**NOTE**: Issue 457 was discussed together with issue 471 below; discussion points mentioned here apply to 471 as well.
There is no need to create one diagram for all purposes, nor use the same software to produce a diagram representing the same information. In that sense, given the purpose of the diagram, one should be able to choose among one or the other software (.pptx vs draw.io, for instance). Being used for didactic purposes, means that the diagrams are not subject to limitations of space (printed page). On the other hand, the graphics in the CIDOC CRM definition must be readable and cannot exceed in size the printed page. In any case, more proposals can be made regarding the tools for making diagrams, the sig should be oriented towards open source tools.

There was a long discussion regarding features of the graphs; topics discussed involve:

* how to standardize color-code for classes,
* thickness of color to make the graphs readable,
* using single or double boxes to represent classes and how they ‘re instantiated,
* if the boxes for classes should be standard-size or of variable size (i.e. proportional to the size of the label of the class)
* if there should be a compact and an expanded version –related to user-needs (i.e. fit everything in one view or allow for multiple views)

**DECISION**: this issue is going to break into three issues, according to the intended goal of the diagrams.

1. one issue should deal with the diagrams present in the CIDOC CRM document (how they appear within the text),
2. another with diagrams for didactic purposes (to appear in the CRM site) and
3. another with the best way to represent the class hierarchy of CIDOC CRM (which will probably never appear as a whole in print –so maybe it is essentially didactic in purpose).

**DECISION**: the sig will revisit this after version 7.0 is released.

**DECISION**: instead of producing an endless wish-list, the sig will review some layout/color samples for figures **1** (properties of basic concepts), **2** (CRM encoding example: Winkelmann seeing Laocoön) and **5** (reasoning with spacetime volumes) of the Modelling Principles document, but **after** the release of CIDOC CRM v.7.0.

* The said diagrams must be presented both separately and embedded in the word document, so that they can be better appreciated in context.
* Regarding the layout of the graphs: they must follow a top-down, left-to-right orientation. Especially when it comes to properties, presentation must be top-down, to ensure that the reader understands how properties of the superclass are inherited by its subclasses.

The sig will ultimately decide among:

* Two styles: draw.io (or other) and .pptx
* Two color-codes: GB vs MD

by comparing the versions of each diagram (separate presentation vs embedded in the text) in draw.io and .pptx on the one hand, by one of the two proposed color-codes (MD vs GB). (8 versions per diagram).

* A horizontal isA hierarchy graph of CRM classes must also be produced and compared.