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11.1 Overview

The original Request for Proposal on Interoperability (OMG Document 93-9-15) defines interoperability as the ability for a client on ORB A to invoke an OMG IDL-defined operation on an object on ORB B, where ORB A and ORB B are independently developed. It further identifies general requirements including in particular:

- Ability for two vendors’ ORBs to interoperate without prior knowledge of each other’s implementation.
- Support of all ORB functionality.
• Preservation of content and semantics of ORB-specific information across ORB boundaries (for example, security).

In effect, the requirement is for invocations between client and server objects to be independent of whether they are on the same or different ORBs, and not to mandate fundamental modifications to existing ORB products.

11.1.1 Domains

The CORBA Object Model identifies various distribution transparencies that must be supported within a single ORB environment, such as location transparency. Elements of ORB functionality often correspond directly to such transparencies. Interoperability can be viewed as extending transparencies to span multiple ORBs.

In this architecture a domain is a distinct scope, within which certain common characteristics are exhibited and common rules are observed: over which a distribution transparency is preserved. Thus, interoperability is fundamentally involved with transparently crossing such domain boundaries.

Domains tend to be either administrative or technological in nature, and need not correspond to the boundaries of an ORB installation. Administrative domains include naming domains, trust groups, resource management domains and other “run-time” characteristics of a system. Technology domains identify common protocols, syntaxes and similar “build-time” characteristics. In many cases, the need for technology domains derives from basic requirements of administrative domains.

Within a single ORB, most domains are likely to have similar scope to that of the ORB itself: common object references, network addresses, security mechanisms, and more. However, it is possible for there to be multiple domains of the same type supported by a given ORB: internal representation on different machine types, or security domains. Conversely, a domain may span several ORBs: similar network addresses may be used by different ORBs, type identifiers may be shared.

11.1.2 Bridging Domains

The abstract architecture describes ORB interoperability in terms of the translation required when an object request traverses domain boundaries. Conceptually, a mapping or bridging mechanism resides at the boundary between the domains, transforming requests expressed in terms of one domain’s model into the model of the destination domain.

The concrete architecture identifies two approaches to inter-ORB bridging:

• At application level, allowing flexibility and portability

• At ORB level, built into the ORB itself
11.2 ORBs and ORB Services

The ORB Core is that part of the ORB which provides the basic representation of objects and the communication of requests. The ORB Core therefore supports the minimum functionality to enable a client to invoke an operation on a server object, with (some of) the distribution transparencies required by CORBA.

An object request may have implicit attributes which affect the way in which it is communicated - though not the way in which a client makes the request. These attributes include security, transactional capabilities, recovery, and replication. These features are provided by “ORB Services,” which will in some ORBs be layered as internal services over the core, or in other cases be incorporated directly into an ORB’s core. It is an aim of this specification to allow for new ORB Services to be defined in the future, without the need to modify or enhance this architecture.

Within a single ORB, ORB services required to communicate a request will be implemented and (implicitly) invoked in a private manner. For interoperability between ORBs, the ORB services used in the ORBs, and the correspondence between them, must be identified.

11.2.1 The Nature of ORB Services

ORB Services are invoked implicitly in the course of application-level interactions. ORB Services range from fundamental mechanisms such as reference resolution and message encoding to advanced features such as support for security, transactions, or replication.

An ORB Service is often related to a particular transparency. For example, message encoding – the marshaling and unmarshaling of the components of a request into and out of message buffers – provides transparency of the representation of the request. Similarly, reference resolution supports location transparency. Some transparencies, such as security, are supported by a combination of ORB Services and Object Services while others, such as replication, may involve interactions between ORB Services themselves.

ORB Services differ from Object Services in that they are positioned below the application and are invoked transparently to the application code. However, many ORB Services include components which correspond to conventional Object Services in that they are invoked explicitly by the application.

Security is an example of service with both ORB Service and normal Object Service components, the ORB components being those associated with transparently authenticating messages and controlling access to objects while the necessary administration and management functions resemble conventional Object Services.

11.2.2 ORB Services and Object Requests

Interoperability between ORBs extends the scope of distribution transparencies and other request attributes to span multiple ORBs. This requires the establishment of relationships between supporting ORB Services in the different ORBs.
In order to discuss how the relationships between ORB Services are established, it is necessary to describe an abstract view of how an operation invocation is communicated from client to server object.

- The client generates an operation request, using a reference to the server object, explicit parameters, and an implicit invocation context. This is processed by certain ORB Services on the client path.

- On the server side, corresponding ORB Services process the incoming request, transforming it into a form directly suitable for invoking the operation on the server object.

- The server object performs the requested operation.

- Any result of the operation is returned to the client in a similar manner.

The correspondence between client-side and server-side ORB Services need not be one-to-one and in some circumstances may be far more complex. For example, if a client application requests an operation on a replicated server, there may be multiple server-side ORB service instances, possibly interacting with each other.

In other cases, such as security, client-side or server-side ORB Services may interact with Object Services such as authentication servers.

11.2.3 Selection of ORB Services

The ORB Services used are determined by:

- Static properties of both client and server objects; for example, whether a server is replicated.

- Dynamic attributes determined by a particular invocation context; for example, whether a request is transactional.

- Administrative policies (e.g., security).

Within a single ORB, private mechanisms (and optimizations) can be used to establish which ORB Services are required and how they are provided. Service selection might in general require negotiation to select protocols or protocol options. The same is true between different ORBs: it is necessary to agree which ORB Services are used, and how each transforms the request. Ultimately, these choices become manifest as one or more protocols between the ORBs or as transformations of requests.

In principle, agreement on the use of each ORB Service can be independent of the others and, in appropriately constructed ORBs, services could be layered in any order or in any grouping. This potentially allows applications to specify selective transparencies according to their requirements, although at this time CORBA provides no way to penetrate its transparencies.

A client ORB must be able to determine which ORB Services must be used in order to invoke operations on a server object. Correspondingly, where a client requires dynamic attributes to be associated with specific invocations, or administrative policies dictate, it must be possible to cause the appropriate ORB Services to be used on client and
server sides of the invocation path. Where this is not possible - because, for example, one ORB does not support the full set of services required - either the interaction cannot proceed or it can only do so with reduced facilities or transparencies.

11.3 Domains

From a computational viewpoint, the OMG Object Model identifies various distribution transparencies which ensure that client and server objects are presented with a uniform view of a heterogeneous distributed system. From an engineering viewpoint, however, the system is not wholly uniform. There may be distinctions of location and possibly many others such as processor architecture, networking mechanisms and data representations. Even when a single ORB implementation is used throughout the system, local instances may represent distinct, possibly optimized scopes for some aspects of ORB functionality.
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Figure 11-1 Different Kinds of Domains can Coexist.

Interoperability, by definition, introduces further distinctions, notably between the scopes associated with each ORB. To describe both the requirements for interoperability and some of the solutions, this architecture introduces the concept of domains to describe the scopes and their implications.

Informally, a domain is a set of objects sharing a common characteristic or abiding by common rules. It is a powerful modelling concept which can simplify the analysis and description of complex systems. There may be many types of domains (e.g., management domains, naming domains, language domains, and technology domains).

11.3.1 Definition of a Domain

Domains allow partitioning of systems into collections of components which have some characteristic in common. In this architecture a domain is a scope in which a collection of objects, said to be members of the domain, is associated with some common characteristic; any object for which the association does not exist, or is undefined, is not a member of the domain. A domain can be modelled as an object and may be itself a member of other domains.

It is the scopes themselves and the object associations or bindings defined within them which characterize a domain. This information is disjoint between domains. However, an object may be a member of several domains, of similar kinds as well as of different kinds, and so the sets of members of domains may overlap.
The concept of a domain boundary is defined as the limit of the scope in which a particular characteristic is valid or meaningful. When a characteristic in one domain is translated to an equivalent in another domain, it is convenient to consider it as traversing the boundary between the two domains.

Domains are generally either administrative or technological in nature. Examples of domains related to ORB interoperability issues are:

- Referencing domain – the scope of an object reference
- Representation domain – the scope of a message transfer syntax and protocol
- Network addressing domain – the scope of a network address
- Network connectivity domain – the potential scope of a network message
- Security domain – the extent of a particular security policy
- Type domain – the scope of a particular type identifier
- Transaction domain – the scope of a given transaction service

Domains can be related in two ways: containment, where a domain is contained within another domain, and federation, where two domains are joined in a manner agreed and set up by their administrators.

### 11.3.2 Mapping Between Domains: Bridging

Interoperability between domains is only possible if there is a well-defined mapping between the behaviors of the domains being joined. Conceptually, a mapping mechanism or bridge resides at the boundary between the domains, transforming requests expressed in terms of one domain’s model into the model of the destination domain. Note that the use of the term “bridge” in this context is conceptual and refers only to the functionality which performs the required mappings between distinct domains. There are several implementation options for such bridges and these are discussed elsewhere.

