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Intended Audience

This specification is intended primarily for DDS vendors and DDS tools developers. End-users may find the specification useful to monitor network traffic in DDS based applications.

Typographical Conventions
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Issues

1 Scope

This specification is a response to the OMG RFP “Data-Distribution Service Interoperability Wire Protocol” (mars/2005-06-13). It defines an interoperability protocol for DDS. Its purpose and scope is to ensure that applications based on different vendors’ implementations of DDS can interoperate.

2 Conformance

Implementations of this specification must comply with the conformance statements listed in Section 8.4.2 of this specification.

3 Normative References

The following normative documents contain provisions which, through reference in this text, constitute provisions of this specification. For dated references, subsequent amendments to, or revisions of, any of these publications do not apply.

- DDS Specification v1.1 (OMG document formal/2005-12-04)

4 Terms and Definitions

For the purposes of this specification, the terms and definitions given in the normative references apply.

5 Symbols

- CDR Common Data Representation
- DDS Data Distribution Service
- EDP Endpoint Discovery Protocol
- GUID Globally Unique Identifier
- PDP Participant Discovery Protocol
- PIM Platform Independent Model
- PSM Platform Specific Model
- RTPS Real-Time Publish-Subscribe
- SEDP Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol
6 Additional Information

6.1 Changes to Adopted OMG Specifications

This specification does not change any adopted OMG specifications. It forms a supplement to the OMG DDS specification (see http://www.omg.org/cgi-bin/doc?formal/05-12-04).

6.2 How to Read this Specification

This specification defines the DDS Interoperability Protocol. Readers not familiar with DDS will benefit from first reading the DDS specification.

For a very high level overview of RTPS (Real-Time Publish-Subscribe) and a brief description of the structure of this document, please refer to the Introduction. Subsequent chapters cover RTPS in much greater detail.

While providing both a PIM (Platform Independent Model) and a PSM (Platform Specific Model) contributed to the size of this document, this approach also enables a selective reader to easily pick sections of interest:

- Readers who are new to RTPS can start by reading the Structure and Messages Modules of the PIM. These Modules provide an overview of the RTPS protocol actors, how they relate to DDS Entities, what RTPS messages exist and how they are structured.

- Readers who would like to explore the RTPS message exchange protocol can read the first part of the Behavior Module. RTPS is a fairly flexible protocol and allows implementations to customize their behavior depending on how much ‘state’ they wish to keep on remote Endpoints. The first part of the Behavior Module lists the general requirements any compliant implementation of RTPS must satisfy to remain interoperable with other implementations.

- The second part of the Behavior Module defines two reference implementations. One reference implementation maintains full state on remote Endpoints, the other none. This section may be of interest to readers who want a more detailed understanding of the RTPS message exchange protocol, but it could easily be skipped by first-time readers.

- Readers interested in how RTPS handles dynamic discovery of remote Endpoints are referred to the stand-alone Discovery Module.

- For readers planning on implementing RTPS or defining a new PSM, the PSM Chapter contains a detailed discussion on how the RTPS PIM is mapped to the UDP/IP PSM.

- Finally, the chapter on data encapsulation defines various data encapsulation mechanisms for use with RTPS.

6.3 Acknowledgements
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6.4 Statement of Proof of Concept

The protocol specified in this proposal has proven its performance and applicability to data-distribution systems. The protocol is the one used by Real-Time Innovation's implementation of DDS which has been deployed in hundreds of applications worldwide over the last 5 years.
The protocol in this document also forms part of the IEC Real-Time Industrial Ethernet Suite IEC-PAS-62030 IEC standard, showing its applicability to the demanding real-time and resource-constrained industrial-control environment.

The protocol has been independently implemented by other middleware providers such as Schneider Electric and the University of Prague, proving the completeness and self-consistency of the specification.
7 Overview

7.1 Introduction

The recently-adopted Data-Distribution Service specification defines an Application Level Interface and behavior of a Data-Distribution Service (DDS) that supports Data-Centric Publish-Subscribe (DCPS) in real-time systems. The DDS specification used a Model-Driven Architecture (MDA) approach to precisely describe the Data-Centric communications model specifically:

- how the application models the data it wishes to send and receive,
- how the application interacts with the DCPS middleware and specifies the data it wishes to send and receive as well as the quality of service (QoS) requirements,
- how data is sent and received (relative to the QoS requirements),
- how the applications access the data, and
- the kinds of feedback the application gets from the state of the middleware.

The DDS specification also includes a platform specific mapping to IDL and therefore an application using DDS is able to switch among DDS implementations with only a re-compile. DDS therefore addresses ‘application portability.’

The DDS specification does not address the protocol used by the implementation to exchange messages over transports such as TCP/UDP/IP, so different implementations of DDS will not interoperate with each other unless vendor-specific “bridges” are provided. The situation is therefore similar to that of other messaging API standards such as JMS.

With the increasing adoption of DDS in large distributed systems, it is desirable to define a standard “wire protocol” that allows DDS implementations from multiple vendors to interoperate. The desired “DDS wire protocol” should be capable of taking advantage of the QoS settings configurable by DDS to optimize its use of the underlying transport capabilities. In particular, the desired wire protocol must be capable of exploiting the multicast, best-effort, and connectionless nature of many of the DDS QoS settings.

7.2 Requirements for a DDS Wire-protocol

In network communications, as in many other fields of engineering, it is a fact that “one size does not fit all.” Engineering design is about making the right set of trade-offs, and these trade-offs must balance conflicting requirements such as generality, ease of use, richness of features, performance, memory size and usage, scalability, determinism, and robustness. These trade-offs must be made in light of the types of information flow (e.g., periodic vs. bursty, state-based vs. event-based, one-to-many vs. request-reply, best-effort vs. reliable, small data-values vs. large files, etc.), and the constraints imposed by the application and execution platforms. Consequently, many successful protocols have emerged such as HTTP, SOAP, FTP, DHCP, DCE, RTP, DCOM, and CORBA. Each of these protocols fills a niche, providing well-tuned functionality for specific purposes or application domains.

The basic communication model of DDS is one of unidirectional data exchange where the applications that publish data “push” the relevant data updates to the local caches of co-located subscribers to the data. This information flow is regulated by QoS contracts implicitly established between the DataWriters and the DataReaders. The DataWriter specifies its QoS contract at the time it declares its intent to publish data and the DataReader does it at the time it declares its intent to subscribe to data. The communication patterns typically include many-to-many style configurations. Of primary
concern to applications deploying DDS technology is that the information is distributed in an efficient manner with minimal overhead. Another important requirement is the need to scale to hundreds or thousands of subscribers in a robust fault-tolerant manner.

The DDS specification prescribes the presence of a built-in discovery service that allows publishers to dynamically discover the existence of subscribers and vice-versa and performs this task continuously without the need to contact any name servers.

The DDS specification also prescribes that the implementations should not introduce any single points of failure. Consequently protocols must not rely on centralized name servers or centralized information brokers.

The large scale, loosely-coupled, dynamic nature of applications deploying DDS and the need to adapt to emerging transports require certain flexibility on the data-definition and protocol such that each can be evolved while preserving backwards compatibility with already deployed systems.

### 7.3 The RTPS Wire-protocol

The Real-Time Publish Subscribe (RTPS) protocol found its roots in industrial automation and was in fact approved by the IEC as part of the Real-Time Industrial Ethernet Suite IEC-PAS-62030. It is a field proven technology that is currently deployed worldwide in thousands of industrial devices.

RTPS was specifically developed to support the unique requirements of data-distributions systems. As one of the application domains targeted by DDS, the industrial automation community defined requirements for a standard publish-subscribe wire-protocol that closely match those of DDS. As a direct result, a close synergy exists between DDS and the RTPS wire-protocol, both in terms of the underlying behavioral architecture and the features of RTPS.

The RTPS protocol is designed to be able to run over multicast and connectionless best-effort transports such as UDP/IP. The main features of the RTPS protocol include:

- Performance and quality-of-service properties to enable best-effort and reliable publish-subscribe communications for real-time applications over standard IP networks.
- Fault tolerance to allow the creation of networks without single points of failure.
- Extensibility to allow the protocol to be extended and enhanced with new services without breaking backwards compatibility and interoperability.
- Plug-and-play connectivity so that new applications and services are automatically discovered and applications can join and leave the network at any time without the need for reconfiguration.
- Configurability to allow balancing the requirements for reliability and timeliness for each data delivery.
- Modularity to allow simple devices to implement a subset of the protocol and still participate in the network.
- Scalability to enable systems to potentially scale to very large networks.
- Type-safety to prevent application programming errors from compromising the operation of remote nodes.

The above features make RTPS an excellent match for a DDS wire-protocol. Given its publish-subscribe roots, this is not a coincidence, as RTPS was specifically designed for meeting the types of requirements set forth by the DDS application domain.

This specification defines the message formats, interpretation, and usage scenarios that underlie all messages exchanged by applications that use the RTPS protocol.
7.4 The RTPS Platform Independent Model (PIM)

The RTPS protocol is described in terms of a Platform Independent Model (PIM) and a set of PSMs.

The RTPS PIM contains four modules: Structure, Messages, Behavior, and Discovery. The Structure module defines the communication endpoints. The Messages module defines the set of messages that those endpoints can exchange. The Behavior module defines sets of legal interactions (message exchanges) and how they affect the state of the communication endpoints. In other words, the Structure module defines the protocol “actors,” the Messages module the set of “grammatical symbols,” and the Behavior module the legal grammar and semantics of the different conversations. The Discovery module defines how entities are automatically discovered and configured.

