### The proper use of rdfs in profiles to express extensions that are associations

GMDM Issue #20

In a rdfs profile description, stereotyping is used to express the fact that classes, attributes and associations are part of a proposed extension and not part of the underlying information model.

In our GMDMGrid\_Basic profile, we had a single information model expressing a small number of extensions whose namespace was defined as follows:

 xmlns:gmdm=”http://ucaiug.org/GMDM#”

In the GMDMGrid\_Basic profile, a class defined in the extension information model appeared like this:

<rdf:Description rdf:about="http://ucaiug.org/GMDM#PointOfCommonCoupling">

.

<cims:stereotype>gmdm</cims:stereotype>

.

</rdf:Description>

And an attribute defined in the extension information model appeared like this:

<rdf:Description rdf:about="http://ucaiug.org/GMDM#TapChanger.ptRatio">

.

<cims:stereotype>gmdm</cims:stereotype>

.

</rdf:Description>

Associations are described by 2 resources (one representing each direction of the association). The general convention for the construction of the identifiers for the 2 association resources is:

<rdf:Description rdf:about="*class1 name*.*role name on class2 end*">

 and

<rdf:Description rdf:about="*class2 name*.*role name on class1 end*">

Should the association be identified in the following way if the association is an extension:

<rdf:Description rdf:about="*extension namespace#class1 name*.*role name on class2 end*">

.

<cims:stereotype>*extension namespace prefix*</cims:stereotype>

.

</rdf:Description>

 and

<rdf:Description rdf:about="*extension namespace#class2 name*.*role name on class1 end*">

.

<cims:stereotype>*extension namespace prefix*</cims:stereotype>

.

</rdf:Description>

Meaning that the extension namespace is assumed to apply to the association as a whole and not the first listed class?

*This guidance belongs in a single IEC standard document, so it is easy to locate.*