For full interoperability, it is essential that all the concepts used in one domain are transformable into concepts in other domains with which interoperability is required, or that if the bridge mechanism filters such a concept out, nothing is lost as far as the supported objects are concerned. In other words, one domain may support a superior service to others, but such a superior functionality will not be available to an application system spanning those domains.

A special case of this requirement is that the object models of the two domains need to be compatible. This specification assumes that both domains are strictly compliant with the CORBA Object Model and the CORBA specifications. This includes the use of OMG IDL when defining interfaces, the use of the CORBA Core Interface Repository, and other modifications that were made to CORBA. Variances from this model could easily compromise some aspects of interoperability.
### 11.4 Interoperability Between ORBs

An ORB “provides the mechanisms by which objects transparently make and receive requests and responses. In so doing, the ORB provides interoperability between applications on different machines in heterogeneous distributed environments…” ORB interoperability extends this definition to cases in which client and server objects on different ORBs “transparently make and receive requests…”

Note that a direct consequence of this transparency requirement is that bridging must be bidirectional: that is, it must work as effectively for object references passed as parameters as for the target of an object invocation. Were bridging unidirectional (e.g. if one ORB could only be a client to another) then transparency would not have been provided, because object references passed as parameters would not work correctly: ones passed as “callback objects,” for example, could not be used.

Without loss of generality, most of this specification focuses on bridging in only one direction. This is purely to simplify discussions, and does not imply that unidirectional connectivity satisfies basic interoperability requirements.

#### 11.4.1 ORB Services and Domains

In this architecture, different aspects of ORB functionality - ORB Services - can be considered independently and associated with different domain types. The architecture does not, however, prescribe any particular decomposition of ORB functionality and interoperability into ORB Services and corresponding domain types. There is a range of possibilities for such a decomposition:

1. The simplest model, for interoperability, is to treat all objects supported by one ORB (or, alternatively, all ORBs of a given type) as comprising one domain. Interoperability between any pair of different domains (or domain types) is then achieved by a specific all-encompassing bridge between the domains. (This is all CORBA implies.)

2. More detailed decompositions would identify particular domain types - such as referencing, representation, security, and networking. A core set of domain types would be pre-determined and allowance made for additional domain types to be defined as future requirements dictate (e.g., for new ORB Services).

#### 11.4.2 ORBs and Domains

In many respects, issues of interoperability between ORBs are similar to those which can arise with a single type of ORB (e.g., a product). For example:

- Two installations of the ORB may be installed in different security domains, with different Principal identifiers. Requests crossing those security domain boundaries will need to establish locally meaningful Principals for the caller identity, and for any Principals passed as parameters.

- Different installations might assign different type identifiers for equivalent types, and so requests crossing type domain boundaries would need to establish locally meaningful type identifiers (and perhaps more).
Conversely, not all of these problems need to appear when connecting two ORBs of a different type (e.g., two different products). Examples include:

- They could be administered to share user visible naming domains, so that naming domains do not need bridging.
- They might reuse the same networking infrastructure, so that messages could be sent without needing to bridge different connectivity domains.

Additional problems can arise with ORBs of different types. In particular, they may support different concepts or models, between which there are no direct or natural mappings. CORBA only specifies the application level view of object interactions, and requires that distribution transparencies conceal a whole range of lower level issues. It follows that within any particular ORB, the mechanisms for supporting transparencies are not visible at the application level and are entirely a matter of implementation choice. So there is no guarantee that any two ORBs support similar internal models or that there is necessarily a straightforward mapping between those models.

These observations suggest that the concept of an ORB (instance) is too coarse or superficial to allow detailed analysis of interoperability issues between ORBs. Indeed, it becomes clear that an ORB instance is an elusive notion: it can perhaps best be characterized as the intersection or coincidence of ORB Service domains.

### 11.4.3 Interoperability Approaches

When an interaction takes place across a domain boundary, a mapping mechanism, or bridge, is required to transform relevant elements of the interaction as they traverse the boundary. There are essentially two approaches to achieving this: mediated bridging and immediate bridging. These approaches are described in the following subsections.
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**Figure 11-2** Two bridging techniques, different uses of an intermediate form agreed on between the two domains.

#### Mediated Bridging

With mediated bridging, elements of the interaction relevant to the domain are transformed, at the boundary of each domain, between the internal form of that domain and an agreed, common form.

Observations on mediated bridging are as follows:

- The scope of agreement of a common form can range from a private agreement between two particular ORB/domain implementations to a universal standard.
There can be more than one common form, each oriented or optimized for a different purpose.

If there is more than one possible common form, then selection of which is used can be static (e.g., administrative policy agreed between ORB vendors, or between system administrators) or dynamic (e.g., established separately for each object, or on each invocation).

Engineering of this approach can range from in-line specifically compiled (compare to stubs) or generic library code (such as encryption routines) code, to intermediate bridges to the common form.

Immediate Bridging

With immediate bridging, elements of the interaction relevant to the domain are transformed, at the boundary of each domain, directly between the internal form of one domain and the internal form of the other.

Observations on immediate bridging are as follows:

• This approach has the potential to be optimal (in that the interaction is not mediated via a third party, and can be specifically engineered for each pair of domains) but sacrifices flexibility and generality of interoperability to achieve this.

• This approach is often applicable when crossing domain boundaries which are purely administrative (i.e., there is no change of technology). For example, when crossing security administration domains between similar ORBs, it is not necessary to use a common intermediate standard.

As a general observation, the two approaches can become almost indistinguishable when private mechanisms are used between ORB/domain implementations.

Location of Inter-Domain Functionality

Logically, an inter-domain bridge has components in both domains, whether the mediated or immediate bridging approach is used. However, domains can span ORB boundaries and ORBs can span machine and system boundaries; conversely, a machine may support, or a process may have access to more than one ORB (or domain of a given type). From an engineering viewpoint, this means that the components of an inter-domain bridge may be dispersed or co-located, with respect to ORBs or systems. It also means that the distinction between an ORB and a bridge can be a matter of perspective: there is a duality between viewing inter-system messaging as belonging to ORBs, or to bridges.

For example, if a single ORB encompasses two security domains, the inter-domain bridge could be implemented wholly within the ORB and thus be invisible as far as ORB interoperability is concerned. A similar situation arises when a bridge between two ORBs or domains is implemented wholly within a process or system which has access to both. In such cases, the engineering issues of inter-domain bridging are
confined, possibly to a single system or process. If it were practical to implement all bridging in this way, then interactions between systems or processes would be solely within a single domain or ORB.

**Bridging Level**

As noted at the start of this section, bridges may be implemented both internally to an ORB and as layers above it. These are called respectively “in-line” and “request-level” bridges.

Request level bridges use the CORBA APIs, including the Dynamic Skeleton Interface, to receive and issue requests. However, there is an emerging class of “implicit context” which may be associated with some invocations, holding ORB Service information such as transaction and security context information, which is not at this time exposed through general purpose public APIs. (Those APIs expose only OMG IDL-defined operation parameters, not implicit ones.) Rather, the precedent set with the Transaction Service is that special purpose APIs are defined to allow bridging of each kind of context. This means that request level bridges must be built to specifically understand the implications of bridging such ORB Service domains, and to make the appropriate API calls.

**11.4.4 Policy-Mediated Bridging**

An assumption made through most of this specification is that the existence of domain boundaries should be transparent to requests: that the goal of interoperability is to hide such boundaries. However, if this were always the goal, then there would be no real need for those boundaries in the first place.

Realistically, administrative domain boundaries exist because they reflect ongoing differences in organizational policies or goals. Bridging the domains will in such cases require policy mediation. That is, inter-domain traffic will need to be constrained, controlled, or monitored; fully transparent bridging may be highly undesirable. Resource management policies may even need to be applied, restricting some kinds of traffic during certain periods.

Security policies are a particularly rich source of examples: a domain may need to audit external access, or to provide domain-based access control. Only a very few objects, types of objects, or classifications of data might be externally accessible through a “firewall.”

Such policy-mediated bridging requires a bridge that knows something about the traffic being bridged. It could in general be an application-specific policy, and many policy-mediated bridges could be parts of applications. Those might be organization-specific, off-the-shelf, or anywhere in between.

Request-level bridges, which use only public ORB APIs, easily support the addition of policy mediation components, without loss of access to any other system infrastructure that may be needed to identify or enforce the appropriate policies.
11.4.5 Configurations of Bridges in Networks

In the case of network-aware ORBs, we anticipate that some ORB protocols will be more frequently bridged to than others, and so will begin to serve the role of “backbone ORBs.” (This is a role that the IIOP is specifically expected to serve.) This use of “backbone topology” is true both on a large scale and a small scale. While a large scale public data network provider could define its own backbone ORB, on a smaller scale, any given institution will probably designate one commercially available ORB as its backbone.

Figure 11-3 An ORB chosen as a backbone will connect other ORBs through bridges, both full-bridges and half-bridges.

Adopting a backbone style architecture is a standard administrative technique for managing networks. It has the consequence of minimizing the number of bridges needed, while at the same time making the ORB topology match typical network organizations. (That is, it allows the number of bridges to be proportional to the number of protocols, rather than combinatorial.)