Figure 7.1 - RTPS Modules

In the PIM, the messages are defined in terms of their semantic content. This PIM can then be mapped to various Platform-Specific Models (PSMs) such as plain UDP or CORBA-events.

7.4.1 The Structure Module

Given its publish-subscribe roots, RTPS maps naturally to many DDS concepts. This specification uses many of the same core entities used in the DDS specification. As illustrated in Figure 7.2, all RTPS entities are associated with an RTPS domain, which represents a separate communication plane that contains a set of Participants. A Participant contains local Endpoints. There are two kinds of endpoints: Readers and Writers. Readers and Writers are the actors that communicate information by sending RTPS messages. Writers inform of the presence and send locally available data on the Domain to the Readers which can request and acknowledge the data.
The Actors in the RTPS Protocol are in one-to-one correspondence with the DDS Entities that are the reason for the communication to occur. This is illustrated in Figure 7.3.

The Structure module is described in Section 8.2.
7.4.2 The Messages Module

The messages module defines the content of the atomic information exchanges between RTPS Writers and Readers. Messages are composed of a header followed by a number of Submessages, as illustrated in Figure 7.4. Each Submessage is built from a series of Submessage elements. This structure is chosen to allow the vocabulary of Submessages and the composition of each Submessage to be extended while maintaining backward compatibility.

![Figure 7.4 - RTPS Messages Module](image)

The Messages module is discussed at length in Section 8.3.

7.4.3 The Behavior Module

The Behavior module describes the allowed sequences of messages that can be exchanged between RTPS Writers and Readers as well as the timings and changes in the state of the Writer and the Reader caused by each message.

The required behavior for interoperability is described in terms of a minimum set of rules that an implementation must follow in order to be interoperable. Actual implementations may exhibit different behavior beyond these minimum requirements, depending on how they wish to trade-off scalability, memory requirements, and bandwidth usage.

To illustrate this concept, the Behavior module defines two reference implementations. One reference implementation is based on StatefulWriters and StatefulReaders, the other on StatelessWriters and StatelessReaders, as illustrated in Figure 7.2. Both reference implementations satisfy the minimum requirements for interoperability, and are therefore interoperable, but exhibit slightly different behavior due to the difference in information they store on matching remote entities. The behavior of an actual implementation of the RTPS protocol may be an exact match or a combination of that of the reference implementations.

The Behavior module is described in Section 8.4.

7.4.4 The Discovery Module

The Discovery module describes the protocol that enables Participants to obtain information about the existence and attributes of all the other Participants and Endpoints in the Domain. This metatraffic enables every Participant to obtain a complete picture of all Participants, Readers and Writers in the Domain and configure the local Writers to communicate with the remote Readers and the local Readers to communicate with the remote Writers.
Discovery is a separate module. The unique needs of Discovery, namely the transparent plug-and-play dissemination of all the information needed to associate matching Writers and Readers make it unlikely that a single architecture or protocol can fulfill the extremely variable scalability, performance, and embeddability needs of the various heterogeneous networks where DDS will be deployed. Henceforth, it makes sense to introduce several discovery mechanisms ranging from the simple and efficient (but not very scalable), to a more complex hierarchical (but more scalable) mechanism. The Discovery module is described in Section 8.5.

7.5 The RTPS Platform Specific Model (PSM)

A Platform Specific Model maps the RTPS PIM to a specific underlying platform. It defines the precise representation in bits and bytes of all RTPS Types and Messages and any other information specific to the platform.

Multiple PSMs may be supported, but all implementations of DDS must at least implement the PSM on top of UDP/IP, which is presented in Chapter 9.

7.6 The RTPS Transport Model

RTPS supports a wide variety of transports and transport QoS. The protocol is designed to be able to run on multicast and best-effort transports, such as UDP/IP and requires only very simple services from the transport. In fact, it is sufficient that the transport offers a connectionless service capable of sending packets best-effort. That is, the transport need not guarantee each packet will reach its destination or that packets are delivered in-order. Where required, RTPS implements reliability in the transfer of data and state above the transport interface. This does not preclude RTPS from being implemented on top of a reliable transport. It simply makes it possible to support a wider range of transports.

If available, RTPS can also take advantage of the multicast capabilities of the transport mechanism, where one message from a sender can reach multiple receivers. RTPS is designed to promote determinism of the underlying communication mechanism. The protocol provides an open trade-off between determinism and reliability.

The general requirements RTPS poses on the underlying transport can be summarized as follows:

• The transport has a generalized notion of a unicast address (shall fit within 16 bytes).

• The transport has a generalized notion of a port (shall fit within 4 bytes), e.g., could be a UDP port, an offset in a shared memory segment, etc.

• The transport can send a datagram (uninterpreted sequence of octets) to a specific address/port.

• The transport can receive a datagram at a specific address/port.

• The transport will drop messages if incomplete or corrupted during transfer (i.e., RTPS assumes messages are complete and not corrupted).

• The transport provides a means to deduce the size of the received message.
8 Platform Independent Model (PIM)

8.1 Introduction

This chapter defines the Platform Independent Model (PIM) for the RTPS protocol. Subsequent chapters map the PIM to a variety of platforms, the most fundamental one being native UDP packets.

The PIM describes the protocol in terms of a “virtual machine.” The structure of the virtual machine is built from the classes described in Section 8.2, which include Writer and Reader endpoints. These endpoints communicate using the messages described in Section 8.3. Section 8.4 describes the behavior of the virtual machine, i.e., what message exchanges take place between the endpoints. It lists the requirements for interoperability and defines two reference implementations using state-diagrams. Section 8.5 defines the discovery protocol used to configure the virtual machine with the information it needs to communicate with its remote peers. Section 8.6 describes how the protocol can be extended for future needs. Finally, Section 8.7 describes how to implement DDS QoS and some advanced DDS features using RTPS.

The only purpose of introducing the RTPS virtual machine is to describe the protocol in a complete and un-ambiguous manner. This description is not intended to constrain the internal implementation in any way. The only criteria for a compliant implementation is that the externally-observable behavior satisfies the requirements for interoperability. In particular, an implementation could be based on other classes and could use programming constructs other than state-machines to implement the RTPS protocol.

8.2 Structure Module

This section describes the structure of the RTPS entities that are the communication actors. The main classes used by the RTPS protocol are shown in Figure 8.1.

8.2.1 Overview

RTPS entities are the protocol-level endpoints used by the application-visible DDS entities in order to communicate with each other.

Each RTPS Entity is in a one-to-one correspondence with a DDS Entity. The HistoryCache forms the interface between the DDS Entities and their corresponding RTPS Entities. For example, each write operation on a DDS DataWriter adds a CacheChange to the HistoryCache of its corresponding RTPS Writer. The RTPS Writer subsequently transfers the CacheChange to the HistoryCache of all matching RTPS Readers. On the receiving side, the DDS DataReader is notified by the RTPS Reader that a new CacheChange has arrived in the HistoryCache, at which point the DDS DataReader may choose to access it using the DDS read or take API.
This section provides an overview of the main classes used by the RTPS virtual machine and the types used to describe their attributes. Subsequent sections describe each class in detail.

### 8.2.1.1 Summary of the classes used by the RTPS virtual machine

All RTPS entities derive from the RTPS `Entity` class. Table 8.1 lists the classes used by the RTPS virtual machine.

#### Table 8.1 - Overview of RTPS Entities and Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>Entity</code></td>
<td>Base class for all RTPS entities. RTPS <code>Entity</code> represents the class of objects that are visible to other RTPS Entities on the network. As such, RTPS <code>Entity</code> objects have a globally-unique identifier (GUID) and can be referenced inside RTPS messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Endpoint</code></td>
<td>Specialization of RTPS <code>Entity</code> representing the objects that can be communication endpoints. That is, the objects that can be the sources or destinations of RTPS messages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Entities and Classes used by the virtual machine each contain a set of attributes. The types of the attributes are summarized in Table 8.2.

### Table 8.2 - Types of the attributes that appear in the RTPS Entities and Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold globally-unique RTPS-entity identifiers. These are identifiers used to uniquely refer to each RTPS Entity in the system. Must be possible to represent using 16 octets. The following values are reserved by the protocol: GUID_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GuidPrefix_t Type used to hold the prefix of the globally-unique RTPS-entity identifiers. The GUIDs of entities belonging to the same participant all have the same prefix (see Section 8.2.4.3).
Must be possible to represent using 12 octets.
The following values are reserved by the protocol: GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN

EntityId_t Type used to hold the suffix part of the globally-unique RTPS-entity identifiers. The EntityId_t uniquely identifies an Entity within a Participant.
Must be possible to represent using 4 octets.
The following values are reserved by the protocol: ENTITYID_UNKNOWN
Additional pre-defined values are defined by the Discovery module in Section 8.5.

