## Issue 333

* The crm-sig reviewed the changes proposed by Steve. Comments are:
* Activity Plan should not ‘refer to’ the activity (as per diagram)
* CEO points out that E29 will then be out of match with Activity Plan so scope note should be revised. MD thinks that E29 can be generalized to cover the plan, CEO will revise the scope note of E29.
* Intention to Apply as child of S16 is problematic because we still don’t understand them, we still do not decide if it could be transferred in CRMbase perhaps putting it in core creates incompatibilities, perhaps putting it in core creates incompatibilities
* Intention to Apply goes directly under E2 temporal entity since actually it is not active and does not change things
* The E5 should be revised. with regard to changes of state (no assignment)
* A comment by Francesco is, if you change fundamentally the meaning of the class, then perhaps you have to change the class #
* We deleted the expression of intention, since it is not necessary. Just use E31 Document. That’s enough
* P189 needs new example, example bad
* P190 is missing quantification must fix (no assignment)
* Issue: update examples in E73 with the correct subclass , update the example with Maxwell equations… formulation of the equations is an E73 not the equation itself (E28) (no assignment)
* p191 example must be reformulated properly
* P192 needs examples
* How to find pattern language to formulate the examples of plans? We should use a pattern language that would replicate these things without repeating the properties of CRM. CEO volunteers.
* LRMoo will have to be declared as subclass of E100 and not E29
* Performance plan is an activity plan
* For P193. SS: The two cases do not match. We need a case of something causing the end like passing a new law. The second case in the text is the loss of the last carrier.Suggestion: add to scope note how an event or an activity could bring about an end to the intention. For instance earthquake or volcanic eruption makes possibility fo realization impossible. Potentially add example form architecture and city planning Anais. Also change of precondition should be in example SS will do it
* Example makes no sense must be fixed
* Scope notes accepted, notwithstanding contradicting opinions about law, HW: SS will do examples
* Question is there a distinction between the law and the activity plan that carries it out
* Reactive or active plan? Laws would be reactive
* Is a law correctly seen as activity plan, Law is not plan for Gangemi because it does not have specific plan
* Should make formal comparison with Gangemi plan, Ask Gangemi for opinion - ask for comment on definition
* It is decided to add a new issue for discussing the Law in relation to planned activities ) (no assignment)
* Actions: find expert, ask Gangemi MD will do, Mda will ask political philosophers, any expert to find ,
* MD: plan taken up by competing actors
* HW: add examples of Laws
* Decided: closed but to document