In large configurations, it will be common to notice that adding ORB bridges doesn’t even add any new “hops” to network routes, because the bridges naturally fit in locations where connectivity was already indirect, and augment or supplant the existing network firewalls.

11.5 Object Addressing

The Object Model (see Chapter 1, Requests) defines an object reference as an object name that reliably denotes a particular object. An object reference identifies the same object each time the reference is used in a request, and an object may be denoted by multiple, distinct references.
The fundamental ORB interoperability requirement is to allow clients to use such object names to invoke operations on objects in other ORBs. Clients do not need to distinguish between references to objects in a local ORB or in a remote one. Providing this transparency can be quite involved, and naming models are fundamental to it.

This section of this specification discusses models for naming entities in multiple domains, and transformations of such names as they cross the domain boundaries. That is, it presents transformations of object reference information as it passes through networks of inter-ORB bridges. It uses the word “ORB” as synonymous with referencing domain; this is purely to simplify the discussion. In other contexts, “ORB” can usefully denote other kinds of domain.

11.5.1 Domain-relative Object Referencing

Since CORBA does not require ORBs to understand object references from other ORBs, when discussing object references from multiple ORBs one must always associate the object reference’s domain (ORB) with the object reference. We use the notation $D_0.R_0$ to denote an object reference $R_0$ from domain $D_0$; this is itself an object reference. This is called “domain-relative” referencing (or addressing) and need not reflect the implementation of object references within any ORB.

At an implementation level, associating an object reference with an ORB is only important at an inter-ORB boundary; that is, inside a bridge. This is simple, since the bridge knows from which ORB each request (or response) came, including any object references embedded in it.

11.5.2 Handling of Referencing Between Domains

When a bridge hands an object reference to an ORB, it must do so in a form understood by that ORB: the object reference must be in the recipient ORB’s native format. Also, in cases where that object originated from some other ORB, the bridge must associate each newly created “proxy” object reference with (what it sees as) the original object reference.

Several basic schemes to solve these two problems exist. These all have advantages in some circumstances; all can be used, and in arbitrary combination with each other, since CORBA object references are opaque to applications. The ramifications of each scheme merits attention, with respect to scaling and administration. The schemes include:

1. **Object Reference Translation Reference Embedding**: The bridge can store the original object reference itself, and pass an entirely different proxy reference into the new domain. The bridge must then manage state on behalf of each bridged object reference, map these references from one ORB’s format to the other’s, and vice versa.
2. **Reference Encapsulation:** The bridge can avoid holding any state at all by conceptually concatenating a domain identifier to the object name. Thus if a reference $D0.R$, originating in domain $D0$, traversed domains $D1... D4$ it could be identified in $D4$ as proxy reference $d3.d2.d1.d0.R$, where $dn$ is the address of $Dn$ relative to $Dn+1$.
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*Figure 11-4* Reference encapsulation adds domain information during bridging.

3. **Domain Reference Translation:** Like object reference translation, this scheme holds some state in the bridge. However, it supports sharing that state between multiple object references by adding a domain-based route identifier to the proxy (which still holds the original reference, as in the reference encapsulation scheme).

It achieves this by providing encoded domain route information each time a domain boundary is traversed; thus if a reference $D0.R$, originating in domain $D0$, traversed domains $D1...D4$ it would be identified in $D4$ as $(d3, x3).R$, and in $D2$ as $(d1,x1).R$, and so on, where $dn$ is the address of $Dn$ relative to $Dn+1$, and $xn$ identifies the pair $(dn-1, xn-1)$.

![Figure 11-5](image)

*Figure 11-5* Domain Reference Translation substitutes domain references during bridging.

4. **Reference Canonicalization:** This scheme is like domain reference translation, except that the proxy uses a “well known” (e.g., global) domain identifier rather than an encoded path. Thus a reference $R$, originating in domain $D0$ would be identified in other domains as $D0.R$.

Observations about these approaches to inter-domain reference handling are as follows:

- Naive application of reference encapsulation could lead to arbitrarily large references. A “topology service” could optimize cycles within any given encapsulated reference and eliminate the appearance of references to local objects as alien references.

- A topology service could also optimize the chains of routes used in the domain reference translation scheme. Since the links in such chains are re-used by any path traversing the same sequence of domains, such optimization has particularly high leverage.
With the general purpose APIs defined in CORBA 2.1, object reference translation can be supported even by ORBs not specifically intended to support efficient bridging, but this approach involves the most state in intermediate bridges. As with reference encapsulation, a topology service could optimize individual object references. (APIs are defined by the Dynamic Skeleton Interface, Dynamic Invocation Interface, and by the object identity operations described in Chapter 8.)

The chain of addressing links established with both object and domain reference translation schemes must be represented as state within the network of bridges. There are issues associated with managing this state.

Reference canonicalization can also be performed with managed hierarchical name spaces such as those now in use on the Internet and X.500 naming.

11.6 An Information Model for Object References

This section provides a simple, powerful information model for the information found in an object reference. That model is intended to be used directly by developers of bridging technology, and is used in that role by the IIOP, described in the General Inter-ORB Protocol chapter, Object References section.

11.6.1 What Information Do Bridges Need?

The following potential information about object references has been identified as critical for use in bridging technologies:

• *Is it null?* Nulls only need to be transmitted and never support operation invocation.

• *What type is it?* Many ORBs require knowledge of an object’s type in order to efficiently preserve the integrity of their type systems.

• *What protocols are supported?* Some ORBs support objrefs that in effect live in multiple referencing domains, to allow clients the choice of the most efficient communications facilities available.

• *What ORB Services are available?* As noted in “Selection of ORB Services” on page 11-4, several different ORB Services might be involved in an invocation. Providing information about those services in a standardized way could in many cases reduce or eliminate negotiation overhead in selecting them.

11.6.2 Interoperable Object References: IORs

To provide the information above, an “Interoperable Object Reference,” (IOR) data structure has been provided. This data structure need not be used internally to any given ORB, and is not intended to be visible to application-level ORB programmers. It should be used only when crossing object reference domain boundaries, within bridges.

This data structure is designed to be efficient in typical single-protocol configurations, while not penalizing multiprotocol ones.
module IOP { // IDL

  // Standard Protocol Profile tag values
  typedef unsigned long ProfileId;
  const ProfileId TAG_INTERNET_IOP = 0;
  const ProfileId TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS = 1;

  struct TaggedProfile {
    ProfileId tag;
    sequence <octet> profile_data;
  };

  struct IOR {
    string type_id;
    sequence <TaggedProfile> profiles;
  };

  typedef unsigned long ComponentId;
  struct TaggedComponent {
    ComponentId tag;
    sequence <octet> component_data;
  };

  typedef sequence <TaggedComponent> MultipleComponentProfile;
};

Object references have at least one tagged profile. Each profile supports one or more protocols and encapsulates all the basic information the protocols it supports need to identify an object. Any single profile holds enough information to drive a complete invocation using any of the protocols it supports; the content and structure of those profile entries are wholly specified by these protocols. A bridge between two domains may need to know the detailed content of the profile for those domains’ profiles, depending on the technique it uses to bridge the domains¹.

¹ Based on topology and policy information available to it, a bridge may find it prudent to add or remove some profiles as it forwards an object reference. For example, a bridge acting as a firewall might remove all profiles except ones that make such profiles, letting clients that understand the profiles make routing choices.
Each profile has a unique numeric tag, assigned by OMG. The ones defined here are for the IIOP (see Chapter 12, General Inter-ORB Protocol) and for use in “multiple component profiles.” Profile tags in the range 0x80000000 through 0xffffffff are reserved for future use, and are not currently available for assignment.

Null object references are indicated by an empty set of profiles, and by a “Null” type ID (a string which contains only a single terminating character). Type IDs may only be “Null” in any message, requiring the client to use existing knowledge or to consult the object, to determine interface types supported. The type ID is provided to allow ORBs to preserve strong typing. This identifier is agreed on within the bridge and, for reasons outside the scope of this interoperability specification, needs to have a much broader scope to address various problems in system evolution and maintenance. Type IDs support detection of type equivalence, and in conjunction with an Interface Repository, allow processes to reason about the relationship of the type of the object referred to and any other type.

The type ID, if provided by the server, indicates the most derived type at the time the reference is generated. The object’s actual most derived type may later change to a more derived type. Therefore, the type ID in the IOR can only be interpreted by the client as a hint that the object supports at least the indicated interface. The client can succeed in narrowing the reference to the indicated interface, or to one of its base interfaces, based solely on the type ID in the IOR, but must not fail to narrow the reference without consulting the object via the “_is_a” or “_get_interface” pseudo-operations.

The **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** Profile

The **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** tag identifies profiles that support the Internet Inter-ORB Protocol. The **ProfileBody** of this profile, described in detail in “IIOP IOR Profiles” on page 13-34, contains a CDR encapsulation of a structure containing addressing and object identification information used by IIOP. Version 1.1 of the **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** profile also includes a **sequence<TaggedComponent>** that can contain additional information supporting optional IIOP features, ORB services such as security, and future protocol extensions.

