**Background:**

RS proposed to introduce **Pxx has current permanent custodian** (to record the normal custodian of an object, as opposed to the current custodian) as a parallel for **P54 has current permanent location**. MD countered that instead of adding this property we should rewrite current permanent location or deprecate it; alternatively, instead of Pxx has current permanent custodian, we could discuss a property like **Pxx has temporary keeper**, s.t. it would not be in conflict with **P50 has current keeper** and would also reflect the fact that the temporary keeper is not the normal custodian of the kept object.

**DISCUSSION:**

**MD**: **(a)** We do not introduce classes and properties to create a symmetric construct, unless there are independent reasons to do so –confirmed by data. **(b)** The notion of **P54 has current permanent location** is at best counter-intuitive and hard to grasp. **(c)** Nested custodianship should be discussed independently of what the case is with P54 has current permanent location. The E10 Transfer of Custody describes a bounded temporal entity, an activity, whereby an object was handed out for an exhibition –and in the context of that exhibition it was handed out to somebody else to take care of, while it was being transported. The returning process would be just as elaborate.

**RS**: The motivation was that organizations can have permanent custody over an object, but NOT ownership: includes permanent loans to museums by (anonymous donors –actual owners) that can be further loaned to other institutions for exhibitions. The objects do not return to their owners, rather the organizations that have been made custodians of said objects. Wants to distinguish the **temporary loan** (ie. From the museum that has permanent custody over the object to the museum that is going to use it for a specific period of time as part of an exhibition) from the **permanent loan** (from the actual owner of the object to the originating museum). Should be able to tease case apart temporary vs. permanent loans, from consecutive instances of **E10 Transfer of Custody** over one and the same object.

**MD**: this can be completely described within the current model by documenting the change in custody. The CRM is event based, meaning that we go through events whenever we need a more detailed description (of an object, etc.). If you don’t want to go through the changes in transfer of custody, you would need a .1 property, on the custody –which may be in conflict with the actual facts of the transfer. This is not a good practice, we would end-up with alternative descriptions at the state and at the transitions.

**RS**: how do we differentiate the intended permanent and ongoing custody of the originating museum versus the intended as temporary custody of exhibiting museums?

**MD**: Starting by a hypothetical **E10 Transfer of CustodyA** to the museum (an accession event). The accession-event entails that there is a transfer of legal responsibility. There can be other instances of **E10 Transfer of CustodyB** that are of a temporary character –for the duration of an exhibition, for instance. Within a temporary instance of **E10 Transfer of CustodyB**, there can be other instances of (temporary) **E10 Transfer of CustodyC**, s.t. the one that would occur if the object needs to undergo conservation.

**GB**: **P54 has current permanent location** is something found quite consistently in museum. He can see a parallel between **P54 has current permanent location** that reflects where the object would be returned and **Pxx has current permanent custodian** that reflects the custodian organization that it should be returned to. It is a useful property that also kind of resembles the **P48 has preferred identifier**.

**MD**: it’s not useful properties that create parallel constructs that we introduce in the CRM but properties implementing necessary constructs, or it would become too difficult to maintain. So, the usefulness is not really an argument. The fact that museums use this practice a lot, means that they should probably should make an extension to cover their needs. The CRM must be kept small, because people find it hard to use as it is now.
The case of collections must also be considered in this context: you would normally have a custodian for the entire collection. But it is not necessarily the case that the entire collection gets loaned to another museum. Rather, it could be just one object. Conservation activities would also not include the entire collection but rather one object thereof. In such cases, the transfer of custody would be over that one object and not over the collection as a whole. We should discuss that in more detail by the sig-list. He does not feel that it’s ripe enough for a decision

**RS**: In what concerns the Linked Art consortium’s take on the property, they find it useful but it isn’t absolutely necessary, because they can use vocabularies and a profile to be clear about the scope of the transfer of custody (in the intent of it). However, there is still the question of **P54** and **P48**, that are also very similar in nature, and could be deprecated to make the ontology more consistent.

**MD**: SdS vehemently objected to the deprecation of **P54**, but he would be glad to get rid of it.

**GB**: we should definitely make an issue of that, because it seems that it touches the core identity of the CIDOC CRM, and a constantly shifting position about whether it is a museum-oriented ontology or a general core ontology.

**PROPOSAL:**

Drop the issue, despite the usefulness of such a property, on the grounds that we prefer the CRM to be a general core ontology and not restricted to museum applications. Museum internal issues do not fall in the scope of the CRM. Its purpose is information integration across institutions. We could harmonize with SPECTRUM, which covers administrative functions.

The scope of custodianship can be described on the level of E10 Change of Custody. Any specialization of the property would be a shortcut of such a description.

The discussion regarding whether to keep existing properties with which Pxx has current permanent custodian would form a parallel construct to (P54, P48) should continue in a separate, [new issue](#_NEW_ISSUE:_keep). The arguments made in favor and against, should be taken into consideration.

 **RS** can start the new issue on P54, P48 (**HW**)

Vote to close Issue 473

In favor: 9

Against: 0

Outcome: **issue is closed**. A [new issue](#_NEW_ISSUE:_keep) is to be formulated regarding keeping vs. deprecating properties P54 and P48. **HW** to **RS** to start the new issue.