These might be 2 cents, but they are about something rather abstract so I will attempt to clarify this in email form (and I may very well fail ;-))

* In Linked data/rdf, the mrid can be part of the URI: uri ***is*** the thing
	+ You may think of this as “I am Joep”, when you talk about Joep, you talk about me (Joep)
* In many other modelling frameworks, UML for instance, the mrid ***is a property of*** the thing
	+ You may think if this as “My name is Joep”. When you talk about Joep you talk about some anonymous thing that has as name(property) the value  “Joep” (my identification is a property, just as my birthdate is a property)

So UML and RDF take different philosophical approaches to how we identify things. CIM has always stated that is just a model in UML, and it may be serialized in any other form if any user so desires (and Alliander so desires ;-)). But some of those serializations take the linked data approach, and others take the UML approach (json and avro for instance), and yet others, like sql and xml allow both. Choosing one over the other in the standard will therefore by definition exclude the possibility to serialize the identification of an object in certain schema formats. So we should be very careful about this.

My 2 cent proposal would therefore be: we state as a standard that if a serialization takes the linked data approach, than the mrid becomes part of the URI and serializing it as an attribute is not necessary, if it takes the UML approach than the mRID is an attribute (of whatever type)