Protocols other than IIOP (such as ESIOPs and other GIOPs) can share profile information (such as object identity or security information) with IIOP by encoding their additional profile information as components in the **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** profile. All **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** profiles support IIOP, regardless of whether they also support additional protocols. Interoperable ORBs are not required to create or understand any other profile, nor are they required to create or understand any of the components defined for other protocols that might share the **TAG_INTERNET_IOP** profile with IIOP.

The **TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS** Profile

The **TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS** tag indicates that the value encapsulated is of type **MultipleComponentProfile**. In this case, the profile consists of a list of protocol components, indicating ORB services accessible using that protocol. ORB
services are assigned component identifiers in a namespace that is distinct from the profile identifiers. Note that protocols may use the MultipleComponentProfile data structure to hold profile components even without using TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS to indicate that particular protocol profile, and need not use a MultipleComponentProfile to hold sets of profile components.

**IOR Components**

TaggedComponents contained in TAG_INTERNET_IOP and TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS profiles are identified by unique numeric tags using a namespace distinct form that used for profile tags. Component tags are assigned by the OMG.

Specifications of components must include the following information:

- **Component ID**: The compound tag that is obtained from OMG.
- **Structure and encoding**: The syntax of the component data and the encoding rules.
- **Semantics**: How the component data is intended to be used.
- **Protocols**: The protocol for which the component is defined, and whether it is intended that the component be usable by other protocols.
- **At most once**: whether more than one instance of this component can be included in a profile.

Specifications of protocols must describe how the components affect the protocol. The following should be specified in any protocol definition for each TaggedComponent that the protocol uses:

- **Mandatory presence**: Whether inclusion of the component in profiles supporting the protocol is required (MANDATORY PRESENCE) or not required (OPTIONAL PRESENCE).
- **Droppable**: For optional presence component, whether component, if present, must be retained or may be dropped.

### 11.6.3 Standard IOR Components

The following are standard IOR components that can be included in TAG_INTERNET_IOP and TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS profiles, and may apply to IIOP, other GIOPs, ESIOPs or other protocols. An ORB must not drop these components from an existing IOR. Additional components that can be used by other protocols are specified in “DCE-CIOP Object References” on page 14-16.
module IOP {
    const ComponentId TAG_ORB_TYPE = 0;
    const ComponentId TAG_CODE_SETS = 1;
    const ComponentId TAG_SEC_NAME = 14;
    const ComponentId TAG_ASSOCIATION_OPTIONS = 13;
    const ComponentId TAG_GENERIC_SEC_MECH = 12;
};

TAG_ORB_TYPE Component

It is often useful in the real world to be able to identify the particular kind of ORB an object reference is coming from, to work around problems with that particular ORB, or exploit shared efficiencies.

The TAG_ORB_TYPE component has an associated value of type unsigned long, encoded as a CDR encapsulation, designating an ORB type ID allocated by the OMG for the ORB type of the originating ORB. Anyone may register any ORB types by submitting a short (one-paragraph) description of the ORB type to the OMG, and will receive a new ORB type ID in return. A list of ORB type descriptions and values will be made available on the OMG web server.

The TAG_ORB_TYPE component can appear at most once in any IOR profile. For profiles supporting IIOP 1.1, it is optionally present and may not be dropped.

Other Components

The following components are specified in different OMG specifications:

• TAG_CODE_SETS (See “CodeSet Component of IOR Multi-Component Profile” on page 11-28.)
• TAG_SEC_NAME (Security - CORBAServices)
• TAG_ASSOCIATION_OPTIONS (Security - CORBAServices)
• TAG_GENERIC_SEC_MECH (Security - CORBAServices)

11.6.4 Profile and Component Composition in IORs

The following rules augment the preceding discussion:

1. Profiles must be independent, complete, and self-contained. Their use shall not depend on information contained in another profile.

2. Any invocation uses information from exactly one profile.

3. Information used to drive multiple inter-ORB protocols may coexist within a single profile, possibly with some information (e.g., components) shared between the protocols, as specified by the specific protocols.

4. Unless otherwise specified in the definition of a particular profile, multiple profiles with the same profile tag may be included in an IOR.
5. Unless otherwise specified in the definition of a particular component, multiple components with the same component tag may be part of a given profile within an IOR.

6. A **TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS** profile may hold components shared between multiple protocols. Multiple such profiles may exist in an IOR.

7. The definition of each protocol using a **TAG_MULTIPLE_COMPONENTS** profile must specify which components it uses, and how it uses them.

8. Profile and component definitions can be either public or private. Public definitions are those whose tag and data format is specified in OMG documents. For private definitions, only the tag is registered with OMG.

9. Public component definitions shall state whether or not they are intended for use by protocols other than the one(s) for which they were originally defined, and dependencies on other components.

The OMG is responsible for allocating and registering protocol and component tags. Neither allocation nor registration indicates any “standard” status, only that the tag will not be confused with other tags. Requests to allocate tags should be sent to tag_request@omg.org.

### 11.6.5 IOR Creation and Scope

IORs are created from object references when required to cross some kind of referencing domain boundary. ORBs will implement object references in whatever form they find appropriate, including possibly using the IOR structure. Bridges will normally use IORs to mediate transfers where that standard is appropriate.

### 11.6.6 Stringified Object References

Object references can be “stringified” (turned into an external string form) by the **ORB::object_to_string** operation, and then “destringified” (turned back into a programming environment’s object reference representation) using the **ORB::string_to_object** operation.

There can be a variety of reasons why being able to parse this string form might not help make an invocation on the original object reference:

- Identifiers embedded in the string form can belong to a different domain than the ORB attempting to destringify the object reference.
- The ORBs in question might not share a network protocol, or be connected.
- Security constraints may be placed on object reference destringification.

Nonetheless, there is utility in having a defined way for ORBs to generate and parse stringified IORs, so that in some cases an object reference stringified by one ORB could be destringified by another.
To allow a stringified object reference to be internalized by what may be a different ORB, a stringified IOR representation is specified. This representation instead establishes that ORBs could parse stringified object references using that format. This helps address the problem of bootstrapping, allowing programs to obtain and use object references, even from different ORBs.

The following is the representation of the stringified (externalized) IOR:

```
<oref> ::= <prefix> <hex_Octets>
<prefix> ::= "IOR:"
<hex_Octets> ::= <hex_Octet> {<hex_Octet>}*
<hex_Octet> ::= <hexDigit> <hexDigit>
<hexDigit> ::= <digit> | <a> | <b> | <c> | <d> | <e> | <f>
<digit> ::= "0" | "1" | "2" | "3" | "4" | "5" | "6" | "7" | "8" | "9"
<a> ::= "a" | "A"
<b> ::= "b" | "B"
<c> ::= "c" | "C"
<d> ::= "d" | "D"
<e> ::= "e" | "E"
<f> ::= "f" | "F"
```

The hexadecimal strings are generated by first turning an object reference into an IOR, and then encapsulating the IOR using the encoding rules of CDR. (See CDR Transfer Syntax in Chapter 13 for more information.) The content of the encapsulated IOR is then turned into hexadecimal digit pairs, starting with the first octet in the encapsulation and going until the end. The high four bits of each octet are encoded as a hexadecimal digit, then the low four bits.

### 11.6.7 Object Service Context

Emerging specifications for Object Services occasionally require service-specific context information to be passed implicitly with requests and replies. (Specifications for OMG’s Object Services are contained in CORBAservices: Common Object Service Specifications.) The Interoperability specifications define a mechanism for identifying and passing this service-specific context information as “hidden” parameters. The specification makes the following assumptions:

- Object Service specifications that need additional context passed will completely specify that context as an OMG IDL data type.
- ORB APIs will be provided that will allow services to supply and consume context information at appropriate points in the process of sending and receiving requests and replies.
• It is an ORB’s responsibility to determine when to send service-specific context information, and what to do with such information in incoming messages. It may be possible, for example, for a server receiving a request to be unable to de-encapsulate and use a certain element of service-specific context, but nevertheless still be able to successfully reply to the message.

As shown in the following OMG IDL specification, the IOP module provides the mechanism for passing Object Service–specific information. It does not describe any service-specific information. It only describes a mechanism for transmitting it in the most general way possible. The mechanism is currently used by the DCE ESIOP and could also be used by the Internet Inter-ORB protocol (IIOP) General Inter_ORB Protocol (GIOP).

Each Object Service requiring implicit service-specific context to be passed through GIOP will be allocated a unique service context ID value by OMG. Service context ID values are of type unsigned long. Object service specifications are responsible for describing their context information as single OMG IDL data types, one data type associated with each service context ID.

The marshaling of Object Service data is described by the following OMG IDL:

```
module IOP { // IDL

typedef unsigned long ServiceId;

struct ServiceContext {
    ServiceId context_id;
    sequence <octet> context_data;
};
typedef sequence <ServiceContext>ServiceContextList;

const ServiceId TransactionService = 0;
const ServiceId CodeSets = 1;
}
```

The context data for a particular service will be encoded as specified for its service-specific OMG IDL definition, and that encoded representation will be encapsulated in the context_data member of IOP::ServiceContext. (See “Encapsulation” on page 13-12). The context_id member contains the service ID value identifying the service and data format. Context data is encapsulated in octet sequences to permit ORBs to handle context data without unmarshaling, and to handle unknown context data types.

