



XMPP

XEP-0426: Character counting in message bodies

Marvin Wissfeld
<mailto:xsf@larma.de>
<xmpp:jabber@larma.de>

2020-01-02
Version 0.2.0

| Status | Type | Short Name |
|----------|---------------|------------|
| Deferred | Informational | charcount |

This document describes how to correctly count characters in message bodies. This is required when referencing a position in the body.

Legal

Copyright

This XMPP Extension Protocol is copyright © 1999 – 2020 by the [XMPP Standards Foundation](#) (XSF).

Permissions

Permission is hereby granted, free of charge, to any person obtaining a copy of this specification (the "Specification"), to make use of the Specification without restriction, including without limitation the rights to implement the Specification in a software program, deploy the Specification in a network service, and copy, modify, merge, publish, translate, distribute, sublicense, or sell copies of the Specification, and to permit persons to whom the Specification is furnished to do so, subject to the condition that the foregoing copyright notice and this permission notice shall be included in all copies or substantial portions of the Specification. Unless separate permission is granted, modified works that are redistributed shall not contain misleading information regarding the authors, title, number, or publisher of the Specification, and shall not claim endorsement of the modified works by the authors, any organization or project to which the authors belong, or the XMPP Standards Foundation.

Warranty

NOTE WELL: This Specification is provided on an "AS IS" BASIS, WITHOUT WARRANTIES OR CONDITIONS OF ANY KIND, express or implied, including, without limitation, any warranties or conditions of TITLE, NON-INFRINGEMENT, MERCHANTABILITY, or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Liability

In no event and under no legal theory, whether in tort (including negligence), contract, or otherwise, unless required by applicable law (such as deliberate and grossly negligent acts) or agreed to in writing, shall the XMPP Standards Foundation or any author of this Specification be liable for damages, including any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages of any character arising from, out of, or in connection with the Specification or the implementation, deployment, or other use of the Specification (including but not limited to damages for loss of goodwill, work stoppage, computer failure or malfunction, or any and all other commercial damages or losses), even if the XMPP Standards Foundation or such author has been advised of the possibility of such damages.

Conformance

This XMPP Extension Protocol has been contributed in full conformance with the XSF's Intellectual Property Rights Policy (a copy of which can be found at <https://xmpp.org/about/xsf/ipr-policy>) or obtained by writing to XMPP Standards Foundation, P.O. Box 787, Parker, CO 80134 USA).

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Character counting | 1 |
| 2.1 | Illegal offsets | 2 |
| 2.2 | Developer notes | 2 |
| 3 | Rationale | 3 |
| 4 | Glossary | 3 |
| 5 | IANA Considerations | 3 |
| 6 | XMPP Registrar Considerations | 4 |
| 7 | Acknowledgements | 4 |

1 Introduction

Various use-cases require the possibility to reference a part of the message body or a specific position in it. This was realized by providing offsets from the beginning of the message (when referencing a region, those offsets would define begin and end of a region). XEPs doing so include [In-Band Real Time Text \(XEP-0301\)](#)¹, [References \(XEP-0372\)](#)² (and thereof derived [Stateless Inline Media Sharing \(XEP-0385\)](#)³) and [Message Markup \(XEP-0394\)](#)⁴.

For these use-cases, it is highly relevant to decide how to count "characters" in a message body. While it at first sounds trivial, there are various ways of doing so in modern font systems. The purpose of this XEP is to define how characters shall be counted for the purpose of the aforementioned XEPs and any future XEP relying on a similar feature.

2 Character counting

When counting characters in a body, they shall be counted by their **number of Unicode code points**. Message bodies must be used as strings of the XML characters (as defined in §2.2 of [XML 1.0](#)⁵). This means that, i.e. no Unicode normalization may be performed before determining offsets when receiving or after determining offsets when sending. Any kind of further body processing shall be performed after counting (e.g. `/me`⁶ as described in [The /me Command \(XEP-0245\)](#)⁷ is always counted as 4 characters without considering the sending user's name). All references (as defined in §4.1 of [XML 1.0](#)⁸) must be counted by their referenced character(s) and not the reference characters (e.g. the encoded `&` is counted as one decoded character `&`).

| String | Grapheme cluster | UTF-8 bytes | UTF-16 units (2 bytes) | Code points |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Hello, world! | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| You & Me | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| □□□□□□□□ | 7 | 21 | 7 | 7 |

¹XEP-0301: In-Band Real Time Text <<https://xmpp.org/extensions/xep-0301.html>>.

