Unicode in VOTable

IVOA Interop Meeting
Banff
12 October 2014

Mark Taylor

with input from Walter Landry,

Markus Demleitner,

Norman Gray,

Dave Morris,

Pat Dowler,

et al.

\$Id: vot-unicode.tex,v 1.6 2014/10/12 15:32:28 mbt Exp \$

Outline

- Unicode
- VOTable
- Problem
- Solutions?

Unicode Primer

(Disclaimer: I'm not an expert)

Unicode:

- Represents characters from many character sets
- Each character is a "code point" an integer
- Code points have designations like U+0058 ("X")
- Code points are arranged in 17 planes, each with 65536 code points
 - ▶ BMP (Basic Multilingual Plane), including all normal letters/characters (Latin, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, ...)
 - > ... and 16 others for weird characters
 - No more will be allocated
- There are 1,112,064 valid code points (= $17 imes 2^{16} 2048$)
- Most modern languages support Unicode (Python, Java, ...)
- Most old languages do not (FORTRAN 77, C, ...)
- Different "encodings" are defined to serialise a sequence of code points as a byte stream

Unicode Encodings

- UCS-2: exactly 2 bytes for all supported code points
 - ▶ Fixed-length code points easy to handle!
 - Only BMP code points can be represented
 - Obsolete since 1996 (Unicode 2.0)
 - Not supported in modern Unicode-friendly environments?
- UCS-4: exactly 4 bytes for all code points
 - ▶ Fixed-length code points easy to handle!
 - ▶ 4 bytes per character not very efficient
 - Not widely used
- UTF-8: 1–4 bytes for all code points
 - ▶ Variable-length code points
 - > 7-bit ASCII is identical to UTF-8!
 - Non-ASCII code points require more than one byte
 - No endianness issues
- UTF-16:
 - Variable-length code points!
 - ▶ Not very efficient for mostly-ASCII text!
 - ▶ Endianness!
- ... and many, many more

Unicode Encodings

- UCS-2: exactly 2 bytes for all supported code points
 - ▶ Fixed-length code points easy to handle!
 - Only BMP code points can be represented
 - Obsolete since 1996 (Unicode 2.0)
 - Not supported in modern Unicode-friendly environments?
- UCS-4: exactly 4 bytes for all code points
 - ▶ Fixed-length code points easy to handle!
 - ▶ 4 bytes per character not very efficient
 - Not widely used
- UTF-8: 1–4 bytes for all code points
 - ▶ Variable-length code points
 - > 7-bit ASCII is identical to UTF-8!
 - Non-ASCII code points require more than one byte
 - No endianness issues
- UTF-16:
 - ▶ Variable-length code points!
 - Not very efficient for mostly-ASCII text!
 - ▶ Endianness!
- ... and many, many more

← This is the useful one

VOTable Primer

VOTable 1.3 (and earlier):

- "Strings" in VOTable are arrays of characters
- Characters are one of two datatypes:
 - ▷ char: strict (7-bit) ASCII
 - □ unicodeChar: "UCS-2"
- There are (approximately) 2 data serializations:
 - ▶ TABLEDATA (XML <TR> and <TD> elements) for unicode, encoding as document
 - ▷ BINARY (stream of bytes) for unicode, must define encoding
- Arrays (hence strings) may be fixed or variable length.

TABLEDATA: <TD>IVOA</TD>

BINARY: 49 56 4F 41 I V 0 A

TABLEDATA: <TD>IVOA</TD>

BINARY: 00 00 00 04 49 56 4F 41 I V 0 A

(length from run-length)

▶ Length (arraysize) is number of characters

VOTable Text

"VOTables support two kinds of characters: ASCII 1-byte characters and Unicode (UCS-2) 2-byte characters. Unicode is a way to represent characters that is an alternative to ASCII. It uses two bytes per character instead of one, it is strongly supported by XML tools, and it can handle a large variety of international alphabets. Therefore VOTable supports not only ASCII strings (datatype="char"), but also Unicode (datatype="unicodeChar")."

VOTable in Practice

You're supposed to put only 7-bit ASCII in char fields

- ... but people sometimes put unicode in there (document encoding for TABLEDATA, UTF-8 for BINARY)
- ... and software often copes with it
- ... even though it shouldn't

Problem

VOTable doesn't have proper Unicode support

... so let's declare char to be Unicode!

- In legal VOTables, only 7-bit ASCII characters are present in char
- TABLEDATA serialization: looks after itself (using XML unicode machinery)
- BINARY serialization: 7-bit ASCII characters are the same in UTF-8 and ASCII, so for characters that are legal now, existing en/decoding methods will work as before
 - No problem?

With UTF-8, number of characters doesn't tell you byte count

49	56	4F	41
I	V	0	Α

49)	56	CE	A9	41
		V	Ω		A

Problem.

- ▶ In the BINARY serialization, array length no longer tells you how many bytes are in the field
- ▶ If you have the number of code points, you have to read the bytes in a BINARY byte stream to work out how many bytes are present.
- This means you can't skip parts of stream (do pointer arithmetic) → inefficient (char fields are not known length, rows are not fixed length even if all fields are)

Possible Solutions

No change

- No unicode allowed in char (but people will keep putting it there)
- UCS-2 in unicodeChar (but it's obsolete, not supported by software, can't represent wacky characters, and is not widely used)
- Use UCS-4 for BINARY
 - Inefficient (4 bytes per character)
 - (also eccentric and endianness to cope with)
- Use UTF-8 for BINARY
 - Some difficulties relating to field length

UTF-8 Questions

Use UTF-8 for BINARY encoding

- What datatype?
 - ▷ datatype="char": matches common current (illegal) usage, it's the most obvious type to use for "normal" text, but some backward compatibility issues
- What about unicodeChar datatype?
 - ▶ Deprecate? Remove?
- How to handle array length?
 - P1: Define both arraysize and binary run-length as *number of code points*→ can't do pointer arithmetic on BINARY streams
 - P2: Define arraysize as *number of code points* and binary run-length as *number of bytes*→ need run-length even for fixed-length char arrays; can do some pointer arithmetic (to skip a unicode field you need to read the run-length, but not the characters)
 - P3: Define both arraysize and binary run-length as number of bytes the characters would take in UTF-8
 - ightarrow declared arraysize N does not guarantee you can store N code points