During request and reply marshaling, ORBs will collect all service context data associated with the Request or Reply in a ServiceContextList, and include it in the generated messages. No ordering is specified for service context data within the list. The list is placed at the beginning of those messages to support security policies that may need to apply to the majority of the data in a request (including the message headers).
11

The **ServiceIds** currently defined are:

- **TransactionService** identifies a CDR encapsulation of the
  **CosTSInteroperation::PropogationContext** defined in *CORBA services: Common Object Services Specifications*.

- **CodeSets** identifies a CDR encapsulation of the
  **CONV_FRAME::CodeSetContext** defined in “GIOP Code Set Service Context” on page 11-29.

11.7 Code Set Conversion

11.7.1 Character Processing Terminology

This section introduces a few terms and explains a few concepts to help understand the character processing portions of this document.

**Character Set**

A finite set of different characters used for the representation, organization or control of data. In this document, the term “character set” is used without any relationship to code representation or associated encoding. Examples of character sets are the English alphabet, Kanji or sets of ideographic characters, corporate character sets (commonly used in Japan), and the characters needed to write certain European languages.

**Coded Character Set, or Code Set**

A set of unambiguous rules that establishes a character set and the one-to-one relationship between each character of the set and its bit representation or numeric value. In this document, the term “code set” is used as an abbreviation for the term “coded character set.” Examples include ASCII, ISO 8859-1, JIS X0208 (which includes Roman characters, Japanese hiragana, Greek characters, Japanese kanji, etc.) and Unicode.

**Code Set Classifications**

Some language environments distinguish between byte-oriented and “wide characters.” The byte-oriented characters are encoded in one or more 8 bit bytes. A typical single-byte encoding is ASCII as used for western European languages like English. A typical multi-byte encoding which uses from one to three 8 bit bytes for each character is eucJP (Extended UNIX Code - Japan, packed format) as used for Japanese workstations.

Wide characters are a fixed 16 or 32 bits long, and are used for languages like Chinese, Japanese, etc., where the number of combinations offered by 8 bits is insufficient and a fixed-width encoding is needed. A typical example is Unicode (a “universal” character set defined by the The Unicode Consortium, which uses an encoding scheme identical
to ISO 10646 UCS-2, or 2-byte Universal Character Set encoding). An extended encoding scheme for Unicode characters is UTF-16 (UCS Transformation Format, 16-bit representations).

The C language has data types `char` for byte-oriented characters and `wchar_t` for wide characters. The language definition for C states that the sizes for these characters are implementation dependent. Some environments do not distinguish between byte-oriented and wide characters, e.g., Ada and Smalltalk. Here again, the size of a character is implementation dependent. The following table illustrates code set classifications as used in this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Code Element Encoding</th>
<th>Code Set Examples</th>
<th>C Data Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>byte-oriented</td>
<td>single-byte</td>
<td>ASCII, ISO 8859-1 (Latin-1), EBCDIC, ...</td>
<td><code>char</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multi-byte</td>
<td>UTF-8, eucJP, Shift-JIS, JIS, Big-5, ...</td>
<td><code>char[]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-byte-oriented</td>
<td>fixed-length</td>
<td>ISO 10646 UCS-2 (Unicode), ISO 10646 UCS-4, UTF-16, ...</td>
<td><code>wchar_t</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrow and Wide Characters**

Some language environments distinguish between “narrow” and “wide” characters. Typically the narrow characters are considered to be 8-bit long and are used for western European languages like English, while the wide characters are 16-bit or 32-bit long and are used for languages like Chinese, Japanese, etc. where the number of combinations offered by 8 bits are insufficient. However, as noted above there are common encoding schemes in which Asian characters are encoded using multi-byte code sets and it is incorrect to assume that Asian characters are always encoded as “wide” characters.

Within this document, the general terms “narrow character” and “wide character” are only used in discussing OMG IDL.

**Char Data and Wchar Data**

The phrase “`char` data” in this document refers to data whose IDL types have been specified as `char` or `string`. Likewise “`wchar` data” refers to data whose IDL types have been specified as `wchar` or `wstring`.

**Byte-Oriented Code Set**

An encoding of characters where the numeric code corresponding to a character code element can occupy one or more bytes. A byte as used in this document is synonymous with octet, which occupies 8 bits.
Multi-Byte Character Strings

A character string represented in a byte-oriented encoding where each character can occupy one or more bytes is called a multi-byte character string. Typically, wide characters are converted to this form from a (fixed-width) process code set before transmitting the characters outside the process (see below about process code sets). Care must be taken to correctly process the component bytes of a character’s multi-byte representation.

Non-Byte Oriented Code Set

An encoding of characters where the numeric code corresponding to a character code element can occupy fixed 16 or 32 bits.

Char Transmission Code Set (TCS-C) and Wchar Transmission Code Set (TCS-W)

These two terms refer to code sets that are used for transmission between ORBs after negotiation is completed. As the names imply, the first one is used for char data and the second one for wchar data. Each TCS can be byte-oriented or non-byte oriented.

Process Code Set and File Code Set

Processes generally represent international characters in an internal fixed-width format which allows for efficient representation and manipulation. This internal format is called a “process code set.” The process code set is irrelevant outside the process, and hence to the interoperation between CORBA clients and servers through their respective ORBs.

When a process needs to write international character information out to a file, or communicate with another process (possibly over a network), it typically uses a different encoding called a “file code set.” In this specification, unless otherwise indicated, all references to a program’s code set refer to the file code set, not the process code set. Even when a client and server are located physically on the same machine, it is possible for them to use different file code sets.

Native Code Set

A native code set is the code set which a client or a server uses to communicate with its ORB. There might be separate native code sets for char and wchar data.
Transmission Code Set

A transmission code set is the commonly agreed upon encoding used for character data transfer between a client’s ORB and a server’s ORB. There are two transmission code sets established per session between a client and its server, one for char data (TCS-C) and the other for wchar data (TCS-W). Figure 11-6 on page 11-25 illustrates these relationships:

![Figure 11-6 Transmission Code Sets](image)

The intent is for TCS-C to be byte-oriented and TCS-W to be non-byte-oriented. However, this specification does allow both types of characters to be transmitted using the same transmission code set. That is, the selection of a transmission code set is orthogonal to the wideness or narrowness of the characters, although a given code set may be better suited for either narrow or wide characters.

Conversion Code Set (CCS)

With respect to a particular ORB’s native code set, the set of other or target code sets for which an ORB can convert all code points or character encodings between the native code set and that target code set. For each code set in this CCS, the ORB maintains appropriate translation or conversion procedures and advertises the ability to use that code set for transmitted data in addition to the native code set.

11.7.2 Code Set Conversion Framework

Requirements

The file code set that an application uses is often determined by the platform on which it runs. In Japan, for example, Japanese EUC is used on Unix systems, while Shift-JIS is used on PCs. Code set conversion is therefore required to enable interoperability across these platforms. This proposal defines a framework for the automatic conversion of code sets in such situations. The requirements of this framework are:

1. Backward compatibility. In previous CORBA specifications, IDL type char was limited to ISO 8859-1. The conversion framework should be compatible with existing clients and servers that use ISO 8859-1 as the code set for char.
2. Automatic code set conversion. To facilitate development of CORBA clients and servers, the ORB should perform any necessary code set conversions automatically and efficiently. The IDL type octet can be used if necessary to prevent conversions.
3. Locale support. An internationalized application determines the code set in use by examining the LOCALE string (usually found in the LANG environment variable), which may be changed dynamically at run time by the user. Example LOCALE strings are fr_FR.ISO8859-1 (French, used in France with the ISO 8859-1 code set) and ja_JP.ujis (Japanese, used in Japan with the EUC code set and X11R5 conventions for LOCALE). The conversion framework should allow applications to use the LOCALE mechanism to indicate supported code sets, and thus select the correct code set from the registry.

4. CMIR and SMIR support. The conversion framework should be flexible enough to allow conversion to be performed either on the client or server side. For example, if a client is running in a memory-constrained environment, then it is desirable for code set converters to reside in the server and for a Server Makes It Right (SMIR) conversion method to be used. On the other hand, if many servers are executed on one server machine, then converters should be placed in each client to reduce the load on the server machine. In this case, the conversion method used is Client Makes It Right (CMIR).

**Overview of the Conversion Framework**

Both the client and server indicate a native code set indirectly by specifying a locale. The exact method for doing this is language-specific, such as the XPG4 C/C++ function `setlocale`. The client and server use their native code set to communicate with their ORB. (Note that these native code sets are in general different from process code sets and hence conversions may be required at the client and server ends.)

