020 --14.00 CEST

1) Acceptance of the agenda
Yes

2) Minutes/notes from meeting 09/6/2020

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EAd_jv573RKsDNAfWJEr_MHb6W5Fb6MeN_qlZ5mDJ_0/edit
Comments: no; minutes accepted

3) The list of open issues

CEO comment: There are 91 open issues. The SIG meeting two days with 3 x 1.5 hours slots. If all issues should be discussed, there will be 15 issues per slot or 6 minutes for each issue. Is this realistic? We may need to go through the list and mark those that are relevant for 7.0.

Proposed Organizing Document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/142QxlsYG1eae--JRFhJ9vXtnqd-CpO3tR4hBsQSD9vQ/edit#heading=h.nife3uqls0um
Issues List Link
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LnGA4SO7aUWEMUz7dO2JAKk1Sb6Mr5i7/edit#gid=317654187

George's email:

Dear all,

A quick follow up on the above. Steve and I had a chance to communicate briefly this morning and bandy about some more ideas.

We guestimate that each session should fit between four and six issues, given our normal rate plus the difficulties of running things virtually especially for the first time. Therefore, we should aim to have our running issues list have 24 to 36 issues that it would be important to address. We can take the opportunity to focus on useful issues that are also resolvable.

The procedure doc now has a lot of information, hopefully almost enough to start to think about running the meeting relatively smoothly. It seems an opportunity to improve our procedures. There are two areas where it seems like we could really make a change for the positive in practice.

a) improve the issue document

The issue document is meant to have a background, an 'old proposal' and a 'new proposal'. In practice this rarely happens and instead the email exchange from the SIG list is copied on to the issue. This is no longer necessary because we have the email archive! It does this automatically. So I propose that we ask FORTH to add one field to the issue entity in drupal that is a link to the email archive and we put that link there and use that to document the conversation.

Instead, the Issue Facilitator should write a short text that summarizes what the issue is about, this is the 'background' and then if / when there is homework the text of it (not a link to a document somewhere) is put into the rich text field that is already in the issue for the 'new proposal'. If the proposal doesn't pass this rich text can be cut and pasted into the 'old proposal box' and when a new proposal exists the same procedure as above can be done. This will make the management of issues much easier because we will know what we are discussing as an action point.

To facilitate this each issue should be adopted by an Issue Facilitator who should arrange the texts for their issues. Given that just the editorial team is six people this could mean 6 issues per person per this SIG. We could of course widen this to the rest of the community and make the load lighter.

Regardless, we need each issue to be managed by somebody and so it would be good if people signed up on the issues list for issues that they would like to and would feel competent to run.

b) improve the working document

The working document should just be a temporary scratch pad that holds the information around a decidable issue and can be used for tracking the discussion at a SIG and the actual changes made at that point.

The working document in practice tends to have a copy paste of the entire email history discussion of an issue. This is not necessary because we have the email archive as noted above and the link should just be in the issue for those who like to read email chains.

So I would suggest again that the work for the Issue Facilitator of someone who volunteers to run an issue is to identify what is the text that is proposed to be worked on during the discussion of the issue and put it in a google doc that is appropriately labelled in an appropriate folder (using Chryssoula's system) on google docs and the link to this scratch pad be put into the running issue list. Then during the meeting, this document is opened and worked upon and when the issue is closed, this information will be transferred to the meeting minutes and on to the issue document documenting the final result.

That's it for now.

Discussion:
GB: proposed that we prioritize the issues that we need to resolve for v7.0 (14 issues) and then take on the other ones that are relevant.

Decision on prioritizing: adding weights to the issues (pressing to less pressing)
Issue 475: The HW by Rob has not been shared through the sig list. If it is to be discussed during the virtual sig meeting, it has to appear on the sig mail archive.
Issue 450: Martin will produce HW by next Monday (22 June 2020)
Issue 438: we shall close the issue and move spatio-temporal reasoning to a new issue
Issue 383: we shall close the issue. We don't need to re-discuss closing it.

Assuming that we resolve all issues relevant for v7.0 and there's still time left for discussion, we could extend the discussion to other issues --ask sig members for any particular issue they have worked on and want to see resolved. GB will send around the email. He will also ask senior sig members to volunteer for session facilitators and/or issue facilitators.
Decision: Session Facilitators **AND** Issue Facilitators need to be made co-hosts.

4) Summon the SIG meeting

GB sent mail and asked for people to indicate that they were coming or no and put a comment. They did:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/185_TIoY2COrL_omggbM-DbX7EMJ7xSwwXaXLE0kfu7s/edit#responses

Decision: Send a last-minute reminder, link to the form. (**GB** to do that)
Should also appear on twitter → send an email to Dominic (CC Martin & Chryssoula) and then to the sig list asking who's got the details for the cidoc-crm account.

5) Rehearsal of the discussion process

6) Rome Meeting Vote

Everyone agreed with one meeting being hosted by Rome and they're also happy that the invitation to have the meeting of summer 2021 in Liege still holds. We'll have to do both, assuming we can travel.

7) diagrams

Discussion:
CEO: we could have evotes right after the meeting
MD: should have a decidable form

TV: it relates to the color-code issue, should be discussed together (457, 471…)
GB: has put everything in one document

Decision: discuss the material during the meeting (assuming it's available by the meeting) and then schedule an evote.

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 09/06/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 6th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: June 9th 2020, 14.00-16.00 CEST
Join Zoom Meeting

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY June 15th, 2020 14.00-16.00 CEST

1) Acceptance of the agenda

Xb will add something about quanitification to AOB

Point (9) in the agenda
Chrysoula: wants to discuss some issues on quantification and missing examples (it will be added under aob).

2) Minutes/notes from meeting 02/6/2020

https://docs.google.com/document/d/159ZroBLy40usyf-3c4jCvoY_WJS7XAbV14PvPeGTGbM/edit

accepted
No comment/point to discuss

3) Transitivity

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j_7oNVrgFjgsZBv4E4Rr1dS5SCPebcGd/edit

P166 was a presence of → could also be transitive, Christian-Emil to form an opinion and share it.

P166 was a presence of (had presence)

Domain: E93 Presence

Range: E92 Spacetime Volume

Subproperty of: E92 Spacetime Volume. P10 falls within (contains): E92 Spacetime Volume

Quantification: (1,1 : 0,n)

> Scope note: This property associates an instance of E93 Presence with the instance of E92 Spacetime Volume of which it represents a temporal restriction (i.e.: a time-slice). Instantiating this property constitutes a necessary part of the identity of the respective instance of E93 Presence.

CEO's comment:
Intuitively it seems to be the case that if A is a presence of B and B is a presence of C then A is a presence of C.

However, as a consequence of the cardinality a presence can only be a presence of a single unique STV: If P166 is transitive restricted to a property with E93 Presence as domain and range then for A, B, C be instances of E93 Presence we have A P166 B and B P166 C implies A P166 C which violates the cardinality constraint.

Two STVs, A and B, can overlap in space and time (P132 spatiotemporally overlaps with: E92 Spacetime Volume) . The temporal overlap of A can be (will define) an instance C of E93 Presence such that C P166 A and C P166 B.

My conclusion is that the cardinality is wrong and should be (1,n : 0,n) and that P166 restricted to a property with E93 Presence as domain and range is transitive.