SequenceNumber_t Type used to hold sequence numbers.
Must be possible to represent using 64 bits.
The following values are reserved by the protocol: SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN

Locator_t Type used to represent the addressing information needed to send a message to an RTPS Endpoint using one of the supported transports.
Should be able to hold a discriminator identifying the kind of transport, an address, and a port number. It must be possible to represent the discriminator and port number using 4 octets, the address using 16 octets.
The following values are reserved by the protocol:
LOCATOR_INVALID
LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID
LOCATOR_KIND_RESERVED
LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4
LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6
LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID
LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID

TopicKind_t Enumeration used to distinguish whether a Topic has defined some fields within to be used as the ‘key’ that identifies data-instances within the Topic. See the DDS specification for more details on keys.
The following values are reserved by the protocol:
NO_KEY
WITH_KEY

ChangeKind_t Enumeration used to distinguish the kind of change that was made to a data-object. Includes changes to the data or the lifecycle of the data-object.
It can take the values:
ALIVE, NOT_ALIVE_DISPOSED, NOT_ALIVE_UNREGISTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GuidPrefix_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold the prefix of the globally-unique RTPS-entity identifiers. The GUIDs of entities belonging to the same participant all have the same prefix (see Section 8.2.4.3). Must be possible to represent using 12 octets. The following values are reserved by the protocol: GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EntityId_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold the suffix part of the globally-unique RTPS-entity identifiers. The EntityId_t uniquely identifies an Entity within a Participant. Must be possible to represent using 4 octets. The following values are reserved by the protocol: ENTITYID_UNKNOWN Additional pre-defined values are defined by the Discovery module in Section 8.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold sequence numbers. Must be possible to represent using 64 bits. The following values are reserved by the protocol: SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locator_t</td>
<td>Type used to represent the addressing information needed to send a message to an RTPS Endpoint using one of the supported transports. Should be able to hold a discriminator identifying the kind of transport, an address, and a port number. It must be possible to represent the discriminator and port number using 4 octets, the address using 16 octets. The following values are reserved by the protocol: LOCATOR_INVALID LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID LOCATOR_KIND_RESERVED LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4 LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6 LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TopicKind_t</td>
<td>Enumeration used to distinguish whether a Topic has defined some fields within to be used as the ‘key’ that identifies data-instances within the Topic. See the DDS specification for more details on keys. The following values are reserved by the protocol: NO_KEY WITH_KEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChangeKind_t</td>
<td>Enumeration used to distinguish the kind of change that was made to a data-object. Includes changes to the data or the lifecycle of the data-object. It can take the values: ALIVE, NOT_ALIVE_DISPOSED, NOT_ALIVE_UNREGISTERED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.1.3 Configuration attributes of the RTPS Entities

RTPS entities are configured by a set of attributes. Some of these attributes map to the QoS policies set on the corresponding DDS entities. Other attributes represent parameters that allow tuning the behavior of the protocol to specific transport and deployment situations. Additional attributes encode the state of the RTPS Entity and are not used to configure the behavior.

The attributes used to configure a subset of the RTPS Entities are shown in Figure 8.2. The attributes to configure Writer and Reader Entities are closely tied to the protocol behavior and will be introduced in Section 8.4.

### Table 8.2 - Types of the attributes that appear in the RTPS Entities and Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ReliabilityKind_t</td>
<td>Enumeration used to indicate the level of the reliability used for communications. It can take the values: BEST_EFFORT, RELIABLE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InstanceHandle_t</td>
<td>Type used to represent the identity of a data-object whose changes in value are communicated by the RTPS protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProtocolVersion_t</td>
<td>Type used to represent the version of the RTPS protocol. The version is composed of a major and a minor version number. See also Section 8.6. The following values are reserved by the protocol: PROTOCOLVERSION PROTOCOLVERSION_1_0 PROTOCOLVERSION_1_1 PROTOCOLVERSION_2_0 PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1 PROTOCOLVERSION is an alias for the most recent version, in this case PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VendorId_t</td>
<td>Type used to represent the vendor of the service implementing the RTPS protocol. The possible values for the vendorId are assigned by the OMG. The following values are reserved by the protocol: VENDORID_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.2 - Attributes used to configure the main RTPS Entities

The remainder of this section describes each of the RTPS entities in more detail.

### 8.2.2 The RTPS HistoryCache

The **HistoryCache** is part of the interface between DDS and RTPS and plays different roles on the reader and the writer side.

On the writer side, the **HistoryCache** contains the partial history of changes to data-objects made by the corresponding DDS **Writer** that are needed to service existing and future matched RTPS **Reader** endpoints. The partial history needed depends on the DDS Qos and the state of the communications with the matched RTPS **Reader** endpoints.

On the reader side, it contains the partial superposition of changes to data-objects made by all the matched RTPS **Writer** endpoints.

The word “partial” is used to indicate that it is not necessary that the full history of all changes ever made is maintained. Rather what is needed is the subset of the history needed to meet the behavioral needs of the RTPS protocol and the QoS needs of the related DDS entities. The rules that define this subset are defined by the RTPS protocol and depend both on the state of the communications protocol and on the QoS of the related DDS entities.

The **HistoryCache** is part of the interface between DDS and RTPS. In other words, both the RTPS entities and their related DDS entities are able to invoke the operations on their associated **HistoryCache**.
The **HistoryCache** attributes are listed in Table 8.3.

### Table 8.3 - RTPS HistoryCache Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes</td>
<td>CacheChange[*]</td>
<td>The list of CacheChanges contained in the HistoryCache.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RTPS entities and the related DDS entities interact with the **HistoryCache** using the operations in Table 8.4.

### Table 8.4 - RTPS HistoryCache operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>HistoryCache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add_change</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_change</td>
<td>a_change</td>
<td>CacheChange</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sections provide details on the operations.

8.2.2.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS HistoryCache. The newly-created history cache is initialized with an empty list of changes.

8.2.2.2 add_change

This operation inserts the CacheChange a_change into the HistoryCache.

This operation will only fail if there are not enough resources to add the change to the HistoryCache. It is the responsibility of the DDS service implementation to configure the HistoryCache in a manner consistent with the DDS Entity RESOURCE_LIMITS QoS and to propagate any errors to the DDS-user in the manner specified by the DDS specification.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

ADD a_change TO this.changes;

8.2.2.3 remove_change

This operation indicates that a previously-added CacheChange has become irrelevant and the details regarding the CacheChange need not be maintained in the HistoryCache. The determination of irrelevance is made based on the QoS associated with the related DDS entity and on the acknowledgment status of the CacheChange. This is described in Section 8.4.1.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

REMOVE a_change FROM this.changes;

8.2.2.4 get_seq_num_min

This operation retrieves the smallest value of the CacheChange::sequenceNumber attribute among the CacheChange stored in the HistoryCache. This operation performs the following logical steps:

min_seq_num := MIN { change.sequenceNumber WHERE (change IN this.changes) }
return min_seq_num;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>remove_change</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_change</td>
<td>CacheChange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get_seq_num_min</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get_seq_num_max</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections provide details on the operations.

8.2.2.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS HistoryCache. The newly-created history cache is initialized with an empty list of changes.

8.2.2.2 add_change

This operation inserts the CacheChange a_change into the HistoryCache.

This operation will only fail if there are not enough resources to add the change to the HistoryCache. It is the responsibility of the DDS service implementation to configure the HistoryCache in a manner consistent with the DDS Entity RESOURCE_LIMITS QoS and to propagate any errors to the DDS-user in the manner specified by the DDS specification.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

ADD a_change TO this.changes;

8.2.2.3 remove_change

This operation indicates that a previously-added CacheChange has become irrelevant and the details regarding the CacheChange need not be maintained in the HistoryCache. The determination of irrelevance is made based on the QoS associated with the related DDS entity and on the acknowledgment status of the CacheChange. This is described in Section 8.4.1.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

REMOVE a_change FROM this.changes;

8.2.2.4 get_seq_num_min

This operation retrieves the smallest value of the CacheChange::sequenceNumber attribute among the CacheChange stored in the HistoryCache. This operation performs the following logical steps:

min_seq_num := MIN { change.sequenceNumber WHERE (change IN this.changes) }
return min_seq_num;
8.2.2.5 get_seq_num_max

This operation retrieves the largest value of the CacheChange::sequenceNumber attribute among the CacheChange stored in the HistoryCache.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{max_seq_num} & := \text{MAX} \{ \text{change.sequenceNumber} \text{ WHERE (change IN this.changes) } \} \\
& \text{return max_seq_num;}
\end{align*}
\]

8.2.3 The RTPS CacheChange

Class used to represent each change added to the HistoryCache. The CacheChange attributes are listed in Table 8.5.

Table 8.5 - RTPS CacheChange attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>ChangeKind_t</td>
<td>Identifies the kind of change. See Table 8.2</td>
<td>DDS instance state kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerGuid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>The GUID_t that identifies the RTPS Writer that made the change</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instanceHandle</td>
<td>InstanceHandle_t</td>
<td>Identifies the instance of the data-object to which the change applies.</td>
<td>In DDS, the value of the fields labeled as ‘key’ within the data uniquely identify each data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequenceNumber</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td>Sequence number assigned by the RTPS Writer to uniquely identify the change.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data_value</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>The data value associated with the change. Depending on the kind of CacheChange, there may be no associated data. See Table 8.2.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.4 The RTPS Entity

RTPS Entity is the base class for all RTPS entities and maps to a DDS Entity. The Entity configuration attributes are listed in Table 8.6.

Table 8.6 - RTPS Entity Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>Globally and uniquely identifies the RTPS Entity within the DDS domain</td>
<td>Maps to the value of the DDS BuiltinTopicKey_t used to describe the corresponding DDS Entity. Refer to the DDS specification for more details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.4.1 Identifying RTPS entities: The GUID

The GUID (Globally Unique Identifier) is an attribute of all RTPS Entities and uniquely identifies the Entity within a DDS Domain.

The GUID is built as a tuple <prefix, entityId> combining a GuidPrefix_t prefix and an EntityId_t entityId.