The conversion framework is illustrated in Figure 11-7 on page 11-27. The server-side ORB stores a server’s code set information in a component of the IOR multiple-component profile structure (see “Interoperable Object References: IORs” on page 11-14). The code sets actually used for transmission are carried in the service context field of an IOP (Inter-ORB Protocol) request header (see “Object Service Context” on page 11-20 and “GIOP Code Set Service Context” on page 11-29). Recall that there are two code sets (TCS-C and TCS-W) negotiated for each session.

---

2. Version 1.1 of the IIOP profile body can also be used to specify the server’s code set information, as this version introduces an extra field that is a sequence of tagged components.
If the native code sets used by a client and server are the same, then no conversion is performed. If the native code sets are different and the client-side ORB has an appropriate converter, then the CMIR conversion method is used. In this case, the server’s native code set is used as the transmission code set. If the native code sets are different and the client-side ORB does not have an appropriate converter but the server-side ORB does have one, then the SMIR conversion method is used. In this case, the client’s native code set is used as the transmission code set.

The conversion framework allows clients and servers to specify a native char code set and a native wchar code set, which determine the local encodings of IDL types char and wchar, respectively. The conversion process outlined above is executed independently for the char code set and the wchar code set. In other words, the algorithm that is used to select a transmission code set is run twice, once for char data and once for wchar data.

The rationale for selecting two transmission code sets rather than one (which is typically inferred from the locale of a process) is to allow efficient data transmission without any conversions when the client and server have identical representations for char and/or wchar data. For example, when a Windows NT client talks to a Windows NT server and they both use Unicode for wide character data, it becomes possible to transmit wide character data from one to the other without any conversions. Of course, this becomes possible only for those wide character representations that are well-defined, not for any proprietary ones. If a single transmission code set was mandated, it might require unnecessary conversions. (For example, choosing Unicode as the transmission code set would force conversion of all byte-oriented character data to Unicode.)

**ORB Databases and Code Set Converters**

The conversion framework requires an ORB to be able to determine the native code set for a locale and to convert between code sets as necessary. While the details of exactly how these tasks are accomplished are implementation-dependent, the following databases and code set converters might be used:
Locale database. This database defines a native code set for a process. This code set could be byte-oriented or non-byte-oriented and could be changed programmatically while the process is running. However, for a given session between a client and a server, it is fixed once the code set information is negotiated at the session's setup time.

Environment variables or configuration files. Since the locale database can only indicate one code set while the ORB needs to know two code sets, one for char data and one for wchar data, an implementation can use environment variables or configuration files to contain this information on native code sets.

Converter database. This database defines, for each code set, the code sets to which it can be converted. From this database, a set of “conversion code sets” (CCS) can be determined for a client and server. For example, if a server’s native code set is eucJP, and if the server-side ORB has eucJP-to-JIS and eucJP-to-SJIS bilateral converters, then the server’s conversion code sets are JIS and SJIS.

Code set converters. The ORB has converters which are registered in the converter database.

**CodeSet Component of IOR Multi-Component Profile**

The code set component of the IOR multi-component profile structure contains:

- server’s native char code set and conversion code sets; and
- server’s native wchar code set and conversion code sets.

Both char and wchar conversion code sets are listed in order of preference. The code set component is identified by the following tag:

```c
const IOP::ComponentID TAG_CODE_SETS = 1;
```

This tag has been assigned by OMG (See “Standard IOR Components” on page 11-17.). The following IDL structure defines the representation of code set information within the component:

```idl
module CONV_FRAME {  // IDL
typedef unsigned long CodeSetId;
struct CodeSetComponent {
  CodeSetId native_code_set;
  sequence<CodeSetId> conversion_code_sets;
};
struct CodeSetComponentInfo {
  CodeSetComponent ForCharData;
  CodeSetComponent ForWcharData;
};
};
```
Code sets are identified by a 32-bit integer id from the OSF Character and Code Set Registry (See “Character and Code Set Registry” on page 11-35 for further information). Data within the code set component is represented as a structure of type `CodeSetComponentInfo`. In other words, the `char` code set information comes first, then the `wchar` information, represented as structures of type `CodeSetComponent`.

A null value should be used in the `native_code_set` field if the server desires to indicate no native code set (possibly with the identification of suitable conversion code sets).

If the code set component is not present in a multi-component profile structure, then the default `char` code set is ISO 8859-1 for backward compatibility. However, there is no default `wchar` code set. If a server supports interfaces that use wide character data but does not specify the `wchar` code sets that it supports, client-side ORBs will raise exception `INV_OBJREF`.

**GIOP Code Set Service Context**

The code set GIOP service context contains:

- `char` transmission code set, and
- `wchar` transmission code set

in the form of a code set service. This service is identified by:

```c
const IOP::ServiceID CodeSets = 1;
```

This service ID has been assigned by OMG (See “Object Service Context” on page 11-20.) The following IDL structure defines the representation of code set service information:

```idl
module CONV_FRAME { // IDL
typedef unsigned long CodesetId;
struct CodeSetContext {
    CodesetId char_data;
    CodesetId wchar_data;
};
}
```

Code sets are identified by a 32-bit integer id from the OSF Character and Code Set Registry (See “Character and Code Set Registry” on page 11-35 for further information).

**Note** – A server’s `char` and `wchar` Code set components are usually different, but under some special circumstances they can be the same. That is, one could use the same code set for both `char` data and `wchar` data. Likewise the `CodesetIds` in the service context don’t have to be different.
**Code Set Negotiation**

The client-side ORB determines a server’s native and conversion code sets from the code set component in an IOR multi-component profile structure, and it determines a client’s native and conversion code sets from the locale setting (and/or environment variables/configuration files) and the converters that are available on the client. From this information, the client-side ORB chooses `char` and `wchar` transmission code sets (TCS-C and TCS-W). For both requests and replies, the `char` TCS-C determines the encoding of `char` and `string` data, and the `wchar` TCS-W determines the encoding of `wchar` and `wstring` data.

Code set negotiation is not performed on a per-request basis, but only when a client initially connects to a server. All text data communicated on a connection are encoded as defined by the TCSs selected when the connection is established.

As the following figure illustrates, there are two channels for character data flowing between the client and the server. The first, TCS-C, is used for `char` data and the second, TCS-W, is used for `wchar` data. Also note that two native code sets, one for each type of data, could be used by the client and server to talk to their respective ORBs (as noted earlier, the selection of the particular native code set used at any particular point is done via `setlocale` or some other implementation dependent method).

![Figure 11-8 Transmission Code Set Use](image)

Let us look at an example. Assume that the code set information for a client and server is as shown in the table below. (Note that this example is talking about only `char` code sets and is applicable only for data described as `char`s in the IDL.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native code set:</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Server</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJIS</td>
<td>eucJP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion code sets:</td>
<td>eucJP, JIS</td>
<td>SJIS, JIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The client-side ORB first compares the native code sets of the client and server. If they are identical, then the transmission and native code sets are the same and no conversion is required. In this example, they are different, so code set conversion is necessary. Next, the client-side ORB checks to see if the server’s native code set, eucJP, is one of the conversion code sets supported by the client. It is, so eucJP is selected as the
transmission code set, with the client (i.e., its ORB) performing conversion to and from its native code set, SJIS, to eucJP. Note that the client may first have to convert all its data described as chars (and possibly wchar ts) from process codes to SJIS first.

Now let us look at the general algorithm for determining a transmission code set and where conversions are performed. First, we introduce the following abbreviations:

- CNCS - Client Native Code Set;
- CCCS - Client Conversion Code Sets;
- SNCS - Server Native Code Set;
- SCCS - Server Conversion Code Sets; and
- TCS - Transmission Code Set.

The algorithm is as follows:

```java
if (CNCS==SNCS)
    TCS = CNCS; // no conversion required
else {
    if (elementOf(SNCS,CCCS))
        TCS = SNCS; // client converts to server’s native code set
    else if (elementOf(CNCS,SCCS))
        TCS = CNCS; // server converts from client’s native code set
    else if (intersection(CCCS,SCCS) != emptySet) {
        TCS = oneOf(intersection(CCCS,SCCS));
        // client chooses TCS, from intersection(CCCS,SCCS), that is
        // most preferable to server;
        // client converts from CNCS to TCS and server from TCS to SNCS
    } else if (compatible(CNCS,SNCS))
        TCS = fallbackCS; // fallbacks are UTF-8 (for char data) and
        // UTF-16 (for wchar data)
    else
        raise CODESET_INCOMPATIBLE exception;
}
```

The algorithm first checks to see if the client and server native code sets are the same. If they are, then the native code set is used for transmission and no conversion is required. If the native code sets are not the same, then the conversion code sets are examined to see if (1) the client can convert from its native code set to the server’s native code set; (2) the server can convert from the client’s native code set to its native code set; or (3) transmission through an intermediate conversion code set is possible. If the third option is selected and there is more than one possible intermediate conversion code set (i.e., the intersection of CCCS and SCCS contains more than one code set), then the one most preferable to the server is selected.3

3.Recall that server conversion code sets are listed in order of preference.
If none of these conversions is possible, then the fallback code set (UTF-8 for char data and UTF-16 for wchar data—see below) is used. However, before selecting the fallback code set, a compatibility test is performed. This test looks at the character sets encoded by the client and server native code sets. If they are different (e.g., Korean and French), then meaningful communication between the client and server is not possible and a CODESET_INCOMPATIBLE exception is raised. This test is similar to the DCE compatibility test and is intended to catch those cases where conversion from the client native code set to the fallback, and the fallback to the server native code set would result in massive data loss. (See 11.9 on page 11-35 for the relevant OSF registry interfaces that could be used for determining compatibility.)