Discussion: Not capable to resolve now… must think about more and talk about in the SIG

Decision:
Leave it as an issue for the sig → involve the sig in the discussion and decision

4) Preparation of material for the SIG Meeting

a.   The CRM v. 7.0 document in the Google Docs folder must be up to date, Check figures. Check comments about email votes and remove yellow if ok
        https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1gu2YdXmuQ4Z9Up0GaRY8X9CQNjNHy07d

Discussion: this is about the actual 7.0 document… this document is fine. It should not be open for editing. Not all should be able to change.
Christian-Emil has pointed out a few typos etc.we'll have to update accordingly

Decision: This will be the reference document for the meeting

5) ontology - issue list

Two parts one for the issues to be resolved before version 7.0 is completes and one for the rest to be discussed in the meeting in June .
a.   Issues for 7.0 can be found in
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LnGA4SO7aUWEMUz7dO2JAKk1Sb6Mr5i7/edit
b.   Other issues to be discussed in the meeting, separate document or at the end of the document for 5a? For each of the issues there has to be an owner/proposer/presenter?

6) Other issues on the agenda for the sig meeting?

Comment (ceo): The requirement that each issue has to have an owner who is willing to present the issue and moderate the discussion. Issues without an owner are closed. George's sketch for the procedure

7) Organization of the meeting

Comment (ceo): Schedule, agenda The length of sessions and how many: Based done the experience with the editorial meetings 2 hours is maximum.

Discussion:
(a) **We need some time to navigate through documents etc.** Also we need to alert people that this is the document we'll be working on and that's where it is, and also the link should be pasted on the chatbox.

Adding to that, one document to start from and then connect to the number of issues on the site, where all info will appear.

In any case, we must make sure that everyone sees what we're working on.

Increased attendance (given that it;s an online meeting), means that we can't have 50 people interrupting.

Steve's proposal: issue numbers on the chatbox

Christian-Emil suggests that the screen must be shared --one person controlling the screen with the master document

Steve disagrees because it's practically impossible to have 2 people simultaneously controlling the screen (one who's responsible for presenting the issue) and another one performing the changes on the master document. So not a good idea probably.

Maybe use webex given that the chat box saves there despite people dis/re-connecting.

Use the google document ??

Highlight links on the list that chrysoula shared and we'll have all the info on each issue

DECISION: George and Steve are going to draft a document based on Chryssoula's.
Also, make the labels on the document (issues/status) more legible / commonsensical
Check whether all issues that need to be discussed for CIDOC-CRM v7.0 are actually in the list. If not, tentatively add them to the bottom of the list.

Everyone should go through the issues list and make sure that they make note of everything they think is missing.

(b) **ISSUES: view only or set to edit??** People who have to present HW on one or other issue should be able to edit the issues they're involved in
Put files under issue, which means under an issue folder (on the website AND/OR the drive)
Make sure that people who will have to present have a gmail address, to make sure that they can use it to access the documents folder.

We need someone to post links on the chatbox with all clarifications necessary, while people presenting are sharing the screen etc. Not a one person job.

This too should be considered as well
https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/205677665-Sharing-a-whiteboard

Give it a go before the sig meeting (rehearsal)

(c) setting the dates for turning HW in before they get postponed for the next meeting.

(d) time slots for the (actual) virtual sig meeting
3 days: 2x1.5 hour sessions in the morning, early afternoon as HW and a final 1.5 hour session for reporting.
Chryssoula to organise the sessions for each day.

9.30 -11:00 CEST Session 1 {Video Plenary}

15 minute break

11:15-12:45 CEST Session 2 {Video Plenary}

Lunch Break
14:00 - 15:30 CEST Home-Work {Breakout Session Offline}

15:30 - 17:00 CEST Session 4 {Video Plenary}

Number of Days: 2 -reasoning: to get CIDOC-CRM v7.0 ready; and also to test whether this way to schedule virtual meetings is OK and working.
Maybe consider having a break in between (24th and 26th of June). We'd recover on the 25th and see if we can resolve any pressing issues that might come up.

8) Invitation to the meeting

Comment (ceo): The invitation is published on the crm-sig list. Doodle for participation. Participants get invitation and password by email (deadline for this ?)

Ask sig members to rsvp for the meeting (doodle) --attendees should also mention their google accounts (so that they can be added to the meeting --make it past the zoom waiting room)

Indicate if you're attending, when (day 1-2-3), and then email address (gmail preferable)
Chrysoula is in favor of doing that in two-steps.

In any case, we need a way to identify participants. The content of the google drive could be public in principle (at least to view if not to edit)

Alternative: anyone who needs to edit will be given a private link to edit, the other a public one to view.

We'll be using a google form to pass around invitations to the meeting.

9) Proposal for SIG Meeting in Rome

We're probably accepting it and writing the letter of support --but we can't really commit to travel at this point.

Also: can the sig editorial can decide that the meeting will take place in Rome?
Maybe send an email to the sig, ask them for an opinion by Friday, if no one says no, then let's agree to it.

George will ask Marta what she needs for the letter, assuming the sig agrees, Martin will write the letter of support.

10) Next meeting

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY June 15th, 2020 14.00-16.00 CEST

11) AOB

Issue 485 Missing quantification of P197

Missing examples

P196 defines (is defined by)
Domain: E18 Physical Thing
Range: E92 Spacetime Volume
 Quantification:
 one to one, necessary (1,1:0,1)

P185 ends before the end of (ends after the end of)
Domain: E2 Temporal Entity
Range: E2 Temporal Entity

P182 ends before or with the start of (starts after or with the end of)
Domain: E2 Temporal Entity
Range: E2 Temporal Entity

P176 starts before the start of (starts after the start of)
Domain: E2 Temporal Entity
Range: E2 Temporal Entity

P175 starts before or with the start of (starts after or with the start of)
Domain: E2 Temporal Entity
Range: E2 Temporal Entity

P174 starts before the end of (ends after the start of)
Domain: E2 Temporal Entity
Range: E2 Temporal Entity

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 02/06/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair:

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 6th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: June 2nd, 2020 14.00-16.00 CEST
Join Zoom Meeting

Chair: Christian Emil Ore.

NEXT MEETING:

Agenda

1) CRMtex - text-editorial question

Prior decision to refer to classes from CRMbase and family models in extensions, instead of copying them Achille has copied them in CRMtex, instead of listing them (also relation with classes and properties particular to CRMtex)

DECISION: Chrysoula to email Achille asking him to remove the copied CRMbase/family model classes and properties from CRMtex. Just list the ones referred in a separate hierarchy. **Thanasis** can add a table to the template of the family models (model component, label, version etc.).

Also: make sure there is a reference to the version of the model that they 're using.

2) minutes/notes from meeting 26/5/2020

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1u-3yOYrtH5KuFB5EAkbuZqRu2G83ysCvfoLFw55hIVc/edit#

Discussion:

3) P139 has alternative form

Relevant document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PDPLxss8jHdcuYGiN_3LOYw_Zia5SoSq82aBUgY55Fg/edit#heading=h.idl74xfsrpt2

DECISION: George will edit the first sentence, maybe break it in two, make it more legible.
Second sentence, need a different term for "equivalent"

4) Transitivity
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j_7oNVrgFjgsZBv4E4Rr1dS5SCPebcGd/edit

P166 was a presence of → could also be transitive, Christian-Emil to form an opinion and share it.
DECISION: postponed for next meeting

5) logic

Relevant document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/12AKFscYuIIumiP9jEy4V8QTM4wwqG__M/edit#

Set of symbols to use:

consult following documents
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_31-11#Miscellaneous_signs_and_symbols

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_logic_symbols

Decision:
Material Implication: double or single arrow?
Equivalence: double or single two headed arrow?

Martin: what we decide has to cause the least confusion (horse-shoe and single also have other uses)
Content of the email vote:
Should we replace horseshoe with double arrow and equivalence with double headed double arrow?
Justification: Christian Emil's email.

6) Template for scope notes

Original document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/18gFccHobxuMitzcwNunftT0XLnQHTqwj37tlMbVEczM/edit#heading=h.x1tac9r364rf

Steve's version: postponed until the next meeting.

