# 482-55th SIG; minutes

TV presented joint HW with DF, MA, GB, AG where they proposed definitions for CR1 Vulnerability Assessment, CR2 Vulnerability Belief and associated properties [represented in the diagram]. The [proposed scope notes](#_Proposal) for **CR1 Vulnerability Assessment** and **CR2 Vulnerability Belief** can be found below.

The scope notes for the associated properties were not further discussed. The modelling constructs should first be reexamined (take more examples of qualitative characterizations for vulnerability beliefs into account), before the SIG is presented with scope-notes for the properties.

## Proposal

### For CR1 Vulnerability Assessment:

**CR1 Vulnerability Assessment**

Subclass of: I5 Inference Making

Scope note: This class comprises making propositions and statements about vulnerability for instances of E24 Physical Human-Made Thing. These propositions are created using existing beliefs based on hypotheses and some inference logic. This class describes the process of evaluating the resilience level of an instance of E24 Physical Human-Made Thing against the damaging potential of local factors. The process that instances of CR1 Vulnerability Assessment describe takes into account the current physical features and condition of the instances of E24 Physical Human-Made Thing that it assesses. It includes evaluation, calculation, and interpretation based on mathematical formulation and propositions.

Examples:

* + the vulnerability assessment of St. Peter Cathedral
	+ the vulnerability assessment of Gubbio historic centre in 2022

Properties

PR4 assessed vulnerability of (had vulnerability assessed by): E24 Human-Made Thing

#### Discussion points:

it seems worth to look at insurance data and models, in the sense that most CH institutions are insured, and so are their collections. To offer quotas, insurance companies should be able to calculate the risks of having to compensate for objects/buildings, and to do that, they probably recourse to some vulnerability metrics. It would be interesting if this kind of data could be mapped against the modelling constructs proposed for CRMrisk. That the financial aspect is only a byproduct where CRMrisk is concerned, does not mean that insurance data should not be used to validate it, insofar as they make claims concerning the vulnerability of insured objects.

* In terms of “scope note writing guidelines”: a clause to be added to indicate the begin and end conditions for a vulnerability assessment.
* The examples should be referenced.

**HW**:

* TV to look for insurance data from CH institutions.
* TV to add the clause for the begin/end conditions of CR1 Vulnerability Assessment
* DF to provide references for the examples -if they were simplified to become more accessible, use the original ones, with references to a paper/database or other source, instead.
* SdS to do some editing in the phrasing once all points above have been concluded

### For CR2 Vulnerability Belief

**CR2 Vulnerability Belief**

Subclass of: I2 Belief

Scope note: This class comprises beliefs resulting from instances of CR1 Vulnerability Assessment. The instance of I4 Proposition Set, that is associated with an instance of CR2 Vulnerability Belief through property *J4 that*, describes the vulnerability of the assessed instance of E24 Physical Human Made Thing. This description could be ascribed through instances of E54 Dimension, through categorical statements or other means.

Examples:

* + the belief that the vulnerability of St. Peter Cathedral is high level
	+ the belief that the vulnerability of Gubbio historic centre is low level in 2022

Properties

PR1 ascribed (was ascribed by): E54 Dimension

PR2 held on (had belief held by): E24 Physical Human-Made Thing

PR3 held by (held): E39 Actor

#### Discussion points:

* No consensus regarding the necessity for the belief to point to a dimension. The belief stemming from the assessment could be a qualitative one.
* Modelling the E54 Dimension of the CR2 Vulnerability Belief as a part/member of an instance of I4 Proposition Set (where statements are made regarding the numeric value and the type of vulnerability for the instance of E24 Physical Human-Made Thing the belief is about) was contested.
* The relation of the proposed *PR1 ascribed* to *J4 that* is contested was considered to be either IsA or shortcut.
* Before deciding on PR1 the group working on CRMrisk need to review more examples (including qualitative ones –to be supplied by AG).

**HW**: DF, MA, TV, AG, AK to discuss the modelling constructs around CR2 Vulnerability Belief and PR1 ascribed some more. Arrange a meeting among themselves and come back with a new, revised proposal to the SIG.