Figure 8.4 - RTPS GUID_t uniquely identifies Entities and is composed of a prefix and a suffix

Table 8.7 - Structure of the GUID_t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prefix</td>
<td>GuidPrefix_t</td>
<td>Uniquely identifies the Participant within the Domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entityId</td>
<td>EntityId_t</td>
<td>Uniquely identifies the Entity within the Participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.4.2 The GUIDs of RTPS Participants

Every Participant has GUID <prefix, ENTITYID_PARTICIPANT>, where the constant ENTITYID_PARTICIPANT is a special value defined by the RTPS protocol. Its actual value depends on the PSM.

The implementation is free to chose the prefix, as long as every Participant in the Domain has a unique GUID.

8.2.4.3 The GUIDs of the RTPS Endpoints within a Participant

The Endpoints contained by a Participant with GUID <participantPrefix, ENTITYID_PARTICIPANT> have the GUID <participantPrefix, entityId>. The entityId is the unique identification of the Endpoint relative to the Participant. This has several consequences:

- The GUIDs of all the Endpoints within a Participant have the same prefix.
- Once the GUID of an Endpoint is known, the GUID of the Participant that contains the endpoint is also known.
- The GUID of any endpoint can be deduced from the GUID of the Participant to which it belongs and its entityId.

The selection of entityId for each RTPS Entity depends on the PSM.

8.2.5 The RTPS Participant

RTPS Participant is the container of RTPS Endpoint entities and maps to a DDS DomainParticipant. In addition, the RTPS Participant facilitates the fact that the RTPS Endpoint entities within a single RTPS Participant are likely to share common properties.

![Figure 8.5 - RTPS Participant](image)

Figure 8.5 - RTPS Participant
RTPS Participant contains the attributes shown in Table 8.8.

Table 8.8 - RTPS Participant attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>defaultUnicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>Default list of unicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the Endpoints contained in the Participant. These are the unicast locators that will be used in case the Endpoint does not specify its own set of Locators.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaultMulticastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>Default list of multicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the Endpoints contained in the Participant. These are the multicast locators that will be used in case the Endpoint does not specify its own set of Locators.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protocolVersion</td>
<td>ProtocolVersion_t</td>
<td>Identifies the version of the RTPS protocol that the Participant uses to communicate.</td>
<td>N/A. Specified for each version of the protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendorId</td>
<td>VendorId_t</td>
<td>Identifies the vendor of the RTPS middleware that contains the Participant.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by each vendor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.6 The RTPS Endpoint

RTPS Endpoint represents the possible communication endpoints from the point of view of the RTPS protocol. There are two kinds of RTPS Endpoint entities: Writer endpoints and Reader endpoints.

RTPS Writer endpoints send CacheChange messages to RTPS Reader endpoints and potentially receive acknowledgments for the changes they send. RTPS Reader endpoints receive CacheChange and change-availability announcements from Writer endpoints and potentially acknowledge the changes and/or request missed changes.
8.2.7 The RTPS Writer

RTPS Writer specializes RTPS Endpoint and represents the actor that sends CacheChange messages to the matched RTPS Reader endpoints. Its role is to transfer all CacheChange changes in its HistoryCache to the HistoryCache of the matching remote RTPS Readers.

The attributes to configure an RTPS Writer are closely tied to the protocol behavior and will be introduced in the Behavior Module (Section 8.4).

8.2.8 The RTPS Reader

RTPS Reader specializes RTPS Endpoint and represents the actor that receives CacheChange messages from the matched RTPS Writer endpoints.

The attributes to configure an RTPS Reader are closely tied to the protocol behavior and will be introduced in the Behavior Module (Section 8.4).

8.2.9 Relation to DDS Entities

As mentioned in Section 8.2.2, the HistoryCache forms the interface between DDS Entities and their corresponding RTPS Entities. A DDS DataWriter, for example, passes data to its matching RTPS Writer through the common HistoryCache.
How exactly a DDS Entity interacts with the *HistoryCache* however, is implementation specific and not formally modeled by the RTPS protocol. Instead, the Behavior Module of the RTPS protocol *only* specifies how *CacheChange* changes are transferred from the *HistoryCache* of the RTPS Writer to the *HistoryCache* of each matching RTPS Reader.

Despite the fact that it is not part of the RTPS protocol, it is important to know how a DDS Entity may interact with the *HistoryCache* to obtain a complete understanding of the protocol. This topic forms the subject of this section.

The interactions are described using UML state diagrams. The abbreviations used to refer to DDS and RTPS Entities are listed in Table 8.10 below.

### Table 8.10 - Abbreviations used in the sequence charts and state diagrams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>DDS DataWriter</td>
<td>DW::write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>DDS DataReader</td>
<td>DR::read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>RTPS Writer</td>
<td>W::heartbeatPeriod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>RTPS Reader</td>
<td>R::heartbeatResponseDelay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>HistoryCache of RTPS Writer</td>
<td>WHC::changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHC</td>
<td>HistoryCache of RTPS Reader</td>
<td>RHC::changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8.2.9.1 The DDS DataWriter

The write operation on a DDS DataWriter adds *CacheChange* changes to the *HistoryCache* of its associated RTPS Writer. As such, the *HistoryCache* contains a history of the most recently written changes. The number of changes is determined by QoS settings on the DDS DataWriter such as the HISTORY and RESOURCE_LIMITS QoS.

By default, all changes in the *HistoryCache* are considered relevant for each matching remote RTPS Reader. That is, the Writer should attempt to send all changes in the *HistoryCache* to the matching remote Readers. How to do this is the subject of the Behavior Module of the RTPS protocol.

Changes may not be sent to a remote Reader for two reasons:

- they have been removed from the *HistoryCache* by the DDS DataWriter and are no longer available.
- they are considered irrelevant for this Reader.

The DDS DataWriter may decide to remove changes from the *HistoryCache* for several reasons. For example, only a limited number of changes may need to be stored based on the HISTORY QoS settings. Alternatively, a sample may have expired due to the LIFESPAN QoS. When using strict reliable communication, a change can only be removed when it has been acknowledged by all readers the change was sent to and which are still active and alive.

Not all changes may be relevant for each matching remote Reader as determined by, for example, the TIME_BASED_FILTER QoS or through the use of DDS content-filtered topics. Note that whether a change is relevant must be determined on a per Reader basis in this case. Implementations may be able to optimize bandwidth and/or CPU usage by filtering on the Writer side when possible. Whether this is possible depends on whether an implementation keeps track of each individual remote Reader and the QoS and filters that apply to this Reader. The Reader itself will always filter.
QoS or content based filtering is represented in this document using `DDS_FILTER(reader, change)`, a notation which reflects that filtering is reader dependent. Depending on what reader specific information is stored by the writer, `DDS_FILTER` may be a noop. For content based filtering, the RTPS specification enables sending information with each change that lists what filters have been applied to the change and which filters it passed. If available, this information can then be used by the Reader to filter a change without having to call `DDS_FILTER`. This approach saves CPU cycles by filtering the sample once on the Writer side, as opposed to filtering on each Reader.

The following state-diagram illustrates how the DDS Data Writer adds a change to the HistoryCache.

![State-diagram](image)

**Figure 8.6 - DDS DataWriter additions to the HistoryCache**

**Table 8.11 - Transitions for DDS DataWriter additions to the HistoryCache**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>new DDS DataWriter</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>DataWriter::write</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>DataWriter::dispose</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>DataWriter::unregister</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>delete DDS DataWriter</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.2.9.1.1 Transition T1**

This transition is triggered by the creation of a DDS DataWriter `the.dds_writer`.

```plaintext
the_rtps_writer = new RTPS::Writer;
the.dds_writer.related_rtps_writer := the_rtps_writer;
```
8.2.9.1.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the act of writing data using a DDS DataWriter ‘the_dds_writer.’ The DataWriter::write() operation takes as arguments the ‘data’ and the InstanceHandle_t ‘handle’ used to differentiate among different data-objects.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{the_rtps_writer} & := \text{the_dds_writer}.related\_rtps\_writer; \\
\text{a_change} & := \text{the_rtps_writer}.new\_change(\text{ALIVE, data, handle}); \\
\text{the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.add}\_change(\text{a change}); \\
\end{align*}
\]

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

\[
\text{the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.get_seq_num_max() == a_change.sequenceNumber}
\]

8.2.9.1.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the act of disposing a data-object previously written with the DDS DataWriter ‘the_dds_writer.’ The DataWriter::dispose() operation takes as parameter the InstanceHandle_t ‘handle’ used to differentiate among different data-objects.

This operation has no effect if the topicKind==NO_KEY.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{the_rtps_writer} & := \text{the_dds_writer}.related\_rtps\_writer; \\
\text{if (the_rtps_writer.topicKind == WITH_KEY) \{} \\
\text{a_change} & := \text{the_rtps_writer}.new\_change(\text{NOT ALIVE DISPOSED, <nil>, handle}); \\
\text{the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.add}\_change(\text{a_change}); \\
\text{\}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

\[
\text{if (the_rtps_writer.topicKind == WITH_KEY) then} \\
\text{the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.get_seq_num_max() == a_change.sequenceNumber}
\]

8.2.9.1.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the act of unregistering a data-object previously written with the DDS DataWriter ‘the_dds_writer.’ The DataWriter::unregister() operation takes as arguments the InstanceHandle_t ‘handle’ used to differentiate among different data-objects.