7) continued work on the issue list

Relevant document: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VsIn72R98--VBHWRqhLwmlB_mXcCIpIU/edit#
a.   E4 Period: should the paragraph below be deleted from the scope note of E4 Period or should it still appear in it?

Consequently, an instance of E4 Period may occupy a number of disjoint spacetime volumes, however there must not be a discontinuity in the timespan covered by these spacetime volumes. This means that an instance of E4 Period must be contiguous in time. If it has ended in all areas, it has ended as a whole. However, it may end in one area before another, such as in the Polynesian migration, and it continues as long as it is ongoing in at least one area

Decision: review the decision of the 46th sig meeting during the next virtual meeting (2 June 2020). The decision is to NOT delete the paragraph (2/6/2020).

NEW ISSUE(s)
a.   make clear that the scope note of E53 can be sets of contiguous areas
b.   Change the cardinality of the temporal projection property of STV → P160 [it's one to one and has to change]

8) Meeting plan toward the June meeting

Put together a document incorporating the results of the internal meetings (editorial). Present all this editorial work as a collective HW of the *editorial group*. The result of this HW will be the release of CIDOC CRM v7.0

Discussion around point 9:

> Discussion: the email list
> Background documents: any documents supporting the thing
> Proposal: the actual decidable thing

Need a protocol that everyone sees the same thing

9) Material for the sig-meeting -Issues (Christian-Emil's notes)

In the sig meetings a major part of the agenda is the issues. Each issue identified with an issue number and can be found in the issue list at http://cidoc-crm.org/issue_summary

Issues are usually created in one of the following two ways:

1) a result of a request email on the crm-sig@ics.forth.gr

2) raised at a crm-sig meeting

In the first case a discussion may start at the crm-sig list. In the latter case a discussion may be started at the list when possible homework is sent to the crm-sig list. In both cases a long and often not very relevant discussion spin off. That is fine and make the list vivid.

A problem with the first case is that the proposer of the list often does not support the proposal with sufficient background material and an overview of the consequences for the model. Since the suite of crm-ontologies has become quite complex, a proposed change should be supported documents. I suggest that the proposer must add such material before the issue can be discussed and eventually accepted or rejected.

For each issue there must be an initial proposal describing the

1) background for the proposal

2) A clear description of what is proposed, e.g., new class, new property, change of existing class(es), property/ies, scope note, example, cardinality

3) Detected consequences for other parts of the model(s)

To this initial proposal (posted on the crm-sig-list) there can be a discussion on the list, resulting in changes of the proposal (from the proposer) or an alternative by somebody else (with point 1,2,3 above). I think it is essential that the person who originally raised the issue, keep an ownership to the proposal but may give it away to another person. If a proposal become ownerless, that is, if nobody is interested in being the advocate for the proposal, it should be closed without any decision.

Material for the discussion:

1)   The content of the entry on the issue list will describe the history of the issue: discussion on the crm-sig list and decisions taken in sig-meetings concerning the issue. So such decisions should be in the minutes and in the entry at the issue list.

2)   Background material and hw. For each issue we need a complete list of written material (hw and initial proposal. This list can be added at the end of the entry. The material can be stored in a folder in the web-site and clearly marked with the actual issue number.

In this way In a sig meeting (agenda) it should be easy to find the relevant files for the issue.

10) aob

a.   Property number for Pxxx covered parts of (was partially covered by). P197/P198
If we accept the PXXx holds or supports for 7.0 we should give the number P198, since issue 426 was announced before issue issue 485. It has been discussed in 45th sig and the minutes read
In the 45th joint meeting of the CIDOC CRM SIG and SO/TC46/SC4/WG9; 38th FRBR – CIDOC CRM Harmonization meeting, the sig discussed RS's proposal agreed with the **scope note definition** provided by RS and proposed that Pxxx holds or supports should best be declared a superproperty of P56 bears feature.   HW assigned to RS & MD to investigate the superproperty.

Heraklion, October 2019

DECISION: Property holds or supports initiated by Getty and Rob → not to be part of version 7.0 we'll discuss it later on.

   b.   **George's proposal for a workflow (issues and sig meeting)**
Issue Information All in Issue... no extra docs with comments, folders of data, etc.. unless there is a real extra file, like a powerpoint, additional evidence... this should be put as a link from the issue in the website. Everything in one place: on the issue, on the website, public.
Each issue has a designated owner
Each issue has a backup/following individual (no pet issues)
Issue discussion and editing all happen in issue... not in a large word doc
Edits should not happen in main CRM doc, but in the issue (relevant text copied out into the issue)
issue owner should suggest time required and this should be used in context of making the agenda
About workflow in meeting:
Work flow is key, cannot have pauses to search for documents and discuss email exxchanges
Agenda should be clear and set in advance with full issue names
Agenda should have hyperlinks to the issue on the website so that all can work from same base...
We should work from the website issue list
Owners of issue, should have edit rights to their issue... they should put edits to their issue themselves
There should always be someone designated as taking notes... the notes should be visible to all so that they can approve when discussion done

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 26/5/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
(Stephen Stead)
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 5th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: May 26, 2020 14.00-16.00 CEST
Join Zoom Meeting
https://uio.zoom.us/j/7908993778

NEXT MEETING:
June 2nd, 2020; 14.00-16.00 CEST
Agenda

1) minutes/notes from meeting 11/5/2020

https://drive.google.com/open?id=13O3HP6HaORiycpB6sg3mtQnUFDGAVKogHDwAuRL6yKM

Discussion:
Nothing to discuss.

2) transitivity

Relevant folder: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1DGH-oQCr__QF-LsuIOloV-T6KNfrmmxX

File to be consulted (with Christian-Emil's HW):
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1j_7oNVrgFjgsZBv4E4Rr1dS5SCPebcGd/edit

DECISION: we DO NOT consider fuzzy borders to be the default case, but we should mark that "In a model with fuzzy borders, this property will not be transitive" in the relevant properties' scope notes.

In terms of what we write in the scope notes: "In a model with fuzzy borders, this property will not be transitive."

DECISION_2: transitive properties should be marked as such, intransitive not so much (unless their domain and range are identical-in which case, it should be explicitly noted when they're not transitive)

List of properties:

P139 has alternative form: Martin will rephrase the equivalence section, because it's not really a case of equivalence.

P150 defines typical parts of: it's wrong to specify sth as *generally intransitive but transitive on occasion* > remedy: remove the *in general*

P152 has parent: remove the *in general*

P15/P17: notice the possibility for said properties being transitive, but we're not picking sides exactly.

P165 incorporates → probably the only one in this list that can be transitive. Already included in the scope note (specific case)

P166 was a presence of → could also be a case, Christian Emil will take a look.

P62 depicts → can be transitive as well.

3) logic

Relevant document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/12AKFscYuIIumiP9jEy4V8QTM4wwqG__M/edit#

Summary of Decisions:
1. **Change the title of the section** "About the logical expressions of the CIDOC-CRM"

   To: About the logical expressions used in the CIDOC CRM

2. First paragraph: Change *alternative* to *additional*
   (old)
   The present CIDOC CRM specifications are annotated with logical axioms, providing an alternative formal expression of the CIDOC CRM ontology.

   (new)
   The present CIDOC CRM specifications are annotated with logical axioms, providing an additional formal expression of the CIDOC CRM ontology.

3.   Establish a correspondence between **.1 properties** (properties of properties) and **ternary predicates** in FOL.

4.   Delete the additional reading column for logical constants, and include the alternative readings (where available) under column ***Reads***.

5.   **Edit typos**: "if and only" → "if and only if"
Bullet-points for properties of properties

In terms of which symbols to use:

consult following documents
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_31-11#Miscellaneous_signs_and_symbols

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_logic_symbols

Reflect on that, decide next week on the symbols. But transfer changes on Christian Emil's document.

