# Issue 457

**Discussion/Comments:**

**MD**: the issue is not presented in a decidable form yet, needs more discussion and should be ultimately decided by an e-vote.

1. common software: different email votes per software proposed
2. if the SIG decides that diagrams are to be drawn in a given way (using a particular software) does that mean that it proscribes diagrams being made differently?

**SS**: It is not a question of dictating how CIDOC CRM diagrams will be made but what sort of templates will the SIG be providing to anyone who wishes to represent the model using such diagrams. It is a matter of workload and maintaining templates, not advertising software.

**GB**: the official documentation of the CRM produced by the SIG should adhere to what we decide regarding the diagrams (once we’ve reached a decision).

**MD**: before settling this issue, we’d have to determine the proposed uses, document them carefully and inform our decision based on the uses these diagrams should have.

**ET**: the template does not have to be used to retrospectively edit legacy editions of the CRM. It should only inform newer versions f.i. CIDOC CRM v7.0.1 and on.

**MD**: but we have to take into consideration all the effort it takes to redo a tutorial using the new template, for version 7 and on.

**GB**: no more than the effort required to make a new tutorial

**TV**: it is unclear whether the issue is only about colors or which software to use or if it should scrutinize every possible design-related detail –font style/size, arrows, lines (style and thickness), size of the bubbles, orientation of hierarchical representations, etc.

**MD**: he’d rather we inform our decision by a style guide, f.i. isA is represented by double-line arrows, and once the style guide is ready and agreed upon, then we should see which software allows said options.

**GB**: the different subtopics have already been teased apart, we should continue working on each of them separately: (1) style guide, (2) software, (3) color, (4) diagrams to be made over using the decided template.

**MD**: they’re deeply intertwined –if the style guide cannot be supported by a software, then we’d have to decide against using that particular software. f.i. Draw.io does not allow double-line arrows, so we cannot represent isA there, according to our style guide.

**SS**: two alternative ways to proceed: (a) look at available software, and let it drive our choices for representing classes/properties/direct & indirect isA etc. or (b) decide how we want to represent these things and let that decision drive our option of software package

**CEO**: we need a certain style guide, and then if the software can deliver these options, all the better. If not, we might want to reconsider how we will be representing them or if we will opt for a different software that can adequately represent them.

**MD**: if no consensus is reached on one style guide, then we can put all the proposed styles to the test. it is possible that we might end up with as many style guides as there are purposes. Geometry and color are two distinct issues –the geometry can influence our decision, color not so much.

**Final proposal**:

1. come up with **geometric style guide** (no colors) for each purpose the diagrams are going to serve and who is supposed to be using them: (i) publications, (ii) didactic proposes & (iii) whole class hierarchy. The style guide is not dependent on the use it is for. The style guide is going to inform the use of software.
2. once we have a style guide for each use case, then we’ll produce colored versions of them, to decide on the impact of the proposed color schemes on the overall set of diagrams (diagrams using the color code that SIG-members proposed.

**VOTE on Final proposal –part (i)**: Develop a geometric style-guide (no color) with use cases and user community clearly defined.

**Result**: 11 SIG members present in favor –none against.

**Decision**: Accept

**VOTE on Final proposal –part (ii):** Try different color schemes on the style guide –once the geometric style guide has been determined.

**Result:** 11 SIG members present in favor –none against

**Decision**: Accept.

**HW** to determine the geometric style guide for representing the CRM diagrams: **ML**, MD, GB, CEO?