This operation has no effect if the topicKind==NO_KEY.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{the_rtps_writer} & := \text{the_dds_writer}.related\_rtps\_writer; \\
\text{if (the_rtps_writer.topicKind == WITH_KEY) \{} \\
\text{a_change} & := \text{the_rtps_writer}.new\_change(\text{NOT ALIVE UNREGISTERED, <nil>, handle}); \\
\text{the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.add}\_change(\text{a_change}); \\
\text{\}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:
if (the_rtps_writer.topicKind == WITH_KEY) then
    the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.get_seq_num_max() == a_change.sequenceNumber

8.2.9.1.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the destruction of a DDS DataWriter ‘the.dds_writer.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

    delete the.dds_writer.related_rtps_writer;

8.2.9.2 The DDS DataReader

The DDS DataReader gets its data from the HistoryCache of the corresponding RTPS Reader. The number of changes stored in the HistoryCache is determined by QoS settings such as the HISTORY and RESOURCE_LIMITS QoS.

Each matching Writer will attempt to transfer all relevant samples from its HistoryCache to the HistoryCache of the Reader. The implementation of the read or take call on the DDS DataReader accesses the HistoryCache. The changes returned to the user are those in the HistoryCache that pass all Reader specific filters, if any.

A Reader filter is equally represented by DDS_FILTER(reader, change). As mentioned above, implementations may be able to perform most of the filtering on the Writer side. In that case, samples are either never sent (and therefore not present in the HistoryCache of the Reader) or contain information on what filters where applied and the corresponding outcome (for content based filtering).

A DDS DataReader may also decide to remove changes from the HistoryCache in order to satisfy such QoS as TIME_BASED_FILTER. This exact behavior is again implementation specific and is not modeled by the RTPS protocol.

The following state-diagram illustrates how the DDS Data Reader accesses changes in the HistoryCache.

![State diagram of DDS DataReader access to the HistoryCache](image_url)

Figure 8.7 - DDS DataReader access to the HistoryCache
8.2.9.2.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the creation of a DDS DataReader ‘the_dds_reader.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```c
the_rtps_reader = new RTPS::Reader;
the_dds_reader.related_rtps_reader := the_rtps_reader;
```

8.2.9.2.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the act of reading data from the DDS DataReader ‘the_dds_reader’ by means of the ‘read’ operation. Changes returned to the application remain in the RTPS Reader’s HistoryCache such that subsequent read or take operations can find them again.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```c
the_rtps_reader := the_dds_reader.related_rtps_reader;
a_change_list := new();
FOREACH change IN the_rtps_reader.reader_cache.changes {
    if DDS_FILTER(the_rtps_reader, change) ADD change TO a_change_list;
}
RETURN a_change_list;
```

The DDS_FILTER() operation reflects the capabilities of the DDS DataReader API to select a subset of changes based on CacheChange::kind, QoS, content-filters and other mechanisms. Note that the logical actions above only reflect the behavior and not necessarily the actual implementation of the protocol.