4) Template for scope notes

https://docs.google.com/document/d/18gFccHobxuMitzcwNunftT0XLnQHTqwj37tlMbVEczM/edit#heading=h.x1tac9r364rf

Thanasis: maybe there should be links from this document to the ontology building principles document. Because they repeat bits and pieces of it.

DECISION: we'll go through it next week. After Steve's done with editing it. Also, Steve should substitute the text in the link with his edited version (instead of transferring all changes implemented thus far)

Examples of good practice? To be taken from CRM extensions (also should include some sort of explanation).

Thanasis: maybe CRMgeo --it's been updated systematically.

5) continued work on the issue list

Relevant document: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VsIn72R98--VBHWRqhLwmlB_mXcCIpIU/edit#

Introduction to the basic concepts:

    a. pg. xviii --Martin's comment // edited on the spot and accepted.

The text changed
FROM:
The notion of identity is key in the application of CIDOC CRM. The properties and relations it provides are designed to allow the accurate historical description of the evolution of real world items through time. This being the case, classes and properties are created in order to provide a definition which will allow the accurate application of the classes or properties to the same real world items by diverse users. Identity in the sense of the CIDOC CRM, therefore, means that informed people are able to agree that they refer to the same, single thing, that according to the scope note of the respective CIDOC CRM class it is regarded to be an instance of. For example, the Great Sphinx of Giza may have lost part of its nose, but there is no question that we are still referring to the same monument as that before the damage occurred, since it continues to represent significant characteristics and distinctness from an overall shaping in the past, which is of archaeological relevance. Things lacking sufficient stability or differentiation, such as atmosphere, soil, clouds, waves, are not instances of E77 Persistent Item, and not suited for information integration. Discourse about such items may be documented with concepts of the CIDOC CRM as observations in relation to things of persistent identity, such as places.

TO:
The notion of identity is key in the application of CIDOC CRM. The properties and relations it provides are designed to allow the accurate historical description of the evolution of real world items through time. This being the case, classes and properties are created in order to provide a definition which will allow the accurate application of the classes or properties to the same real world items by diverse users. Identity, in

the sense of the CIDOC CRM, therefore, means that informed people are able to agree that they refer to the same, single thing in its distinction from others, both in its extent and over its time of existence. The criteria for such a determination should come from understanding the scope note of the respective CIDOC CRM class this thing is regarded to be an instance of, because communication via information systems may not leave space for respective clarifying dialogues between users. For example, the Great Sphinx of Giza may have lost part of its nose, but there is no question that we are still referring to the same monument as that before the damage occurred, since it continues to represent significant characteristics and distinctness from an overall shaping in the past, which is of archaeological relevance. Things lacking sufficient stability or differentiation, such as atmosphere, soil, clouds, waves, are not instances of E77 Persistent Item, and not suited for information integration. Discourse about such items may be documented with concepts of the CIDOC CRM as observations in relation to things of persistent identity, such as places.

b. **Temporal Relations (a comment by Thanasis on fig.5)** → Decision to resolve the comment. According to the decision reached during the 46th CRM-sig meeting, all temporal topological relations are to be represented by one arrow in the figure. "DECISION: The sig opted for representing properties P173 through P185 with only one arrow rather than two or more"

The comment that not all temporal topological relations are expressed by arrows is no longer relevant.

c. **Spatial Relations: comments**
These properties provide a valid interface to the OGC standards, as elaborated in CRMgeo (Doerr and Hiebel 2013).
DECISION [26/5/2020]: it does not refer to a family model; it's a citation, listed under References. However, we can ask Gerald if there is a scientific publication we can refer to.

d. Applied Form – update formats
DECISION: JSON LD/RDF/XML drop the rest.
The text changed

FROM:
Applied Form
The CIDOC CRM is an ontology in the sense used in computer science. It has been expressed as an object-oriented semantic model, in the hope that this formulation will be comprehensible to both documentation experts and information scientists alike, while at the same time being readily converted to machine-readable formats such as RDF Schema, KIF, DAML+OIL, OWL, , etc. It can be implemented in any Relational or object-oriented schema. CIDOC CRM instances can also be encoded in RDF, XML, DAML+OIL, OWL and others.

TO:
Applied Form
The CIDOC CRM is an ontology in the sense used in computer science. It has been expressed as an object-oriented semantic model, in the hope that this formulation will be comprehensible to both documentation experts and information scientists alike, while at the same time being readily converted to machine-readable formats such as RDF Schema or OWL. It can be implemented in Relational or Object-Oriented schema. CIDOC CRM instances can also be encoded in RDF, JSON LD , XML, OWL among and others

e. E4 Period: should the paragraph below be deleted from the scope note of E4 Period or should it still appear in it?

Consequently, an instance of E4 Period may occupy a number of disjoint spacetime volumes, however there must not be a discontinuity in the timespan covered by these spacetime volumes. This means that an instance of E4 Period must be contiguous in time. If it has ended in all areas, it has ended as a whole. However, it may end in one area before another, such as in the Polynesian migration, and it continues as long as it is ongoing in at least one area

Decision: review the decision of the 46th sig meeting during the next virtual meeting (2 June 2020).

6) Meeting plan toward the June meeting

7) aob

New issue: CRMgeo harmonization (E19 Physical Thing still appears as a subclass of E92 STV).

1 document: preparation for the sig meeting, but we could keep the minute discussions

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 11/5/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 4th CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: May 11, 2020 02:00 PM Amsterdam, Berlin, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna
Join Zoom Meeting
https://uio.zoom.us/j/63970188250

NEXT MEETING: May 26th 14.00-16.00 CEST

Agenda

Meeting issues

1) Notes/minutes from the 5/5/2020

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1j_VpdDBzPd6CsgvFCjUbAwXGrYEm8Ve2UfFTIwu1NXY

Discussions: comments on last meeting minutes?

Announcement and Results:

We need to send out an email to the sig list with the summary of the decisions. The summary can be found here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DNeeASAuqADHrp_tmVHPF_-wnMq5QA-h6kisWGJx99U/edit

Right after the vote, an email should be sent out making known the result of the vote to the entire sig list.

George will be doing that. Issue 484 (missing examples) is resolved by said decisions → and it will first be updated on the site (George again) and then the email.

we should have noted in the minutes that there are some examples missing in version7.0 (the last properties that do not have examples).

whether examples are sufficient or if there is need for more: if they make sense, they're enough. it's not that easy to come up with examples to begin with.

examples for P170, P173, P183 do not need to be sent out for an email vote. We have the outcome of the votes already.

2) the google drive - internal issue list and the one t the cidoc-crm.org

George will send by email the email account and password for the joint drive of CRM. People will be editing using their own identities.

3) Continue work on the 7.0 issues
Pending issues grouped in (a) and (b) below.

  a) The excerpt document pending issues excerpts from_6.2.9.docx

  b) "Martin's document" Issues7.0 xm (Martin's document).docx

Christian-Emil's suggestion:

I suggest we start with a) and identify editorial issues, issues ready for email vote, issues for form vote and issues that needs more homework. Document b) is a supporting document

pg. iii yellow highlight;

the property illustrating how examples instantiate properties fixed to:
The Mona Lisa *has former or current owner* The Louvre is an instance of the property *P51 has former or current owner (is former or current owner of)*.

transitivity HW to be found here:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vEJNofCzwe5SAVAtwmWZCV2eH390bq6F/edit#

    a. **P175, P182,P184 are not transitive when a fuzzy boundary exists**
    Christian Emil to check and then send it out for an evote.
    b. **P69 has association with, P130 shows features of, P189 approximates** <u>not transitive and should be listed as non-transitive</u>.
    c. **new definition of transitivity** (proposed by Martin) accepted (see below).