A DATA_CONVERSION exception is raised when a client or server attempts to transmit a character that does not map into the negotiated transmission code set. For example, not all characters in Taiwan Chinese map into Unicode. When an attempt is made to transmit one of these characters via Unicode, an ORB is required to raise a DATA_CONVERSION exception.

In summary, the fallback code set is UTF-8 for char data (identified in the Registry as 0x05010001, “X/Open UTF-8; UCS Transformation Format 8 (UTF-8)”), and UTF-16 for wchar data (identified in the Registry as 0x00010109, "ISO/IEC 10646-1:1993; UTF-16, UCS Transformation Format 16-bit form”). As mentioned above the fallback code set is meaningful only when the client and server character sets are compatible, and the fallback code set is distinguished from a default code set used for backward compatibility.

If a server’s native char code set is not specified in the IOR multi-component profile, then it is considered to be ISO 8859-1 for backward compatibility. However, a server that supports interfaces that use wide character data is required to specify its native wchar code set; if one is not specified, then the client-side ORB raises exception INV_OBJREF.

Similarly, if no char transmission code set is specified in the code set service context, then the char transmission code set is considered to be ISO 8859-1 for backward compatibility. If a client transmits wide character data and does not specify its wchar transmission code set in the service context, then the server-side ORB raises exception BAD_PARAM.

To guarantee “out-of-the-box” interoperability, clients and servers must be able to convert between their native char code set and UTF-8 and their native wchar code set (if specified) and Unicode. Note that this does not require that all server native code sets be mappable to Unicode, but only those that are exported as native in the IOR. The server may have other native code sets that aren’t mappable to Unicode and those can be exported as SCCSs (but not SNCSs). This is done to guarantee out-of-the-box interoperability and to reduce the number of code set converters that a CORBA-compliant ORB must provide.

ORB implementations are strongly encouraged to use widely-used code sets for each regional market. For example, in the Japanese marketplace, all ORB implementations should support Japanese EUC, JIS and Shift JIS to be compatible with existing business practices.
11.7.3 Mapping to Generic Character Environments

Certain language environments do not distinguish between byte-oriented and wide characters. In such environments both `char` and `wchar` are mapped to the same “generic” character representation of the language. `string` and `wstring` are likewise mapped to generic strings in such environments. Examples of language environments that provide generic character support are Smalltalk and Ada.

Even while using languages that do distinguish between wide and byte-oriented characters (e.g., C and C++), it is possible to mimic some generic behavior by the use of suitable macros and support libraries. For example, developers of Windows NT and Windows 95 applications can write portable code between NT (which uses Unicode strings) and Windows 95 (which uses byte-oriented character strings) by using a set of macros for declaring and manipulating characters and character strings. Appendix A in this chapter shows how to map wide and byte-oriented characters to these generic macros.

Another way to achieve generic manipulation of characters and strings is by treating them as abstract data types (ADTs). For example, if strings were treated as abstract data types and the programmers are required to create, destroy, and manipulate strings only through the operations in the ADT interface, then it becomes possible to write code that is representation independent. This approach has an advantage over the macro-based approach in that it provides portability between byte-oriented and wide character environments even without recompilation (at runtime the string function calls are bound to the appropriate byte-oriented/wide library). Another way of looking at it is that the macro-based genericity gives compile-time flexibility, while ADT-based genericity gives runtime flexibility.

Yet another way to achieve generic manipulation of character data is through the ANSI C++ Strings library defined as a template that can be parameterized by `char`, `wchar_t` or other integer types.

Given that there can be several ways of treating characters and character strings in a generic way, this standard cannot, and therefore does not, specify the mapping of `char`, `wchar`, `string` and `wstring` to all of them. It only specifies the following normative requirements which are applicable to generic character environments:

- `wchar` must be mapped to the generic character type in a generic character environment.
- `wstring` must be mapped to a string of such generic characters in a generic character environment.
- The language binding files (i.e., stubs) generated for these generic environments must ensure that the generic type representation is converted to the appropriate code sets (i.e., CNCS on the client side and SNCS on the server side) before character data is given to the ORB runtime for transmission.
Describing Generic Interfaces

To describe generic interfaces in IDL we recommend using wchar and wstring. These can be mapped to generic character types in environments where they do exist and to wide characters where they do not. Either way interoperation between generic and non-generic character type environments is achieved because of the code set conversion framework.

Interoperation

Let us consider an example to see how a generic environment can interoperate with a non-generic environment. Let us say there is an IDL interface with both char and wchar parameters on the operations, and let us say the client of the interface is in a generic environment while the server is in a non-generic environment (for example the client is written in Smalltalk and the server is written in C++).

Assume that the server’s (byte-oriented) native char code set (SNCS) is eucJP and the client’s native char code set (CNCS) is SJIS. Further assume that the code set negotiation led to the decision to use eucJP as the char TCS-C and Unicode as the wchar TCS-W.

As per the above normative requirements for mapping to a generic environment, the client’s Smalltalk stubs are responsible for converting all char data (however they are represented inside Smalltalk) to SJIS and all wchar data to the client’s wchar code set before passing the data to the client-side ORB. (Note that this conversion could be an identity mapping if the internal representation of narrow and wide characters is the same as that of the native code set(s).) The client-side ORB now converts all char data from SJIS to eucJP and all wchar data from the client’s wchar code set to Unicode, and then transmits to the server side.

The server side ORB and stubs convert the eucJP data and Unicode data into C++’s internal representation for char and wchar as dictated by the IDL operation signatures. Notice that when the data arrives at the server side it does not look any different from data arriving from a non-generic environment (e.g., that is just like the server itself). In other words, the mappings to generic character environments do not affect the code set conversion framework.

11.8 Example of Generic Environment Mapping

This Appendix shows how char, wchar, string, and wchar can be mapped to the generic C/C++ macros of the Windows environment. This is merely to illustrate one possibility. This Appendix is not normative and is applicable only in generic environments. See “Mapping to Generic Character Environments” on page 11-33.
11.8.1 Generic Mappings

`char` and `string` are mapped to C/C++ `char` and `char*` as per the standard C/C++ mappings. `wchar` is mapped to the `TCHAR` macro which expands to either `char` or `wchar_t` depending on whether `_UNICODE` is defined. `wstring` is mapped to pointers to `TCHAR` as well as to the string class `CORBA::Wstring_var`. Literal strings in IDL are mapped to the `_TEXT` macro as in `_TEXT(<literal>)`.

11.8.2 Interoperation and Generic Mappings

We now illustrate how the interoperation works with the above generic mapping. Consider an IDL interface operation with a `wstring` parameter, a client for the operation which is compiled and run on a Windows 95 machine, and a server for the operation which is compiled and run on a Windows NT machine. Assume that the locale (and/or the environment variables for CNCS for `wchar` representation) on the Windows 95 client indicates the client’s native code set to be SJIS, and that the corresponding server’s native code set is Unicode. The code set negotiation in this case will probably choose Unicode as the TCS-W.

Both the client and server sides will be compiled with `_UNICODE` defined. The IDL type `wstring` will be represented as a string of `wchar_t` on the client. However, since the client’s locale or environment indicates that the CNCS for wide characters is SJIS, the client side ORB will get the `wstring` parameter encoded as a SJIS multi-byte string (since that is the client’s native code set), which it will then convert to Unicode before transmitting to the server. On the server side the ORB has no conversions to do since the TCS-W matches the server’s native code set for wide characters.

We therefore notice that the code set conversion framework handles the necessary translations between byte-oriented and wide forms.

11.9 Relevant OSFM Registry Interfaces

11.9.1 Character and Code Set Registry

The OSF character and code set registry is defined in OSF Character and Code Set Registry (see References in the Preface) and current registry contents may be obtained directly from the Open Software Foundation (obtain via anonymous ftp to ftp.opengroup.org:/pub/code_set_registry). This registry contains two parts: character sets, and code sets. For each listed code set, the set of character sets encoded by this code set is shown.

Each 32-bit code set value consists of a high-order 16-bit organization number and a 16-bit identification of the code set within that organization. As the numbering of organizations starts with 0x0001, a code set null value (0x00000000) may be used to indicate an unknown code set.

When associating character sets and code sets, OSF uses the concept of “fuzzy equality,” meaning that a code set is shown as encoding a particular character set if the code set can encode “most” of the characters.
“Compatibility” is determined with respect to two code sets by examining their entries in the registry, paying special attention to the character sets encoded by each code set. For each of the two code sets, an attempt is made to see if there is at least one (fuzzy-defined) character set in common, and if such a character set is found, then the assumption is made that these code sets are “compatible.” Obviously, applications which exploit parts of a character set not properly encoded in this scheme will suffer information loss when communicating with another application in this “fuzzy” scheme.