8.2.9.2.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the act of reading data from the DDS DataReader ‘the_dds_reader’ by means of the ‘take’ operation. Changes returned to the application are removed from the RTPS Reader’s HistoryCache such that subsequent read or take operations do not find the same change.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```c
the_rtps_reader := the_dds_reader.related_rtps_reader;
a_change_list := new();
FOREACH change IN the_rtps_reader.reader_cache.changes {
    if DDS_FILTER(the_rtps_reader, change) { 
```

### Table 8.12 - Transitions for DDS DataReader access to the HistoryCache

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>new DDS DataReader</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>DDS DataReader::read</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>DDS DataReader::take</td>
<td>alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>alive</td>
<td>delete DDS DataReader</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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ADD change TO a_change_list;
}
the_rtps_reader.reader_cache.remove_change(a_change);
}
RETURN a_change_list;

The DDS_FILTER() operation reflects the capabilities of the DDS DataReader API to select a subset of changes based on CacheChange::kind, QoS, content-filters and other mechanisms. Note that the logical actions above only reflect the behavior and not necessarily the actual implementation of the protocol.

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

FOREACH change IN a_change_list
    change BELONGS_TO the_rtps_reader.reader_cache.changes == FALSE

8.2.9.2.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the destruction of a DDS DataReader ‘the_dds_reader.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

delte the_dds_reader.related_rtps_reader;

8.3 Messages Module

The Messages module describes the overall structure and logical contents of the messages that are exchanged between the RTPS Writer endpoints and RTPS Reader endpoints. RTPS Messages are modular by design and can be easily extended to support both standard protocol feature additions as well as vendor-specific extensions.

8.3.1 Overview

The Messages module is organized as follows:

- Section 8.3.2 introduces any additional types needed for defining RTPS messages in the subsequent sections.
- Section 8.3.3 describes the common structure used for all RTPS Messages. All RTPS Messages consist of a Header followed by a series of Submessages. The number of Submessages that can be sent in a single RTPS Message is only limited by the maximum message size the underlying transport can support.
- Certain Submessages may affect how subsequent Submessages within the same RTPS Message must be interpreted. The context for interpreting Submessages is maintained by the RTPS Message Receiver and is described in Section 8.3.4.
- Section 8.3.5 lists the elementary building blocks for creating Submessages, also referred to as SubmessageElements. This includes sequence number sets, timestamp, identifiers, etc.
- Section 8.3.6 describes the structure of the RTPS Header. The fixed size RTPS Header is used to identify an RTPS Message.
- Finally, Section 8.3.7 introduces all available Submessages in detail. For each Submessage, the specification defines its contents, when it is considered valid and how it affects the state of the RTPS Message Receiver. The PSM will define the actual mapping of each of these Submessage to bits and bytes on the wire in Section 9.4.5.
8.3.2 Type Definitions

In addition to the types defined in Section 8.2.1.2, the Messages module makes use of the types listed in Table 8.13.

Table 8.13 - Types used to define RTPS messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProtocolId_t</td>
<td>Enumeration used to identify the protocol. The following values are reserved by the protocol: PROTOCOL_RTPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Type used to specify a Submessage flag. A Submessage flag takes a boolean value and affects the parsing of the Submessage by the receiver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubmessageKind</td>
<td>Enumeration used to identify the kind of Submessage. The following values are reserved by this version of the protocol: DATA, GAP, HEARTBEAT, ACKNACK, PAD, INFO_TS, INFO_REPLY, INFO_DST, INFO_SRC, DATA_FRAG, NACK_FRAG, HEARTBEAT_FRAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold a timestamp. Should have at least nano-second resolution. The following values are reserved by the protocol: TIME_ZERO, TIME_INVALID, TIME_INFINITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count_t</td>
<td>Type used to encapsulate a count that is incremented monotonically, used to identify message duplicates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParameterId_t</td>
<td>Type used to uniquely identify a parameter in a parameter list. Used extensively by the Discovery Module mainly to define QoS Parameters. A range of values is reserved for protocol-defined parameters, while another range can be used for vendor-defined parameters, see Section 8.3.5.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FragmentNumber_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold fragment numbers. Must be possible to represent using 32 bits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.3 The Overall Structure of an RTPS Message

The overall structure of an RTPS Message consists of a fixed-size leading RTPS Header followed by a variable number of RTPS Submessage parts. Each Submessage in turn consists of a SubmessageHeader and a variable number of SubmessageElements. This is illustrated in Figure 8.8.
Each message sent by the RTPS protocol has a finite length. This length is not sent implicitly by the RTPS protocol but is part of the underlying transport with which RTPS messages are sent. In the case of a packet-oriented transport (like UDP/IP), the length of the message is already provided by the transport encapsulation. A stream-oriented transport (like TCP) would need to insert the length ahead of the message in order to identify the boundary of the RTPS message.

### 8.3.3.1 Header structure

The RTPS **Header** must appear at the beginning of every message.
The **Header** identifies the message as belonging to the RTPS protocol. The **Header** identifies the version of the protocol and the vendor that sent the message. The **Header** contains the fields listed in Table 8.14.

### Table 8.14 - Structure of the Header

| field      | type             | meaning                                                        |
|------------|------------------|                                                               |
| protocol   | ProtocolId_t     | Identifies the message as an RTPS message.                    |
| version    | ProtocolVersion_t| Identifies the version of the RTPS protocol.                  |
| vendorId   | VendorId_t       | Indicates the vendor that provides the implementation of the RTPS protocol. |
| guidPrefix | GuidPrefix_t      | Defines a default prefix to use for all GUIDs that appear in the message. |

The structure of the RTPS **Header** cannot be changed in this major version (2) of the protocol.

#### 8.3.3.1.1 protocol

The *protocol* identifies the message as an RTPS message. This value is set to PROTOCOL_RTPS.

#### 8.3.3.1.2 version

The *version* identifies the version of the RTPS protocol. Implementations following this version of the document implement protocol version 2.1 (major = 2, minor = 1) and have this field set to PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1.

#### 8.3.3.1.3 vendorId

The *vendorId* identifies the vendor of the middleware that implemented the RTPS protocol and allows this vendor to add specific extensions to the protocol. The *vendorId* does not refer to the vendor of the device or product that contains RTPS middleware. The possible values for the *vendorId* are assigned by the OMG.
The protocol reserves the following value:

\texttt{VENDORID\_UNKNOW}

\subsection*{8.3.3.1.4 guidPrefix}

The \texttt{guidPrefix} defines a default prefix that can be used to reconstruct the Globally Unique Identifiers (GUIDs) that appear within the Submessages contained in the message. The \texttt{guidPrefix} allows Submessages to contain only the EntityId part of the GUID and therefore saves from having to repeat the common prefix on every GUID (See Section 8.2.4.1).

\subsection*{8.3.3.2 Submessage structure}

Each RTPS \texttt{Message} consists of a variable number of RTPS \texttt{Submessage} parts. All RTPS Submessages feature the same identical structure shown in Figure 8.10.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure8_10.png}
\caption{Structure of the RTPS Submessages}
\end{figure}

All Submessages start with a \texttt{SubmessageHeader} part followed by a concatenation of \texttt{SubmessageElement} parts. The \texttt{SubmessageHeader} identifies the kind of Submessage and the optional elements within that Submessage. The \texttt{SubmessageHeader} contains the fields listed in Table 8.15.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Structure of the SubmessageHeader}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|p{6cm}|}
\hline
\textbf{field} & \textbf{type} & \textbf{meaning} \\
\hline
\textit{submessageId} & SubmessageKind & Identifies the kind of Submessage. The possible Submessages are described in Section 8.3.7. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
The structure of the RTPS Submessage cannot be changed in this major version (2) of the protocol.

8.3.3.2.1 SubmessageId

The SubmessageId identifies the kind of Submessage. The valid ID’s are enumerated by the possible values of SubmessageKind (see Table 8.13).

The meaning of the Submessage IDs cannot be modified in this major version (2). Additional Submessages can be added in higher minor versions. In order to maintain inter-operability with future versions, Platform Specific Mappings should reserve a range of values intended for protocol extensions and a range of values that are reserved for vendor-specific Submessages that will never be used by future versions of the RTPS protocol.

8.3.3.2.2 flags

The flags in the Submessage header contain 8 boolean values. The first flag, the EndiannessFlag, is present and located in the same position in all Submessages and represents the endianness used to encode the information in the Submessage. The literal ‘E’ is often used to refer to the EndiannessFlag.

If the EndiannessFlag is set to FALSE, the Submessage is encoded in big-endian format, EndiannessFlag set to TRUE means little-endian.

Other flags have interpretations that depend on the type of Submessage.

8.3.3.2.3 submessageLength

Indicates the length of the Submessage (not including the Submessage header).

In case submessageLength > 0, it is either

- The length from the start of the contents of the Submessage until the start of the header of the next Submessage (in case the Submessage is not the last Submessage in the Message).
- Or else it is the remaining Message length (in case the Submessage is the last Submessage in the Message). An interpreter of the Message can distinguish between these two cases as it knows the total length of the Message.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flags</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag[8]</td>
<td>Identifies the endianness used to encapsulate the Submessage, the presence of optional elements within the Submessage, and possibly modifies the interpretation of the Submessage. There are 8 possible flags. The first flag (index 0) identifies the endianness used to encapsulate the Submessage. The remaining flags are interpreted differently depending on the kind of Submessage and are described separately for each Submessage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submessageLength</td>
<td>ushort</td>
<td>Indicates the length of the Submessage. Given an RTPS Message consists of a concatenation of Submessages, the Submessage length can be used to skip to the next Submessage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In case \texttt{submessageLength}==0, the \texttt{Submessage} is the last \texttt{Submessage} in the \texttt{Message} and extends up to the end of the \texttt{Message}. This makes it possible to send Submessages larger than 64k (the maximum length that can be stored in the \texttt{submessageLength} field), provided they are the last \texttt{Submessage} in the \texttt{Message}.

### 8.3.4 The RTPS Message Receiver

The interpretation and meaning of a \texttt{Submessage} within a \texttt{Message} may depend on the previous \texttt{Submessages} contained within that same \texttt{Message}. Therefore, the receiver of a \texttt{Message} must maintain state from previously deserialized \texttt{Submessages} in the same \texttt{Message}. This state is modeled as the state of an RTPS \texttt{Receiver} that is reset each time a new message is processed and provides context for the interpretation of each \texttt{Submessage}. The RTPS Receiver is shown in Figure 8.11. Table 8.16 lists the attributes used to represent the state of the RTPS Receiver.

![RTPS Receiver Diagram](image)

**Figure 8.11 - RTPS Receiver**

For each new \texttt{Message}, the state of the Receiver is reset and initialized as listed below.

**Table 8.16 - Initial State of the Receiver**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>initial value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sourceVersion</td>
<td>PROTOCOLVERSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sourceVendorId</td>
<td>VENDORID_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sourceGuidPrefix</td>
<td>GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destGuidPrefix</td>
<td>GUID prefix of the participant receiving the message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnicastReplyLocatorList</td>
<td>The list is initialized to contain a single Locator_t with the Locator_Kind, Address, and Port fields specified below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Locator_Kind is set to the kind that identifies the transport that received the message (e.g., LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Address is set to the Address of the source of the message, assuming the Transport used supports this (e.g., for UDP the source address is part of the UDP header). Otherwise it is set to LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The port is set to LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.4.1 Rules Followed by the Message Receiver

The following algorithm outlines the rules that a receiver of any Message must follow:

1. If the full Submessage header cannot be read, the rest of the Message is considered invalid.

2. The submessageLength field defines where the next Submessage starts or indicates that the Submessage extends to the end of the Message, as explained in Section 8.3.3.2.3, “submessageLength,” on page 34. If this field is invalid, the rest of the Message is invalid.

3. A Submessage with an unknown SubmessageId must be ignored and parsing must continue with the next Submessage. Concretely: an implementation of RTPS 2.1 must ignore any Submessages with IDs that are outside of the SubmessageKind set defined in version 2.1. SubmessageIds in the vendor-specific range coming from a vendorId that is unknown must also be ignored and parsing must continue with the next Submessage.

4. Submessage flags. The receiver of a Submessage should ignore unknown flags. An implementation of RTPS 2.1 should skip all flags that are marked as “X” (unused) in the protocol.

5. A valid submessageLength field must always be used to find the next Submessage, even for Submessages with known IDs.

6. A known but invalid Submessage invalidates the rest of the Message. Section 8.3.7 describes each known Submessage and when it should be considered invalid.

Reception of a valid header and/or Submessage has two effects:

- It can change the state of the Receiver; this state influences how the following Submessages in the Message are interpreted. Section 8.3.7 discusses how the state changes for each Submessage. In this version of the protocol, only the Header and the Submessages InfoSource, InfoReply, InfoDestination, and InfoTimestamp change the state of the Receiver.

- It can affect the behavior of the Endpoint to which the message is destined. This applies to the basic RTPS messages: Data, DataFrag, HeartBeat, AckNack, Gap, HeartbeatFrag, NackFrag.

Section 8.3.7 describes the detailed interpretation of the Header and every Submessage.
8.3.5 RTPS SubmessageElements

Each RTPS message contains a variable number of RTPS Submessages. Each RTPS Submessage in turn is built from a set of predefined atomic building blocks called SubmessageElements. RTPS 2.1 defines the following Submessage elements: GuidPrefix, EntityId, SequenceNumber, SequenceNumberSet, FragmentNumber, FragmentNumberSet, VendorId, ProtocolVersion, LocatorList, Timestamp, Count, SerializedData, and ParameterList.

![Diagram of SubmessageElements structure]

Figure 8.12 - RTPS SubmessageElements

8.3.5.1 The GuidPrefix, and EntityId

These SubmessageElements are used to encapsulate the GuidPrefix_t and EntityId_t parts of a GUID_t (defined in Section 8.2.4.1) within Submessages.

Table 8.17 - Structure of the GuidPrefix SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>GuidPrefix_t</td>
<td>Identifies the GuidPrefix_t part of the GUID_t of the Entity that is the source or target of the message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.5.2 VendorId

The VendorId identifies the vendor of the middleware implementing the RTPS protocol and allows this vendor to add specific extensions to the protocol. The vendor ID does not refer to the vendor of the device or product that contains DDS middleware.

The following values are reserved by the protocol:

- VENDORID_UNKNOWN

Other values must be assigned by the OMG.

8.3.5.3 ProtocolVersion

The ProtocolVersion defines the version of the RTPS protocol.

The RTPS protocol version 2.1 defines the following special values:

- PROTOCOLVERSION_1_0
- PROTOCOLVERSION_1_1
- PROTOCOLVERSION_2_0
- PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1
- PROTOCOLVERSION

### Table 8.18 - Structure of the EntityId SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>EntityId_t</td>
<td>Identifies the EntityId_t part of the GUID_t of the Entity that is the source or target of the message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.19 - Structure of the VendorId SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>VendorId_t</td>
<td>Identifies the vendor of the middleware that implements the protocol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.20 - Structure of the ProtocolVersion SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>ProtocolVersion_t</td>
<td>Identifies the major and minor version of the RTPS protocol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.5.4 SequenceNumber

A sequence number is a 64-bit signed integer, that can take values in the range: \(-2^{63} \leq N \leq 2^{63}-1\). The selection of 64 bits as the representation of a sequence number ensures the sequence numbers never\(^1\) wrap. Sequence numbers begin at 1.

Table 8.21 - Structure of the SequenceNumber SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td>Provides the value of the 64-bit sequence number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protocol reserves the following value:

