

Issue 615

Scope note of E13 Attribute Assignment (tentative)

short version: close it!

*

problematic last paragraph has been deleted:

All cases of properties in this model that are also described indirectly through a subclass of E13 Attribute Assignment are characterised as "short cuts" of a path via this subclass. This redundant modelling of two alternative views is preferred because many implementations may have good reasons to model either the action of assertion or the short cut, and the relation between both alternatives can be captured by simple rules.

Redraft P38 deassigned → issue 630 closed, the only TODO for P38 are examples

Both P37 "assigned" and P38 "deassigned" are in fact subproperties of P141 "assigned". On the other hand, according to its scope note P1 is a shortcut for "P140i was attributed by E15 Identifier Assignment P37 assigned" but the counterpart "P140i was attributed by E15 Identifier Assignment P38 deassigned" is not mentioned.

Re the lack of subproperty of P140 for domain E15 Identifier Assignment. No one seems to remember what motivated this "lack of symmetry". Discussion to continue in the thread for issue 615.

→ is this still up to date? If yes, move to separate issue?

no longer up to date, moot point, P38 no longer related to P140, separate issue (talk with George about this afterwards)

As a rule, multiple properties of a superclass should not be specialized altogether by analogy. Properties are and must be specialized if and only if they convey a more specific meaning than the superproperty of the superclass in the context of the subclass. Obviously, there is nothing you can say about an entity that enables it to have an Identifier assigned and not only an Appellation. Conversely, there should exist at least one entity that, by its nature, cannot be assigned an identifier to.

This rule, even though general KR, may be worthwhile to be documented as another ISSUE. We had more frequently cases in CRM extensions, where properties were not specialized but should have been.

→ new issue?? to add in introduction?

George: not make an issue

left todo from my perspective: add a clause in the first paragraph that “property” can mean a CRM property or any other property

This class comprises the actions of making assertions about one property of an object or any single relation between two items or concepts. **The property or relation does not have to be part of the CRM.** The type of the property asserted to hold between two items or concepts can be described by the property *P177 assigned property of type (is type of property assigned)*: E55 Type.

George: makes sense

→ make this an issue, or not?

make evote