

## WG14 Part 9 Issues - CIM Issues #6512

### Support measurements of configuration status

08/30/2023 09:25 AM - David Haynes

<b>Status:</b>	New		
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal		
<b>Target version:</b>			
<b>Author/Contact Info:</b>	dhaynes@hubbell.com	<b>Standard(s):</b>	61968-9
<b>Base Release:</b>		<b>Version:</b>	4
<b>Solution to be Applied To:</b>		<b>Clause:</b>	Annex C
<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>	08/30/2023
<b>Breaking Change Description:</b>		<b>Origination ID:</b>	
<b>CIM Impacted Groups:</b>	WG14	<b>Originally Assigned To:</b>	
<b>Requestor:</b>	David Haynes		

#### Description

We need a way to indicate that the device has detected an illegitimate configuration. This is ordinarily done as an event. But it seems that every event needs a corresponding measurement. A change in a measurement status creates an event. How would we measure the current configuration status legitimacy?

#### Proposed Solution

We need a "measurement" for this, so Annex C is affected.

There are not many fields available to "drill down" into this.

Propose adding "commodity" as a "configuration", then "measurementKind" can be used to indicate the configuration area (if there is one).

The UOM can be "status", and the value 0, 1, or some other defined value to represent the configuration status.

We could also present the configuration "checksum" as the value if we add "checksum" as a "measurementKind."

#### History

#1 - 09/21/2023 03:05 PM - David Haynes

- Subject changed from support measurements of configuration status to Support measurements of configuration status