Transitivity	Transitivity is defined in the standard way found in mathematics or logic: A property P is transitive if the domain and range is the same class and for all instances x, y, z of this class the following is the case: If x is related by P to y and y is related by P to z, then x is related by P to z. The intention of a property as described in the scope note will decide whether a property is transitive or not. ==For example, the property *P121 overlaps with* between instances of E53 Place is not transitive, while the property *P89 falls within (contains)* between instances of E53 Place and the property *P46 is composed of (forms part of)* between instances of E18 Physical Thing are both transitive.== Transitivity is especially useful when CIDOC CRM is implemented in a system with deduction.

Issue 456: Compatibility Statement: Reality, Knowledge Bases and CIDOC CRM – to be rephrased by MD:
Decision: Review this issue over the next sig meeting --the proposal is to close it for lack of feedback and/or interest. The version of the text to appear in 7.0 is the one that the ISO have already agreed on. The issue will be left open for now, but will not be revisited in the context of version 7.0. But can be discussed again in the future.

pg. ix. Property Quantifiers --highlighted text:
<u>Discussion</u>: maybe prepare graphic examples illustrating cardinalities of properties --but for v.7.1 and on. NOT for 7.0. A nice graphic would be much more effective than all the wordsmithing in the world. MAKE IT AN ISSUE PERHAPS and Thanassis wants to be involved in it.

The yellow highlight probably indicated that the reference to Carlo and Martin's paper was added to the text.

Decision: remove the highlight and start the new issue on expressing the cardinalities of CRM properties in a nice graphic. Thanasis wants to be involved in this.

pg. xi. About the logical expressions of the CIDOC CRM
Decision: Christian-Emil will go through the document to check the logical expressions in use and also check for best practices and make a proposal over the next meeting.[[logical symbols for iff, if...then,

and all logical expressions appearing across inferences/axioms should be used consistently]]

Reality, Knowledge Bases and CIDOC CRM (plus footnotes)
Decision: The text to keep is the following (the formatting in actual footnotes though).

The CIDOC CRM is a formal ontology in the sense introduced by (N. Guarino 1998) [fN 1]. The present document is intended to embrace an audience not specialized in computer science and logic; therefore, it focuses on the informal semantics and on the pragmatics of the CIDOC CRM concepts, offering a detailed discussion of the main traits of the conceptualization underlying the CIDOC CRM through basic usage patterns [fN 2]. The CIDOC CRM aims to assist sharing, connecting and integrating information from research about the past. In order to understand the function of a formal ontology of this kind, one needs to make the following distinctions:

[fN 1]: Nicola Guarino defines a formal ontology as a specification of a set of named concepts used to describe and approximate a part of reality, plus a first-order logical theory narrowing down the intended meaning of the named concepts.

[fN 2]: For the readers interested in computer science and logic, the syntax and formal semantics employed by the CIDOC CRM are given in (Meghini & Doerr 2018), where the computational aspects are also discussed.

Correct citation to Carlo & Martin's paper added
Decision: drop the highlight.
Meghini C. &, Doerr M., 2018. A first-order logic expression of the CIDOC conceptual reference model, International Journal of Metadata, Semantics and Ontologies, Vol.13 No.2, pp.131 - 149

Links and references:
Regarding the decision to add hyperlinks to classes and properties mentioned in passing in the introduction section, it was considered an overkill, with no added value, so it will be dropped. An editorial issue will be made though --to check if the E and P numbers of all the classes and properties mentioned in the introduction are also listed there.
clarification (but quite random and not necessarily the case in the text): instead of referring to a Time-Span, we should make sure that the class referred to is E52 Time-Span.
another thing is, we need to make sure that the hyperlinks work (in contents, other tables, class and property definitions etc.)

Extensions of *CIDOC* CRM: *Decision: substitute text in yellow highlight with George's version*
- old
  The CIDOC CRM models with priority the kinds of facts one would like to retrieve and relate from across heterogeneous content from different institutions, in contrast, for instance, to administrative practices internal to an institution
- George's version
  The CIDOC CRM prioritizes modelling the kinds of facts one would like to retrieve and relate from heterogeneous content sources, potentially from different institutions. It does not, by way

of contrast, focus on the modelling of facts with a more local scope such as the administrative practices internal to an institution.

Decision: substitute text in ==yellow highlight== with <u>new one</u>.

==At the model level, new classes and properties within the CIDOC CRM's scope may be found at any time in the course of integrating more documentation records or when new kinds of relevant facts come to the attention of its maintainers.==

<u>At the model level, new classes and properties within the CIDOC CRM's scope may be found in the course of integrating more documentation records or when new kinds of relevant facts come to the attention of its maintainers.</u>

Decision: keep text as is in the document -remove highlight.
This ability to integrate information with different specificity of description in a well-defined way is particularly important for large-scale information integration.

Reference to the basic function of E2 Temporal Entity and its subclasses [[something happening over time]] and its similarity with the function of action verbs in natural language.

Discussed during the sig meeting (February 2020 Athens), no objections there, we (I) forgot to erase the highlight.
Decision: remove the highlight

Decision: Martin will rephrase the sentence in blue. He'll break it into two (or more) clauses to make it more legible.
The notion of identity is key in the application of CIDOC CRM. The properties and relations it provides are designed to allow the accurate historical description of the evolution of real world items through time. This being the case, classes and properties are created in order to provide a definition which will allow the accurate application of the classes or properties to the same real world items by diverse users. Identity in the sense of the CIDOC CRM, therefore, means that informed people are able to agree that they refer to the same, single thing, according to the scope note of the respective CIDOC CRM class it is regarded to be an instance of. For example, the Great Sphinx of Giza may have lost part of its nose, but there is no question that we are still referring to the same monument as that before the damage occurred, since it continues to represent significant characteristics and distinctness from an overall shaping in the past, which is of archaeological relevance. Things lacking sufficient stability or differentiation, such as atmosphere, soil, clouds, waves, are not instances of E77 Persistent Item, and not suited for information integration. Discourse about such items may be documented with concepts of the CIDOC CRM as observations in relation to things of persistent identity, such as places.

b) "Martin's document"

Issues7.0 xm (Martin's document).docx

We didn't go through this document, but it has informed the one dubbed *pending issues* so we didn't exactly ignore it..

4) The remaining issues in the large issue list.
Identify 7.0 relevant issues, issues that may be closed, issues ready for vote, issues that need more homework

5) Template for scope notes?
<u>Martin</u>:

Attached my first draft for scope note writing. I have not touched yet the scope notes for properties. There is much less theory about it. Substance and Identity is discussed by David Wiggins in an excellent book. Unity criteria and identity criteria by Nicola Guarino in several papers. There are the old AAT guidelines for scope note writing, which I used from memory. We could try to find them. Existence criteria are rather things I have discussed with Maria Daskalaki. I think the idea is implicit in Wiggin's book.

I'd suggest Steve to rework if adequate, and all of you to comment.

I'll continue with property scope notes.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qj_w_zHovek133M5EjnHiIldSAJCGaYob1MtlNLwHWo/edit?usp=sharing

6) a.o.b

- <u>Martin</u> to respond to CHIN regarding renewing their membership with the sig. Answer along the lines of: as far as we're concerned they never left, but have been inactive, they will henceforth be represented by Philippe Michon as requested.
- they appear in the old website, and were never transferred to the new site. it should be concluded over email.
- also to appear in the new site.

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 5/5/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker

Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 3rd CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: May 5, 2020 01:00 PM Amsterdam, Berlin, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna
Join Zoom Meeting
https://uio.zoom.us/j/63076004307

Agenda

1) minutes/notes from meeting 30.04.2020

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CflF7t6V4CBmD-ufgtwdJgeHHs3hKwDQCaiegAk1E5g/edit

Discussion: No comments

2) crm-sig email user

What should it be?

