### Issue 476

**Proposal:** Introduce a new property (**Pxxx represents entity of type**) to facilitate documenting the type of an entity represented by a visual item, where the actual individual represented is of no interest to the documentalist (either the object was imagined and never existed, or –if it existed at all –its identity is considered really trivial and knowledge about it does not contribute much to understanding/appreciating/documenting the visual item itself). The alternative would be to introduce entities and assign them identities and a type –even though they never existed (except for the depiction).

**Discussion**:

The usefulness of the property was debated, given that the range of P138 represents is set to E1 CRM Entity, i.e. it can directly link to E55 Type if necessary. In the case of photographs the things represented have necessarily existed at the time the photograph was taken, so there is no issue there with creating hypothesized entities.

**MD:** The proposed property must reflect how it is different from P138 represents in both its uses:

* E36 Visual Item –P138 represents: E1 CRM Entity –P2 has type: E55 Type
* E36 Visual Item –P138 represents: E55 Type

If it fails to do so, it shouldn’t be introduced in the model at all.

The case that such a property might be useful is when the object represented is either a conceptualization (something that never was except in the particular instance of E36 Visual Item) or an unidentified/unidentifiable particular of some type. In both instances, the type can be recovered, the particular not so much. In essence the property serves as a shortcut when one needs to bypass the thing represented altogether.

**RS**: proposed to add this clarification to the scope note

**SS**: suggested that the examples need to be reworked to capture this reading.

Debate whether this property will appear in the CIDOC CRM version to be submitted to ISO: all senior SIG members present against (MD, SS, CEO, GB, TV, RS).

**MD** proposed that no new property be introduced in the model in the version submitted to ISO, unless it has been well thought of and judged necessary.

**Summary –outcome of discussion**: Postpone reaching a decision until **RS** has brought back an updated proposal incorporating the changes suggested by the SIG (define it as a shortcut and redraft the examples); which should be before session 2.3. Then, if the SIG agrees it could be given an identifier and be used by the community –it is not to go to the version submitted to ISO.

**HW** for **RS**