### Consistent up-to-date approach to identifiers

GMDM Issue #19

The general philosophy used in IOP decision-making was to follow what was believed to be the most likely future direction of WG13. In that spirit, the GMDM serialization approach adhered to much of the proposed 61970-552 Version 3. See the file **GMDM IOP Serialization.docx**.

Concerns were raised in the following areas:

* The use of rdf in non-standard ways, especially the fact the InstanceSet object was expected to be the first object in the xml file.
* The uncertainty on the standard approach to passing the .mRID attribute in rdf serializations. There appeared to be conflict in past practice (CPSM vs CDPSM?) as well as future direction (-552 vs ENTSO-E). The issue is whether the .mRID attribute should be explicitly passed or should be represented by the UUID of the rdf:about?. Discussion by WG13 is required and should consider:
* How mRID is handled in serializations other than rdf
* Expectations related to the rdf:about UUID assigned to objects that don’t inherit from IdentifiedObject (and don’t have an mRID). Does it persist across multiple exchanges? Should everything inherit from IdentifiedObject?
* Support for the use of CIM for local data exchanges that have assured unique, persistent, opaque identifiers, but are not able (or can’t afford) to implement UUIDs (don’t blow this one off… if we want utilities to start using the CIM, we need to be serious in our support for minimum requirements)
* Expectations regarding rdf:about UUID if mRID is also passed. Must mRID always=UUID? Is UUID ‘serialization only’ with no intent to persist across different data exchanges?

See also files called **Joeps thoughts on identifiers.docx** and **Pats thoughts and notes on identifiers.docx**

**This issue relates to existing Redmine issue #5963 – mRID topics.**