Proposed: cidoccrm_sig@gmail.com
Decided: we all agree, George will try to implement and report next time

3) Example template revisited

Proposal: discuss at the end if time
Decision: agreed

4) Template for scope notes?

Discussion: CEO, do we need one of these?
Martin volunteered to write some guidelines, scope notes should not be definitions per se, but delimit the scope of what it is that they're talking about.
It should comprise
HW for Martin to come up with a proposal for the guidelines by the next meeting.

In need of a catch phrase like "**Guidelines for editing contributions", "Policy and Procedures".**
Discussion on where to put that:
Probably not under Resources but also maybe under Activities

Decision: draft this by next meeting, template for scope notes

5) votes continued

Discussion points:
Martin proposed that examples that are related to one another should be explicitly linked somehow.
Christian-Emil considers that examples should be self contained.

Decision: The results of the votes will be documented through their respective issues, with links pointing to the google spreadsheets with the answers /decisions and comments.

Minor editorial changes were made in almost all the examples so that their form matches the CRM examples' template (property label in italics, no mention of property No, IDs of the most specific Domain and Range Classes used in property examples mentioned in parentheses, supply of contextual information in [] instead of (), use of lowercase at the beginning of examples (except for Proper names), dropping of full stops at the end of examples (except for long sentences, where punctuation is needed)
Other changes involve:
- substituting "whereabouts" for "presence" to avoid tautological examples (for E93 Presence and properties that it appears in).
- Editing chronologies where there were copy-paste errors spotted
- Abbreviations dropped in favor of full forms (so "November instead of "Nov.")
- Other minor typos (prepositions etc).

Examples for E93 Presence and its properties.

Examples for Pxxx covered parts of (was partially covered by) --new property of E93 Presence.

- **Johann Joachim Winckelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1968 Pxxx covered parts of Florence, Italy**
  - o The example was accepted unanimously (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winckelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 <u>1768 (E93)</u> *covered parts of* Florence, Italy (E53)

- **Johann Joachim Winckelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1968 Pxxx covered parts of Paestum, Italy**
  - o The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winckelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 <u>1768 (E93)</u> *covered parts of* Paestum, Italy (E53)

- **The Byzantine Empire 1013 AD Pxxx covered parts of The Italian Peninsula**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). No of the property to be removed and its label to be italicized.
  - o The Byzantine Empire 1013 AD (E93) *covered parts of* The Italian Peninsula (E53)

E93 Presence Examples

- **The Roman Empire in 19 August AD 14**
  - o The example was accepted unanimously (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads
    The Roman Empire <u>on</u> 19 August AD 14

- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence in December 1775**
  - o The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winkelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> in December 1775

- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1768**
  - o The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winkelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 1768

P195 was a presence of (had presence) Examples

- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence in December 1775 P195 was a presence of Johann Joachim Winkelmann (E21)**
  - The example was unanimously accepted (6/6).It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winckelmann's <u>whereabouts </u>in December 1755 (E93) *was a presence of* Johann Joachim Winckelmann (E21)
- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1678 P195 was a presence of Johann Joachim Winkelmann (E21)**
  - The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winckelmann's <u>whereabouts </u>from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 1768 (E93) *was a presence of* Johann Joachim Winckelmann (E21)

P167 at (was place of) Examples

- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence in December 1755 at Rome**
  - The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes
  - It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winkelmann's <u>whereabouts </u>in December 1755 (E93) *at* Rome (E53)

- **Johann Joachim Winkelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1968 *at* Italy**
  - The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes
  - It now reads:
    Johann Joachim Winkelmann's <u>whereabouts </u>from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 1768 (E93) *at* Italy (E53)

Link to (9) aob below. Martin proposed it be renamed to *P167 was within (includes)*

P164 during (was time-span of) Examples

- **Johann JoachimWinckelmann's presence in December 1755 during December 1755 (E52)**
  - The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - It now reads:
    Johann JoachimWinckelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> in December 1755 (E93) *during* December 1755 (E52)

- **Johann JoachimWinckelmann's presence from Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1978 *during* Nov. 19 1755 until April 9 1768 (E52)**

- The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (4/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
- It now reads:
  Johann Joachim Winkelmann's <u>whereabouts</u> from <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 <u>1768</u> (E93) *during* <u>November</u> 19 1755 until April 9 1768 (E52)

Link to (9) aob below. Martin proposed it be renamed to *P164 concerns* but there has been no consensus so far.

P166 was a presence of (had presence) Example

- **The Roman Empire in 19 August AD 14 P166 was a presence of The Roman Empire (E4)**
  - The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - It now reads:
    The Roman Empire <u>on</u> 19 August AD 14 (E93) was a presence of The Roman Empire (E4)

STV and Temporal Properties Examples

P156 occupies (is occupied by) Examples

- **Burg Eltz (english: Eltz Castle) near Koblenz, Germany P156 occupies the space within the outer walls of Burg Eltz since 1661AD (E53) (the castle has been extended from the 12th century until 1661AD and not been destroyed up to present, containing buildings from various periods)**
  - The example was unanimously accepted, <u>Steve</u> will proofread and edit.

- **The Saint Titus reliquary P156 occupies the space of the Saint Titus reliquary (the reliquary is currently kept in the Saint Titus Church in Heraklion, Crete since 1966 and contains the skull of Saint Titus)**
  - The example was accepted by the majority of the sig members who took part in the evote (5/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - The example now reads:
    The Saint Titus reliquary *occupies* the space of the Saint Titus reliquary [the reliquary is currently kept in the Saint Titus Church in Heraklion, Crete since 1966 and contains the skull of Saint Titus]
  - Eleni to look for references for this example

P160 has temporal projection (is temporal projection of) Examples

- **The spatio-temporal trajectory of the H.M.S. Temeraire from its building in 1798 to its destruction in 1838 P160 has temporal projection The Time-Span of the existence of H.M.S. Temeraire [P82 at some time within 1798-1838 (E61 Time Primitive)]**

- o The example was unanimously accepted as is (6/6 It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    the spatio-temporal trajectory of the H.M.S. Temeraire from its building in 1798 to its destruction in 1838 (E5) *has temporal projection* The Time-Span of the existence of H.M.S. Temeraire [P82 at some time within 1798-1838 (E61 Time Primitive)]

- **The Spacetime Volume of the Battle of Waterloo 1815 P160 has temporal projection The Time-Span of the Battle of Waterloo [P82 at some time within Sunday, 18 June 1815 (E61 Time Primitive)]**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads
    The Battle of Waterloo 1815 (E7) *has temporal projection* the time-span of The Battle of Waterloo [P82 at some time within Sunday, 18 June 1815 (E61 Time Primitive)]

P168 place is defined by (defines place) Examples
- **The centroid from https://sws.geonames.org/735927 (E53) P168 place is defined by [40°31'17.9"N 21°15'48.3"E] (E94) (a single point for approximating the centre of the city of Kastoria, Greece)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    the centroid from https://sws.geonames.org/735927 (E53) *place is defined by* 40°31'17.9"N 21°15'48.3"E (E94) [a single point for approximating the centre of the city of Kastoria, Greece]

- **Martin's coordinates for Kastoria (E53) P168 place is defined by [40°30'23"N 21°14'53"E, 40°31'40"N 21°16'43"E] (E94) (a square covering the built settlement structure of Kastoria, Greece)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    Martin's coordinates for Kastoria (E53) *place is defined by* 40°30'23"N 21°14'53"E, 40°31'40"N 21°16'43"E (E94) [a square covering the built settlement structure of Kastoria, Greece]

- **Martin's centroid for Kastoria (E53) P168 place is defined by [40°31'01.5"N 21°15'48"E] (a point in the lake of Kastoria in the centre of the area covered by the city)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.

