# 57 SIG – Issue 321. BP11.2 connected through

AG proposed that the issue be closed and raised the following questions to the SIG:

1. What do we do with models that are no longer maintained?
2. Do we continue to enrich the model with aspects relevant for architecture and conservation or should it remain a model that only deals with building archaeology?

**Discussion points**:

* Its scope needs to be revised as well. It’s not particularly relevant if one is not treating buildings as stratigraphic units (so not an excavation archaeology perspective), but as architectural units and cultural heritage units that require preservation/restauration (risk analysis and conservation perspective). Does this expansion of scope require a whole different model, or can it be done through a revision of CRMba?
	+ CRMba was not supposed to be a part of CRMarchaeo in the first place; rather it concerned free-standing monuments (typically churches), not buildings embedded in archaeological layers.
	+ However, CRMba depends on 5 classes from CRMarchaeo, which makes it a de facto model about building archaeology, which is about documenting observations concerning the development of structures; for instance, looking at the wall of a building and how deeply embedded it is in the ground in the present, how high from the ground it originally stood at, etc.
	+ The Notre Dame case should ultimately be describable in terms of CRMba (a revision therefore is necessary).
* CRMba needs to be properly maintained and extensively reviewed to be brought into sync with CRMbase and extensions. At the moment, nobody is maintaining CRMba.
	+ Wrt sustainability: if no one is interested in maintaining a certain model, then the SIG should issue some statement that *<Model Extension a> is compatible with CRMbase up to version 6.2.1 (f.i.); and <Model Extension b> up to version <x.y.z>*.
* PIN tried to use CRMba for conservation and risk analysis, but it was impossible to use. It was completely orthogonal to the perspective assumed by architects.

**How to proceed**:

* Vote to close the issue: All in favor, none against. **Motion passes**
* Contact Paola Ronzino to get addional information about the data used to validate CRMba (**HW**: AG)

Form a group to review CRMba – in a separate issue. First create a road map, assign a time frame to do that, etc. (**HW**: TV to coordinate)