²XEP-0372: References <<https://xmpp.org/extensions/xep-0372.html>>.

³XEP-0385: Stateless Inline Media Sharing (SIMS) <<https://xmpp.org/extensions/xep-0385.html>>.

⁴XEP-0394: Message Markup <<https://xmpp.org/extensions/xep-0394.html>>.

⁵Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fourth Edition) <<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/>>.

⁶The middle dot is used to represent a space character and is not meant to be taken verbatim.

⁷XEP-0245: The /me Command <<https://xmpp.org/extensions/xep-0245.html>>.

⁸Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fourth Edition) <<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/>>.

| String | Grapheme cluster | UTF-8 bytes | UTF-16 units (2 bytes) | Code points |
|---------|---|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
| ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | 5 There are spaces between the emojis. You may also perceive this as more than 5 glyphs if your font or display engine does not support the required Unicode version. | 43 | 21 | 13 |

2.1 Illegal offsets

As grapheme clusters may consist of multiple code points, a code point offset might be illegal if it points inside a grapheme cluster.

However, receiving entities SHOULD NOT consider illegal offsets invalid, as different Unicode versions may have different understanding of what a grapheme cluster is. Instead, receiving entities may choose one of the following behaviors:

- Split the grapheme cluster into multiple graphemes. In most cases, this is closest to the intended behavior. Many font display engines will do this automatically as needed.
- When the offset defines the end of a region, include the full grapheme cluster in the region. Otherwise, take the offset as if it pointed to the beginning of the grapheme cluster.

2.2 Developer notes

Some programming languages include a string type that operates directly on Unicode code points. If these types are used, offset numbers can be used as-is in string operations. Popular examples of such programming languages are Python and Haskell.

Other programming languages include a string type that operates on UTF-16 units. As can be seen in the table above, those match the number of code points in many cases and thus are sometimes confused to be the same. Popular examples of such programming languages are C#, Java and JavaScript.

C/C++ includes a wide character and string type. Those behave differently across platforms and as such should be used with care.

3 Rationale

The most obvious way of counting characters is to count them how humans would. This sounds easy when only having western scripts in mind but becomes more complicated in other scripts and most importantly is not well-defined across Unicode versions. New unicode versions regularly added new possibilities to build grapheme clusters, including from existing code points. To be forward compatible, counting grapheme clusters, graphemes, glyphs or similar is thus not an option. This leaves basically the two options of using the number of code units of the encoded string or the number of code points.

The main advantage of using the code units would be that those are native to many programming languages, easing the task for developers. However programming languages do not share a common encoding for their string type (C/C++ use UTF-8, C#/Java use UTF-16, Python 3 hides the internal encoding from the developer and only presents it in code points), so there is no best pick here. If one was to choose an encoding, the best choice would be UTF-8, the native encoding of XMPP. However this makes counting bytes a more complex task for programming languages that use a different encoding like UTF-16, as strings would need to be transcoded first.

Counting code points has the advantage that offset counts cannot point inside a code point. This could happen when using code units of any encoding that may use more than one unit to represent a code point (such as UTF-8 and UTF-16). If an offset count points inside a code point, that would be an invalid offset, raising more uncertainty of the correct behavior in such cases. Most notably the opportunity of splitting (as it exists for grapheme cluster) is not an option in that case, because splitting a code point would not create any usable output. Counting code points is widely supported in programming languages and can easily be implemented for encoded strings when not. The [XML 1.0](#)⁹ standard also defines a character as a unicode code point, thus counting code points is equivalent to counting XML characters.

4 Glossary

Unicode terminology used across this document, can be looked up in the Unicode glossary at <https://www.unicode.org/glossary/>.

5 IANA Considerations

This document requires no interaction with the [Internet Assigned Numbers Authority \(IANA\)](#)¹⁰.

⁹Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0 (Fourth Edition) <<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/>>.

¹⁰The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) is the central coordinator for the assignment of unique parameter values for Internet protocols, such as port numbers and URI schemes. For further information, see <<http://www.iana.org/>>.

6 XMPP Registrar Considerations

This document requires no interaction with [XMPP Registrar](#)¹¹.

7 Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Guus der Kinderen, Ralph Meijer, Jonas Schäfer, Lance Stout and others that provided feedback.

¹¹The XMPP Registrar maintains a list of reserved protocol namespaces as well as registries of parameters used in the context of XMPP extension protocols approved by the XMPP Standards Foundation. For further information, see <https://xmpp.org/registrar/>.