- o It now reads:
  Martin's centroid for Kastoria (E53) *place is defined by* 40°31'01.5"N 21°15'48"E (E94) [a point in the lake of Kastoria in the centre of the area covered by the city]

- **Alexander v. Humboldt's measurement for the Plaza Mayor in Cumaná, Sucre,Venezuela 1799-1800AD (E53) P168 place is defined by [10°27'52"N 66°30'02"W] (actually 260km west of Cumaná)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    the position measured by Alexander von Humboldt for the Plaza Mayor in Cumaná, Sucre,Venezuela 1799-1800AD (E53) *place is defined by* 10°27'52"N 66°30'02"W (E94) [actually 260km west of Cumaná]

- **[40°30'23"N 21°14'53"E, 40°31'40"N 21°16'43"E, 200BC-2020AD] (E95) P169 defines spacetime volume Martin's spatiotemporal enclosure 2020 for the evolution of the settlement of today's city of Kastoria, Greece since its conquest by the Romans (E92) (a square covering the current built settlement structure of Kastoria, Greece, through the years 200BC to 2020AD, which includes the extents of earlier phases of the city)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). It was edited according to proposed changes.
  - o It now reads:
    {40°30'23"N 21°14'53"E, 40°31'40"N 21°16'43"E, 200BC-2020AD} (E95) *defines spacetime volume* Martin's spatiotemporal enclosure 2020 for the evolution of the settlement of today's city of Kastoria, Greece, since its conquest by the Romans (E92) [a square covering the current built settlement structure of Kastoria, Greece, through the years 200BC to 2020AD, which includes the extents of earlier phases of the city]
  - o **Decision**: revise use of {}.

P170 defines time (time is defined by) Examples

- **(1800/1/1 0:00:00 – 1899/31/12 23:59:59)(E61) P170 defines time The 19th century (E52)**
  - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). Minor editorial changes were made so that its form matches the CRM examples' template.
  - o It now reads:
    (1800/1/1 0:00:00 – 1899/31/12 23:59:59)(E61) *defines time* The 19th century (E52)

- **(1968/1/1 – 2018/1/1)(E61) P170 defines time "1968/1/1 – 2018/1/1" (E52) (an arbitrary time-span during which the Saint Titus reliquary was present in the Saint Titus Church in Heraklion, Crete)**
    - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). Minor editorial changes were made so that its form matches the CRM examples' template (property label in italics, no mention of property No, contextual information in [] instead of ()).
    - o It now reads:
      (1968/1/1 – 2018/1/1)(E61) *defines time* "1968/1/1 – 2018/1/1" (E52) [an arbitrary time-span during which the Saint Titus reliquary was present in the Saint Titus Church in Heraklion, Crete]

P173 starts before or with the end of (ends after or with the start of) Example

- **The legendary run from Marathon to Athens 490BC (E7) P173 starts before or with the end of The Battle of Marathon 490BC (E7)**
    - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). Minor editorial changes were made so that its form matches the CRM examples' template (property label in italics, no mention of property No). It now reads:
    - o The legendary run from Marathon to Athens 490BC (E7) *starts before or with the end of* The Battle of Marathon 490BC (E7)

P183 ends before the start of (starts after the en of) Example

- **Gisle taking office as Bishop of Linköping 1139(E7) P183 ends before the start of The Guta saga composition (E65)**
    - o The example was unanimously accepted (6/6). Minor editorial changes were made so that its form matches the CRM examples' template (property label in italics, no mention of property No). AD was also added after the chronology.
    - o It now reads:
      Gisle taking office as Bishop of Linköping 1139 AD (E7) *ends before the start of* The Guta saga composition (E65)

6) homework

Nothing here

7) issue list

Focus on that next time (11/5/2020)
List will have been updated by the next meeting, look at the .xlsx

http://www.cidoc-crm.org/Meeting/47th-cidoc-crm-and-40th-frbr-crm

Chrysoula will update the list and turn it into a google spreadsheet.

The link below is where the updated google spreadsheet should be stored.

https://drive.google.com/open?id=18n-_ZVHGxCqK13azA9faGxWpOSekiT4R

8) next meeting
Monday, 11/5/2020 14.00-16.00 CEST

9) aob.

Remember ad vs ce in dates question
Martin's proposal to change the labels on:
** P164 during → to become *concerns (is concern of)*
** P167 → to become *was within (includes)*
George not a fan of *concerns*, Steve either.
was within is acceptable.
HW for Steve, Martin and George to come up with a better label for P164 by the next meeting --maybe *is delineated by* or *is temporarily specified by (temporarily specifies)* or *has specifying time* --probably the underlined one.

E-vote for the change of labels to be prepared
DECIDE whether we should call an e vote or have a discussion over this during the sig meeting.

10) Fun things

http://www.loc.gov/standards/datetime/edtf.html

https://www.ogc.org/standards/tsml

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 30/4/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead

Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios
Martin Doerr
Christian-Emil Ore

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Meeting Coordinates:

Topic: 2nd CRM editorial Zoom Meeting
Time: Apr 30, 2020 01:00 PM Amsterdam, Berlin, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna
Join Zoom Meeting
https://uio.zoom.us/j/63076004307

Agenda

1) the last meeting - minutes

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VgtHC68QE9vP-wTTlWzdeM_TKaXJdCGDxzFcMgGcmxI/edit

Discussion: No comments to the last meeting minutes

2) common repository:

google documents/folders? Who is responsible?

Option 1: Google Drive
https://drive.google.com/open?id=1eHq8iLLSCEW69X2ihZJILfowMRVi1r8F

Option 2: move that to a new drive (cidoc-crm) editors should all be owners. If we start using too much space then we'll have to consider some business plan?

Decision: HW: George will setup a gmail account for CIDOC CRM SIG and transfer the files that exist so far there (and password to gmail account to be commonly shared out to SIG editorial)

3) organisational issue - who accepts email votes.

Discussion:

Regarding Collecting the Votes (Chrysoula & Eleni -team FORTH) can continue collecting votes and make sure that the decisions are made available to the group.

Send reminders to the group concerning the deadlines. If f.i. We have a two weeks period to collect the votes, after that, we should send reminders letting everyone know what the results are.

** Minor comments should be incorporated without requiring a new decision. In principle everyone can veto a vote etc.

The extended group of vice/chairs and editors keep track of the email/electronic votes, announce the result and keep the documentation(?)

!! DIscuss at the end of the meeting if we go for email votes (like we used to) or opt for google forms instead…

4) example templates

    Thanasis presents

Relevant docs here:

https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1vKhZCqdYE-9dhyWMrQcBi4mJvPGUp0cV

Is the text consistent with FRBRoo? In principle yes, but there are both double and single quotes. Thanasis saw that.

In the intro to FRBR there must be some mention to what the typographic convention is. And we should probably follow that consistently.

** re. Styles: the templates document should also contain info why sth is spelled with capitals (initial letter) etc.

** multiple instantiation: should we do that within examples? Or just use examples that do not involve multiple instantiation?

Steve & Martin: against that, they think they're good examples.

Martin disagrees with moving multiple instantiation examples to the designated section in the introduction. This treatment is on a par with sublcassing (which we do all the time).

Introduce a comment in this particular case (in angle brackets []).

E12 production example needs to also go to multiple instantiation paragraph in CRm intro document.

On a different note: This example should become part of the didactic material. And also section on multiple instantiation.

!!! someone has to go through the entire document (check the examples)!!
Entity identifiers to be maintained in property examples and added in the class examples.

.1 properties:
Right below quantification.

Bibliography of cidoc-crm examples. Imported from Zotero.
Should find out who presently holds/maintains the zotero. (FORTH HW)
GB and TV could discuss possibilities for integrating zotero data in a useful/easy way to CRM Site. To discuss next time.
Thanasis: not all examples come with references.

