In the 58th CIDOC CRM SIG & 51st FRBR/LRMoo SIG Meeting, PF gave a summary of the discussions for issue 349, see [here](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1mU4CZ1gRpXy-QW6Yyu2KrzbWBoMTmbPM/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=106527976073466803201&rtpof=true&sd=true) for the slide deck of his presentation.

**Discussion points:**

* Why not use CRMinf to represent uncertainty? Making individual assertions about the probability of one particular statement is not the typical case. Usually one wants to assert the probability of a proposition set that supports logical argumentation, not assign probability values to each statement making it up, with very little evidence as to why that is the case.
* The .2 solution comes with unwarranted implications, namely that the .2 statements are explicitly uncertain, vs all other statements that are implicitly uncertain. Even for values Truth and False, there’s always a possibility that the assigned values are not “correct”. And calculating the probability values in terms of percentages also calls for knowing the dependencies between the statements. It’s best that this is handled in terms of proposition sets and CRMinf properties that connect them to belief values instead.
* Individual statements are meaningless unless they support a piece of argumentation. .2 statements are only relevant for systems that automatically produce triples that come with confidence scores.

**How to proceed**:

* Determine the extent to which the solutions that make use of E13 Attribute Assignment, R1 Reliability Assessment, or CRMinf constructs are fit to represent the use cases identified. If none of the proposed solutions can do that, then one should look for new modeling constructs.
* The range of possible values registered in I6 Belief Value could be {True, False, Unknown}, but the two extra probability values assumed by PF’s proposal do not have to be explicitly modelled through CRMinf.
* **Share use-cases with PF**:
  + Former National Monuments’ record has free-text data (statements assigned to particular authors, including statements about the plausibility of the original statements –for instance: X said Y, but I don’t believe him/it)  
    HW: SdS will look for it (also with a Swedish dataset that involves ongoing work)
  + Conservation data from the National Archives about inconclusive analyses can be of use, but the probability statements are not for individual assertions   
    HW: **DO** (summarize the discussion and provide use cases)
  + Look for contingencies with Risk Assessment (confer with AG, MA)
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