The ORB is responsible for accessing the OSF registry and determining “compatibility” based on the information returned.

OSF members and other organizations can request additions to both the character set and code set registries by email to cs-registry@opengroup.org; in particular, one range of the code set registry (0xf5000000 through 0xffffffff) is reserved for organizations to use in identifying sets which are not registered with the OSF (although such use would not facilitate interoperability without registration).

11.9.2 Access Routines

The following routines are for accessing the OSF character and code set registry. These routines map a code set string name to code set id and vice versa. They also help in determining character set compatibility. These routine interfaces, their semantics and their actual implementation are not normative (i.e., ORB vendors do not have to bundle the OSF registry implementation with their products for compliance).

The following routines are adopted from RPC Runtime Support For I18N Characters - Functional Specification (see References in the Preface).

\textit{dce\_cs\_loc\_to\_rgy}

Maps a local system-specific string name for a code set to a numeric code set value specified in the code set registry.

**SYNOPSIS**

\begin{verbatim}
void dce_cs_loc_to_rgy(
    idl_char *local_code_set_name,
    unsigned32 *rgy_code_set_value,
    unsigned16 *rgy_char_sets_number,
    unsigned16 **rgy_char_sets_value,
    error_status_t *status);
\end{verbatim}

**PARAMETERS**

Input

local_code_set_name

A string that specifies the name that the local host's locale environment uses to refer to the code set. The string is a maximum of 32 bytes: 31 data bytes plus a terminating NULL character.
Output

rgy_code_set_value
The registered integer value that uniquely identifies the code set specified by local_code_set_name.

rgy_char_sets_number
The number of character sets that the specified code set encodes. Specifying NULL prevents this routine from returning this parameter.

rgy_char_sets_value
A pointer to an array of registered integer values that uniquely identify the character set(s) that the specified code set encodes. Specifying NULL prevents this routine from returning this parameter. The routine dynamically allocates this value.

status
Returns the status code from this routine. This status code indicates whether the routine completed successfully or, if not, why not.

The possible status codes and their meanings are as follows:
- dce_cs_c_ok – Code set registry access operation succeeded.
- dce_cs_c_cannot_allocate_memory – Cannot allocate memory for code set info.
- dce_cs_c_unknown – No code set value was not found in the registry which corresponds to the code set name specified.
- dce_cs_c_notfound – No local code set name was found in the registry which corresponds to the name specified.

**DESCRIPTION**

The dce_cs_loc_to_rgy() routine maps operating system-specific names for character/code set encodings to their unique identifiers in the code set registry.

The dce_cs_loc_to_rgy() routine takes as input a string that holds the host-specific “local name” of a code set and returns the corresponding integer value that uniquely identifies that code set, as registered in the host's code set registry. If the integer value does not exist in the registry, the routine returns the status dce_cs_c_unknown.

The routine also returns the number of character sets that the code set encodes and the registered integer values that uniquely identify those character sets. Specifying NULL in the rgy_char_sets_number and rgy_char_sets_value[] parameters prevents the routine from performing the additional search for these values. Applications that want only to obtain a code set value from the code set registry can specify NULL for these parameters in order to improve the routine's performance. If the value is returned from the routine, application developers should free the array after it is used, since the array is dynamically allocated.

**dce_cs_rgy_to_loc**

Maps a numeric code set value contained in the code set registry to the local system-specific name for a code set.
SYNOPSIS

```c
void dce_cs_rgy_to_loc(
    unsigned32 *rgy_code_set_value,
    idl_char **local_code_set_name,
    unsigned16 *rgy_char_sets_number,
    unsigned16 **rgy_char_sets_value,
    error_status_t *status);
```

PARAMETERS

Input

rgy_code_set_value
The registered hexadecimal value that uniquely identifies the code set.

Output

local_code_set_name
A string that specifies the name that the local host's locale environment uses to refer to the code set. The string is a maximum of 32 bytes: 31 data bytes and a terminating NULL character.

rgy_char_sets_number
The number of character sets that the specified code set encodes. Specifying NULL in this parameter prevents the routine from returning this value.

rgy_char_sets_value
A pointer to an array of registered integer values that uniquely identify the character set(s) that the specified code set encodes. Specifying NULL in this parameter prevents the routine from returning this value. The routine dynamically allocates this value.

status
Returns the status code from this routine. This status code indicates whether the routine completed successfully or, if not why not.

The possible status codes and their meanings are as follows:

dce_cs_c_ok – Code set registry access operation succeeded.
dce_cs_c_cannot_allocate_memory – Cannot allocate memory for code set info.
dce_cs_c_unknown – The requested code set value was not found in the code set registry.
dce_cs_c_notfound – No local code set name was found in the registry which corresponds to the specific code set registry ID value. This implies that the code set is not supported in the local system environment.

DESCRIPTION

The dce_cs_rgy_to_loc() routine maps a unique identifier for a code set in the code set registry to the operating system-specific string name for the code set, if it exists in the code set registry.

The dce_cs_rgy_to_loc() routine takes as input a registered integer value of a code set and returns a string that holds the operating system-specific, or local name, of the code set.
If the code set identifier does not exist in the registry, the routine returns the status dce_cs_c_unknown and returns an undefined string.

The routine also returns the number of character sets that the code set encodes and the registered integer values that uniquely identify those character sets. Specifying NULL in the rgy_char_sets_number and rgy_char_sets_value[] parameters prevents the routine from performing the additional search for these values. Applications that want only to obtain a local code set name from the code set registry can specify NULL for these parameters in order to improve the routine's performance. If the value is returned from the routine, application developers should free the rgy_char_sets_value array after it is used.

**rpc_cs_char_set_compat_check**

Evaluates character set compatibility between a client and a server.

**SYNOPSIS**

```c
void rpc_cs_char_set_compat_check(
    unsigned32 client_rgy_code_set_value,
    unsigned32 server_rgy_code_set_value,
    error_status_t *status);
```

**PARAMETERS**

Input

- **client_rgy_code_set_value**
  The registered hexadecimal value that uniquely identifies the code set that the client is using as its local code set.

- **server_rgy_code_set_value**
  The registered hexadecimal value that uniquely identifies the code set that the server is using as its local code set.

Output

- **status**
  Returns the status code from this routine. This status code indicates whether the routine completed successfully or, if not, why not.

The possible status codes and their meanings are as follows:

- **rpc_s_ok** – Successful status.
- **rpc_s_ss_no_compat_charsets** – No compatible code set found. The client and server do not have a common encoding that both could recognize and convert.

The routine can also return status codes from the dce_cs_rgy_to_loc() routine.

**DESCRIPTION**

The rpc_cs_char_set_compat_check() routine provides a method for determining character set compatibility between a client and a server; if the server's character set is incompatible with that of the client, then connecting to that server is most likely not acceptable, since massive data loss would result from such a connection.
The routine takes the registered integer values that represent the code sets that the
client and server are currently using and calls the code set registry to obtain the
registered values that represent the character set(s) that the specified code sets support.
If both client and server support just one character set, the routine compares client and
server registered character set values to determine whether or not the sets are
compatible. If they are not, the routine returns the status message
rpc_s_ss_no_compat_charsets.

If the client and server support multiple character sets, the routine determines whether
at least two of the sets are compatible. If two or more sets match, the routine considers
the character sets compatible, and returns a success status code to the caller.

\textit{rpc\_rgy\_get\_max\_bytes}

Gets the maximum number of bytes that a code set uses to encode one character from
the code set registry on a host

\textbf{SYNOPSIS}

\begin{verbatim}
void rpc_rgy_get_max_bytes(
    unsigned32 rgy_code_set_value,
    unsigned16 *rgy_max_bytes,
    error_status_t *status);
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{PARAMETERS}

\begin{description}
    \item[Input] \hspace{1cm} rgy\_code\_set\_value
        The registered hexadecimal value that uniquely identifies the code set.
    \item[Output] \hspace{1cm} rgy\_max\_bytes
        The registered decimal value that indicates the number of bytes this code set
        uses to encode one character.
    \item[status]
        Returns the status code from this routine. This status code indicates whether
        the routine completed successfully or, if not, why not.
\end{description}

The possible status codes and their meanings are as follows:
\begin{description}
    \item[rpc\_s\_ok] Operation succeeded.
    \item[dce\_cs\_c\_cannot\_allocate\_memory] Cannot allocate memory for code set
        info.
    \item[dce\_cs\_c\_unknown] No code set value was not found in the registry which
        corresponds to the code set value specified.
    \item[dce\_cs\_c\_notfound] No local code set name was found in the registry which
        corresponds to the value specified.
\end{description}
DESCRIPTION

The rpc_rgy_get_max_bytes() routine reads the code set registry on the local host. It takes the specified registered code set value, uses it as an index into the registry, and returns the decimal value that indicates the number of bytes that the code set uses to encode one character.

This information can be used for buffer sizing as part of the procedure to determine whether additional storage needs to be allocated for conversion between local and network code sets.