Where it goes? Should be referenced in 449 (how to write examples) and saved somewhere on the website in the resources area
Could be placed together with the TEMPLATE FOR THE EXTENSIONS:

Discussion: when to make the changes to the examples and by whom? Does it go in 7.0?

The version we will propose to ISO will be 7.1. So this will not go into 7.0

5) the issue lists

 we go through the two attached lists, discuss and close the editorial issues and formulate email votes for the remaining.

DECISIONS (regarding HW):
New examples for P130 shows feature of (features also found on):
   i.   Mary Lamb's Cymbeline [from Charles and Mary Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare] P130 shows features of William Shakespeare's Cymbeline
       7 sig members voted --was unanimously accepted.
   ii. The audio recording of Dante Alighieri's La divina commedia read by Enrico de Negri P130 shows features of the text of Dante Alighieri's La divina commedia
       7 sig members voted --6 in favor
   iii. My coffee cup P130 shows features of the Starbucks company logo
       7 sig members voted --4 in favor, but Vetoed (GB) and rejected after some discussion.
New example for E96 Purchase

   i.   the purchase of 10 okka of nails by the captain A. Syrmas on 18/9/1895 in Thessaloniki
       7 sig members voted --was unanimously accepted

New example for P179 had sales price (was sales price of)

    i.   the purchase of 10 okka of nails by the captain A. Syrmas on 18/9/1895 (E96) had sales price 20 piastre (grosi) (E97)
        7 sig members voted --was unanimously accepted

New property for Presence: Pxx covered parts of (was partially covered by):

    i.   The addition of the new property was accepted based on the result of the evote
        6 sig members voted --was unanimously accepted

Scope note for the new property Pxx covered parts of (was partially covered by) :

    i.   The scope note was accepted following <u>Steve's adjustment</u>.
        6 sig members voted --was unanimously accepted

The definition of the property reads:
Pxx covered parts of (was partially covered by):
Domain: E93 Presence
Range: E53 Place
Quantification:
Scope note: This property associates an instance of E93 Presence with an instance of E53 Place that geometrically overlaps with the spatial projection of the respective instance of E93 Presence. <u>A use case of this property is to state through which places an object or an instance of E21 Person has or was moved within a given time-span.</u> It may also be used to describe a partial or complete, temporary or permanent extension of the spatial extent of some realm into a neighboring region during a known time-span. It may also be used to describe a partial or complete, temporary or permanent extension of the spatial extent of some realm into a neighboring region during a known time-span. It is a shortcut of the more fully developed path from E93 Presence through P161 has spatial projection, E53 Place, P121 overlaps with to E53 Place.

6) Homework

Thanasis to revise the example template document and share.

7) Next meeting
Next tuesday 14.00-16.00 CEST.

8) a.o.b

- Look at results of last vote calls

- We'll need some guidelines on how to write scope notes.

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 27/3/2020
Medium: Skype

Scope: This meeting called to manage the change to the second CRM SIG of 2020 which will not take place in Liege as planned. Rather, the meeting will take on a virtual form in view of the covid situation.

Attendees:
Chryssoula Bekiari
Christian-Emil Ore
Eleni Tsoulouha
Martin Doerr
Steve Stead
Thanasis Velios
George Bruseker

1. How to organize virtual meeting

What are reasonable working times? Can't be eight hours a day

Steve: each session, up to one hour, 15 minute break between (optimum for keeping everyone focussed)

2 one hour sessions, break, and then another 2 one hour sessions

Chryssoula: Highlight that the issues have to be very well prepared and assigned to individuals and taken up

- Generally agreed

Suggestion: Three 1.5 hour sessions

Steve: WE might need 2 people per issue. A chair and a discussant

Thanasis: can we set a deadline for the HW. The HW should be there 2 weeks before the meeting OR the issue will not be discussed.

Martin: yes those people who stand behind an issue need to confirm that they will come and prepare their issue, or that issue will not be discussed.

Chrysoula: In practice people send HW at the last minute.

Martin: This is bad practice - the mailing list should be update with the HW in advance
George: Focus only to version 7.0 or a limited number of issues.

Martin: 3 days: 2x1.5 hour sessions in the morning, early afternoon as HW and a final 1.5 hour session for reporting. Chryssoula to organise the sessions for each day. Deadline for proposed issues to discuss: one month in advance to publish the list of issues to be discussed (who will be presenting each issue; tentatively assign people to discuss each issue), and give a **ONE-week** response time to get the HW set (then if no response, we'll reassign).

DEADLINES:
Publishing list of issues to be discussed and person doing the introductions: 18 MAY 2020
First Deadline for response: 25th May
Second Deadline: 1st June

2. How to organize immediate homework for 7.0

Martin: Minutes only have remarks about issues which DO NOT go to version 7.0.
CMO: We need to go through the issues again and check which of the issues should go to 7.0
Martin: Done work on examples. Help from archaeologist and historians neded for the temporal primitives. CMO to assist with examples following MD and SS's work. (CEO to be reminded by email).
Send reminders to people for HM for 7.0

In two weeks time we'll be testing with zoom. Christian Emil will set it up, and pass around a doodle to be filled in (find time-slot).

Chrysoula will update version 7.0 with the changes made during the last sig meeting.

3. Email votes

Package them in yes/no boxes. Maybe use surveymonkey ? google forms (questionnaire) and then get them out in an excel spreadsheet that can be edited. Martin will send George a sample of that (and a list of the examples) and then George will set up the questionnaires.
BY April 3rd, 2020.

4. No of participants.
Probably gonna increase, cause they'll be able to join for free. We have to take this into consideration while we're planning for this meeting.

CIDOC CRM Editorial Team's Virtual Meeting –Date: 15/4/2020

Participants:
George Bruseker
Chryssoula Bekiari
Stephen Stead
Eleni Tsouloucha
Thanasis Velios

Chair: Christian-Emil Ore

Agenda

1) test zoom

Connection of members seemed to work well.

2) agree on rules of procedure: who is in charge of the minutes document, the crm document, chair
(as i mentioned yesterday, I can make all co-host.)

Documents to consider:

- Outstanding issues sheet - from XB for 7.0
- Martin document of list of things to do for 7.0
- Total outstanding issues excel - from CEO

Need to have a list of house rules for how to create the document (e.g. examples)… style guide for how to write the manual

template for creating new examples
a style guide with detail re what to put in italics, when to use square brackets etc.
--> these things that need tightening up etc. the rules need to be spelled out and add any extra things that come up

Thanasis would be happy to help with that --should be fairly soon though.
Chrysoula will be sharing old notes with Thanasis re. typing conventions etc.

Updates required before merging documents into one. G in Martin's document seems half-done for instance, E could be dealt with very quickly, we ve received HW for F and the text is updated from the minutes …

Steve: in 2 weeks time there should be a consolidated document taking into account Chrysoula's, Martin's and Christian Emil's documents, and we should also have a list of issues which we have homework for.
Chrysoula reminds people about their pending home work.

Christian Emil will be providing the list of missing examples prior to the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING: go through the merged list and also check the yellow highlights in the text.

3) discuss and agree on the voting system George will put everything on google forms and will distribute them.

4) go through the excerpt document

    Postponed to the next meeting

5) go through excel list of open issues and mark the ones essential for CRM 7.0

    Chrysoula will update the issue list on the web page. New excel list, C-E will go through the open issues and check for relevance to CRM 7.0.

6) assign presenters to the issues

Hopefully, the presentations should be so clear that a decision could be taken by a e-vote

7) Virtual SIG Discussion

    Decide: we will make official announcement <website, mailing list, twitter>
GEorge will write a few lines announcing that this meeting will be a virtual one through zoom
It has to be shared through twitter, website, mailing list.

8) NEXT MEETING:

probably April 30 , Christian Emil will be sharing a doodle again.