### Issue 602: determine the interface btw CRMsci and CRMinf

The SIG reviewed the decision of the 56th SIG’s meeting to adopt (c) out of the three alternatives below, that were proposed by AK and concerned the integration the Argumentation model of CRMsci with CRMinf:

1. Deprecate S5; keep I5 in CRMinf; keep S6, S7 in CRMsci and declare them subclasses of E13; move S8 to CRMinf
2. Deprecate S5; keep I5 in CRMinf; keep S6, S7 in CRMsci, declare them subclasses of I5 -not E13; move S8 to CRMinf
3. Deprecate S5; keep I5 in CRMinf and extend it by S6, S7, S8 (that are all moved to CRMinf and declared subclasses of I5); make I5 isA E13.

**Discussion points**:

* E13 Attribute Assignment does not work well with making arguments, in the sense that it is about one statement at the time (i.e., it describes one single assignment).
* Resolving this issue is dependent on [614](https://cidoc-crm.org/Issue/ID-614-definition-of-i4-proposition-set-and-what-an-instance-of-i2-belief-is-about), that proposes to explicitly make the connection between a single proposition (i.e., a specific case of I4 Proposition Set) and an attribute assignment
* What we need is to have an instance of I4 that contains a reification construct. It could be achieved through specialization of I4 (like Ixxx Singleton Proposition Set), which would come with a content model describable by a reification construct (assigned, assigned attribute to, assigned property type).

**How to proceed**:

* Define a subclass of I4 Proposition Set, namely Ixxx Singleton Proposition Set (label up for debate). Express the connection to the Attribute Assignment instance through FOL. To be dealt with in a new issue.

**HW**: MD & PF. AK will collaborate.

* Once the point above has been settled, we can revisit the I5/S5 relation and the place of S6, S7, and S8 in CRMsci or CRMinf.
* For the next releases of CRMsci and CRMinf, the previous decisions in 602 are undone.