```
SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN
```

8.3.5.5 SequenceNumberSet

SequenceNumberSet SubmessageElements are used as parts of several messages to provide binary information about individual sequence numbers within a range. The sequence numbers represented in the SequenceNumberSet are limited to belong to an interval with a range no bigger than 256. In other words, a valid SequenceNumberSet must verify that:

\[
\text{maximum(SequenceNumberSet)} - \text{minimum(SequenceNumberSet)} < 256 \\
\text{minimum(SequenceNumberSet)} \geq 1
\]

The above restriction allows SequenceNumberSet to be represented in an efficient and compact way using bitmaps.

SequenceNumberSet SubmessageElements are used for example to selectively request re-sending of a set of sequence numbers.

Table 8.22 - Structure of the SequenceNumberSet SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td>Identifies the first sequence number in the set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t[*]</td>
<td>A set of sequence numbers, each verifying that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base &lt;= element(set) &lt;= base+255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Even assuming an extremely fast rate of message generation for a single RTPS Writer such as 100 messages per microsecond, the 64-bit integer would not roll over for approximately 3000 years of uninterrupted operation.
8.3.5.6 FragmentNumber

A fragment number is a 32-bit unsigned integer and is used by Submessages to identify a particular fragment in fragmented serialized data. Fragment numbers start at 1.

**Table 8.23 - Structure of the FragmentNumber SubmessageElement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>FragmentNumber_t</td>
<td>Provides the value of the 32-bit fragment number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.5.7 FragmentNumberSet

**FragmentNumberSet** SubmessageElements are used to provide binary information about individual fragment numbers within a range. The fragment numbers represented in the **FragmentNumberSet** are limited to belong to an interval with a range no bigger than 256. In other words, a valid **FragmentNumberSet** must verify that:

\[
\text{maximum}(\text{FragmentNumberSet}) - \text{minimum}(\text{FragmentNumberSet}) < 256
\]

\[
\text{minimum}(\text{FragmentNumberSet}) \geq 1
\]

The above restriction allows **FragmentNumberSet** to be represented in an efficient and compact way using bitmaps.

**FragmentNumberSet** SubmessageElements are used for example to selectively request re-sending of a set of fragments.

**Table 8.24 - Structure of the FragmentNumberSet SubmessageElement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>FragmentNumber_t</td>
<td>Identifies the first fragment number in the set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set</td>
<td>FragmentNumber_t[*]</td>
<td>A set of fragment numbers, each verifying that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>base \leq \text{element(set)} \leq \text{base}+255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.5.8 Timestamp

**Timestamp** is used to represent time. The representation should be capable of having a resolution of nano-seconds or better.

**Table 8.25 - Structure of the Timestamp SubmessageElement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>Time_t</td>
<td>Provides the value of the timestamp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three special values used by the protocol:

- **TIME_ZERO**
- **TIME_INVALID**
- **TIME_INFINITY**
8.3.5.9 ParameterList

ParameterList is used as part of several messages to encapsulate QoS parameters that may affect the interpretation of the message. The encapsulation of the parameters follows a mechanism that allows extensions to the QoS without breaking backwards compatibility.

Table 8.26 - Structure of the ParameterList SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parameter</td>
<td>Parameter[*]</td>
<td>List of parameters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.27 - Structure of each Parameter in a ParameterList SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parameterId</td>
<td>ParameterId_t</td>
<td>Uniquely identifies a parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>Length of the parameter value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>octet[length]</td>
<td>Parameter value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual representation of the ParameterList is defined for each PSM. However, in order to support inter-operability or bridging between PSMs and allow for extensions that preserve backwards compatibility, the representation used by all PSMs must comply with the following rules:

- There shall be no more than $2^{16}$ possible values of the ParameterId_t parameterId.
- A range of $2^{15}$ values is reserved for protocol-defined parameters. All the parameter_id values defined by the 2.1 version of the protocol and all future revisions of the same major version must use values in this range.
- A range of $2^{15}$ values is reserved for vendor-defined parameters. The 2.1 version of the protocol and any future revisions of the protocol that correspond to the same major version are not allowed to use values in this range.
- The maximum length of any parameter is limited to $2^{16}$ octets.

Subject to the above constraints, different PSMs might choose different representations for the ParameterId_t parameterId. For example a PSM could represent parameterId using short integers while another PSM may use strings.

8.3.5.10 Count

Count is used by several Submessages and enables a receiver to detect duplicates of the same Submessage.

Table 8.28 - Structure of the Count SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>Count_t</td>
<td>Count value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.5.11 LocatorList

LocatorList is used to specify a list of locators.

Table 8.29 - Structure of the LocatorList SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of locators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.5.12 SerializedData

 SerializedData contains the serialized representation of the value of a data-object. The RTPS protocol does not interpret the serialized data-stream. Therefore, it is represented as opaque data. For additional information on data encapsulation, see Chapter 10.

Table 8.30 - Structure of the SerializedData SubmessageElement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>octet[*]</td>
<td>Serialized data-stream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.5.13 SerializedDataFragment

SerializedDataFragment contains the serialized representation of a data-object that has been fragmented. Like for unfragmented SerializedData, the RTPS protocol does not interpret the fragmented serialized data-stream. Therefore, it is represented as opaque data. For additional information on data encapsulation, see Chapter 10.

Table 8.31 - SerializedDataFragment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>octet[*]</td>
<td>Serialized data-stream fragment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.6 The RTPS Header

As described in Section 8.3.3, every RTPS Message must start with a Header.

8.3.6.1 Purpose

The Header is used to identify the message as belonging to the RTPS protocol, to identify the version of the RTPS protocol used, and to provide context information that applies to the Submessages contained within the message.

8.3.6.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the Header were described in Section 8.3.3.1. The structure of the Header can only be changed if the major version of the protocol is also changed.
8.3.6.3 Validity

A Header is invalid when any of the following are true:

- The Message has less than the required number of octets to contain a full Header. The number required is defined by the PSM.
- Its protocol value does not match the value of PROTOCOL_RTPS
- The major protocol version is larger than the major protocol version supported by the implementation.

8.3.6.4 Change in state of Receiver

The initial state of the Receiver is described in Section 8.3.4. This section describes how the Header of a new Message affects the state of the Receiver.

