

## WG13 Issues - CIM Issues #6355

### [GMDM #20] Clarification of extension association expression in rdfs

05/24/2023 12:37 PM - Pat Brown

<b>Status:</b>	Review	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	
<b>Target version:</b>		
<b>Author/Contact Info:</b>	Pat Brown pat@cimpliedata.com	<b>Standard(s):</b> 61970-501?
<b>Base Release:</b>		<b>Version:</b>
<b>Solution to be Applied To:</b>		<b>Clause:</b>
<b>Solution Version:</b>		<b>Sub-Clause:</b>
<b>Solution Applied By:</b>		<b>Paragraph:</b>
<b>Completion Date:</b>		<b>Table:</b>
<b>CIM Keywords:</b>		<b>Originally Closed in Version:</b>
<b>Breaking Change:</b>	No	<b>Origination Date:</b>
<b>Breaking Change Description:</b>		<b>Origination ID:</b>
<b>CIM Impacted Groups:</b>	WG13	<b>Originally Assigned To:</b>
<b>Requestor:</b>	Pat Brown	
<b>Description</b> <p>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: &lt;rdf:Description rdf:about="class1 name.role name on class2 end"&gt; and &lt;rdf:Description rdf:about="class2 name.role name on class1 end"&gt;</p> <p>Should the association be identified in the following way if the association is an extension: &lt;rdf:Description rdf:about="extension namespace#class1 name.role name on class2 end"&gt; . &lt;cims:stereotype&gt;extension namespace prefix&lt;/cims:stereotype&gt; . &lt;/rdf:Description&gt; and &lt;rdf:Description rdf:about="extension namespace#class2 name.role name on class1 end"&gt; . &lt;cims:stereotype&gt;extension namespace prefix&lt;/cims:stereotype&gt; . &lt;/rdf:Description&gt;</p> <p>Meaning that the extension namespace on the rdf:about is assumed to apply to the association as a whole and not the first listed class? Or another way to put it, you can't tell by looking at the rdfs description of an extension association what the namespace of the source object is. You only know the namespace of the association itself.</p>		
<b>Decision</b> <p>Oslo, 14 June 2023</p> <p>1) Fix issue in Cimcontextor so that it is possible to create association between 2 CIM classes as inherited association</p> <p>2) Review the profiling guidelines so that it is required that extension between 2 CIM classes is done by creating an association between 2 extended classes inheriting from the 2 CIM classes</p> <p>3) In the profiling guideline add a rule to require that extended classes should have the same name but different stereotype indicating the namespace.</p>		

#### History

#1 - 06/14/2023 04:33 AM - Chavdar Ivanov

- Status changed from New to Open
- Decision updated

**#2 - 06/14/2023 04:38 AM - Chavdar Ivanov**

- Status changed from Open to Review
- Decision updated

**Files**

---

GMDM 20 - Proper use of rdfs in profiles to express extensions that are associations.docx	4.45 KB	05/24/2023	Pat Brown
---	---------	------------	-----------