# Issue 602 55th SIG meeting

The SIG reviewed the proposal by TV & AK to deprecate S5 Inference Making in CRMsci v2.1 and only keep it in CRMinf, where it should be declared a subclass of E13 Attribute Assignment to ensure that the subclasses of S5 (namely S6 Data Evaluation, S7 Simulation or Prediction) can still be declared subclasses of I5 Inference Making. As for S8 Categorical Hypothesis Building, the kind of inference making it describes, it applies more broadly than CRMsci and can be moved to CRMinf on these grounds.

Details of the implications for CRMsci and CRMinf can be found in the [attached](https://cidoc-crm.org/sites/default/files/argumentationTheory2.ppt) diagram.

**Discussion points**:

* Replicating equivalent classes across models is not ideal.
* From a conceptual point of view, CRMinf has a broader scope compared to CRMsci and makes use of constructs defined in CRMsci to document the way that knowledge was obtained through making observations. In that sense, only defining Inference Making in CRMinf and altering its semantics to make it compatible with S6, S7 forms a more economical solution.
* However, if one wants to only use CRMsci they would not have access to the wrapper class S5 Inference Making in this scenario. If S5 is declared a subclass of I5, instead then this would be in line with the relation postulated between the two models, as well as the semantics postulated for S6, S7, S8 (IsA S5 Inference Making, for which it holds that IsA I1 Argumentation AND E13 Attribute Assignment).
* Declare dependency from CRMsci to CRMinf, wrt Inference Making.

**Decisions**:

* Accept the proposal by AK & TV.
* Inform CRMsci (V2.1) of the decision,
* Update CRMinf (i.e., declare I5 IsA E13 as well, move S8 to CRMinf).

**HW** to AK, SdS, PF & MD:   
To check that the scope notes for I5 and S5 do not have clashing semantics in any way. If there are any mismatches, the SIG should reconsider declaring S5 a subclass of I5 and retaining them in both models.