```plaintext
Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix = Header.guidPrefix
Receiver.sourceVersion = Header.version
Receiver.sourceVendorId = Header.vendorId
Receiver.haveTimestamp = false
```

8.3.6.5 Logical Interpretation

None

8.3.7 RTPS Submessages

The RTPS protocol version 2.1 defines several kinds of Submessages. They are categorized into two groups: Entity-Submessages and Interpreter-Submessages. Entity Submessages target an RTPS Entity. Interpreter Submessages modify the RTPS Receiver state and provide context that helps process subsequent Entity Submessages.

The Entity Submessages are:

- **Data**: Contains information regarding the value of an application Date-object. Data Submessages are sent by Writers (NO_KEY Writer or WITH_KEY Writer) to Readers (NO_KEY Reader or WITH_KEY Reader).
- **DataFrag**: Equivalent to Data, but only contains a part of the new value (one or more fragments). Allows data to be transmitted as multiple fragments to overcome transport message size limitations.
- **Heartbeat**: Describes the information that is available in a Writer. Heartbeat messages are sent by a Writer (NO_KEY Writer or WITH_KEY Writer) to one or more Readers (NO_KEY Reader or WITH_KEY Reader).
- **HeartbeatFrag**: For fragmented data, describes what fragments are available in a Writer. HeartbeatFrag messages are sent by a Writer (NO_KEY Writer or WITH_KEY Writer) to one or more Readers (NO_KEY Reader or WITH_KEY Reader).
- **Gap**: Describes the information that is no longer relevant to Readers. Gap messages are sent by a Writer to one or more Readers.

2. The actual value of the PROTOCOL_RTPS constant is provided by the PSM.
- **AckNack**: Provides information on the state of a Reader to a Writer. AckNack messages are sent by a Reader to one or more Writers.

- **NackFrag**: Provides information on the state of a Reader to a Writer, more specifically what fragments the Reader is still missing. NackFrag messages are sent by a Reader to one or more Writers.

The Interpreter Submessages are:

- **InfoSource**: Provides information about the source from which subsequent Entity Submessages originated. This Submessage is primarily used for relaying RTPS Submessages. This is not discussed in the current specification.

- **InfoDestination**: Provides information about the final destination of subsequent Entity Submessages. This Submessage is primarily used for relaying RTPS Submessages. This is not discussed in the current specification.

- **InfoReply**: Provides information about where to reply to the entities that appear in subsequent Submessages.

- **InfoTimestamp**: Provides a source timestamp for subsequent Entity Submessages.

- **Pad**: Used to add padding to a Message if needed for memory alignment.
This section describes each of the Submessages and their interpretation. Each Submessage is described in the same manner under the headings described in Table 8.32.

Table 8.32 - Scheme used to describe each Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heading</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>High-level description of the main purpose of the Submessage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Description of the SubmessageHeader (SubmessageId and flags). Description of the SubmessageElements that can appear in the Submessage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Constraints that must be met by the Submessage in order for it to be valid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.1 AckNack

8.3.7.1.1 Purpose

This Submessage is used to communicate the state of a Reader to a Writer. The Submessage allows the Reader to inform the Writer about the sequence numbers it has received and which ones it is still missing. This Submessage can be used to do both positive and negative acknowledgments.

8.3.7.1.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the AckNack message are described in the table below.

### Table 8.33 - Structure of the AckNack Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinalFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates to the Writer whether a response is mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Reader entity that acknowledges receipt of certain sequence numbers and/or requests to receive certain sequence numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Writer entity that is the target of the AckNack message. This is the Writer Entity that is being asked to re-send some sequence numbers or is being informed of the reception of certain sequence numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerSNState</td>
<td>SequenceNumberSet</td>
<td>Communicates the state of the reader to the writer. All sequence numbers up to the one prior to readerSNState.base are confirmed as received by the reader. The sequence numbers that appear in the set indicate missing sequence numbers on the reader side. The ones that do not appear in the set are undetermined (could be received or not).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.1.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small.
- `readerSNState` is invalid (as defined in Section 8.3.5.5).

8.3.7.1.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.1.5 Logical Interpretation

The Reader sends the AckNack message to the Writer to communicate its state with respect to the sequence numbers used by the Writer.

The Writer is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{writerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.destGuidPrefix}, \text{AckNack.writerId} \}
\]

The Reader is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{readerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix}, \text{AckNack.readerId} \}
\]

The message serves two purposes simultaneously:

- The Submessage acknowledges all sequence numbers up to and including the one just before the lowest sequence number in the SequenceNumberSet (that is readerSNState.base -1).
- The Submessage negatively-acknowledges (requests) the sequence numbers that appear explicitly in the set.

The mechanism to explicitly represent sequence numbers depends on the PSM. Typically, a compact representation (such as a bitmap) is used.

The FinalFlag indicates whether a response by the Writer is expected by the Reader or if the decision is left to the Writer. The use of this flag is described in Section 8.4.

8.3.7.2 Data

This Submessage is sent from an RTPS Writer (NO_KEY_ or WITH_KEY) to an RTPS Reader (NO_KEY or WITH_KEY).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>A counter that is incremented each time a new AckNack message is sent. Provides the means for a Writer to detect duplicate AckNack messages that can result from the presence of redundant communication paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.33 - Structure of the AckNack Submessage
8.3.7.2.1 Purpose

The Submessage notifies the RTPS Reader of a change to a data-object belonging to the RTPS Writer. The possible changes include both changes in value as well as changes to the lifecycle of the data-object.

8.3.7.2.2 Contents

The elements that form the structure of the Data message are described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InlineQosFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates to the Reader the presence of a ParameterList containing QoS parameters that should be used to interpret the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates to the Reader that the dataPayload submessage element contains the serialized value of the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates to the Reader that the dataPayload submessage element contains the serialized value of the key of the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the RTPS Reader entity that is being informed of the change to the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the RTPS Writer entity that made the change to the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Uniquely identifies the change and the relative order for all changes made by the RTPS Writer identified by the writerGuid. Each change gets a consecutive sequence number. Each RTPS Writer maintains its own sequence number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlineQos</td>
<td>ParameterList</td>
<td>Present only if the InlineQosFlag is set in the header. Contains QoS that may affect the interpretation of the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serializedPayload</td>
<td>SerializedPayload</td>
<td>Present only if either the DataFlag or the KeyFlag are set in the header. If the DataFlag is set, then it contains the encapsulation of the new value of the data-object after the change. If the KeyFlag is set, then it contains the encapsulation of the key of the data-object the message refers to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.2.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- submessageLength in the Submessage header is too small.
- writerSN.value is not strictly positive (1, 2, ...) or is SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN.
- inlineQos is invalid.

8.3.7.2.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.2.5 Logical Interpretation

The RTPS Writer sends the Data Submessage to the RTPS Reader to communicate changes to the data-objects within the writer. Changes include both changes in value as well as changes to the lifecycle of the data-object.

Changes to the value are communicated by the presence of the serializedPayload. When present, the serializedPayload is interpreted either as the value of the data-object or as the key that uniquely identifies the data-object from the set of registered objects.

- If the DataFlag is set and the KeyFlag is not set, the serializedPayload element is interpreted as the value of the data-object.
- If the KeyFlag is set and the DataFlag is not set, the serializedPayload element is interpreted as the value of the key that identifies the registered instance of the data-object.

If the InlineQosFlag is set, the inlineQos element contains QoS values that override those of the RTPS Writer and should be used to process the update. For a complete list of possible in-line QoS parameters, see Table 8.80.

The Writer is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{writerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix}, \text{Data.writerId} \}
\]

The Reader is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{readerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.destGuidPrefix}, \text{Data.readerId} \}
\]

The Data.readerId can be ENTITYID_UNKNOWN, in which case the Data applies to all Readers of that writerGUID within the Participant identified by the GuidPrefix_t Receiver.destGuidPrefix.

8.3.7.3 DataFrag

This Submessage is sent from an RTPS Writer (NO_KEY or WITH_KEY) to an RTPS Reader (NO_KEY or WITH_KEY).

8.3.7.3.1 Purpose

The DataFrag Submessage extends the Data Submessage by enabling the serializedData to be fragmented and sent as multiple DataFrag Submessages. The fragments contained in the DataFrag Submessages are then re-assembled by the RTPS Reader.

Defining a separate DataFrag Submessage in addition to the Data Submessage, offers the following advantages:
- It keeps variations in contents and structure of each Submessage to a minimum. This enables more efficient implementations of the protocol as the parsing of network packets is simplified.

- It avoids having to add fragmentation information as in-line QoS parameters in the Data Submessage. This may not only slow down performance, it also makes on-the-wire debugging more difficult, as it is no longer obvious whether data is fragmented or not and which message contains what fragment(s).

### 8.3.7.3.2 Contents

The elements that form the structure of the DataFrag Submessage are described in the table below.

**Table 8.35 - Structure of the DataFrag Submessage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InlineQosFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates to the Reader the presence of a ParameterList containing QoS parameters that should be used to interpret the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the RTPS Reader entity that is being informed of the change to the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the RTPS Writer entity that made the change to the data-object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Uniquely identifies the change and the relative order for all changes made by the RTPS Writer identified by the writerGuid. Each change gets a consecutive sequence number. Each RTPS Writer maintains its own sequence number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentStartingNum</td>
<td>FragmentNumber</td>
<td>Indicates the starting fragment for the series of fragments in serializedData. Fragment numbering starts with number 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentsInSubmessage</td>
<td>ushort</td>
<td>The number of consecutive fragments contained in this Submessage, starting at fragmentStartingNum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dataSize</td>
<td>ulong</td>
<td>The total size in bytes of the original data before fragmentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentSize</td>
<td>ushort</td>
<td>The size of an individual fragment in bytes. The maximum fragment size equals 64K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlineQos</td>
<td>ParameterList</td>
<td>Present only if the InlineQosFlag is set in the header. Contains QoS that may affect the interpretation of the message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.3.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small.
- `writerSN.value` is not strictly positive (1, 2, ...) or is `SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN`.
- `fragmentStartingNum.value` is not strictly positive (1, 2, ...) or exceeds the total number of fragments (see below).
- `fragmentSize` exceeds `dataSize`.
- The size of `serializedData` exceeds `fragmentsInSubmessage * fragmentSize`.
- `inlineQos` is invalid.

8.3.7.3.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.3.5 Logical Interpretation

The `DataFrag` Submessage extends the `Data` Submessage by enabling the `serializedData` to be fragmented and sent as multiple `DataFrag` Submessages. Once the `serializedData` is re-assembled by the RTPS Reader, the interpretation of the `DataFrag` Submessages is identical to that of the `Data` Submessage.

How to re-assemble `serializedData` using the information in the `DataFrag` Submessage is described below.

The total size of the data to be re-assembled is given by `dataSize`. Each `DataFrag` Submessage contains a contiguous segment of this data in its `serializedData` element. The size of the segment is determined by the size of the `serializedData` element. During re-assembly, the offset of each segment is determined by:
The data is fully re-assembled when all fragments have been received. The total number of fragments to expect equals:

\[
\text{dataSize} / \text{fragmentSize} + (\text{dataSize} \% \text{fragmentSize}) \cdot 1 : 0
\]

Note that each DataFrag Submessage may contain multiple fragments. An RTPS Writer will select fragmentSize based on the smallest message size supported across all underlying transports. If some RTPS Readers can be reached across a transport that supports larger messages, the RTPS Writer can pack multiple fragments into a single DataFrag Submessage or may even send a regular Data Submessage if fragmentation is no longer required. For more details, see Section 8.4.14.1.

8.3.7.4 Gap

8.3.7.4.1 Purpose

This Submessage is sent from an RTPS Writer to an RTPS Reader and indicates to the RTPS Reader that a range of sequence numbers is no longer relevant. The set may be a contiguous range of sequence numbers or a specific set of sequence numbers.

8.3.7.4.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the Gap message are described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Reader Entity that is being informed of the irrelevance of a set of sequence numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Writer Entity to which the range of sequence numbers applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gapStart</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Identifies the first sequence number in the interval of irrelevant sequence numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gapList</td>
<td>SequenceNumberSet</td>
<td>Serves two purposes: (1) Identifies the last sequence number in the interval of irrelevant sequence numbers. (2) Identifies an additional list of sequence numbers that are irrelevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.4.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small.
- `gapStart` is zero or negative.
- `gapList` is invalid (as defined in Section 8.3.5.5).
8.3.7.4.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.4.5 Logical Interpretation

The RTPS Writer sends the Gap message to the RTPS Reader to communicate that certain sequence numbers are no longer relevant. This is typically caused by Writer-side filtering of the sample (content-filtered topics, time-based filtering). In this scenario, new data-values may replace the old values of the data-objects that were represented by the sequence numbers that appear as irrelevant in the Gap.

The irrelevant sequence numbers communicated by the Gap message are composed of two groups:

- All sequence numbers in the range gapStart <= sequence_number <= gapList.base -1
- All the sequence numbers that appear explicitly listed in the gapList.

This set will be referred to as the Gap::irrelevant_sequence_number_list.

The Writer is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[ \text{writerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix}, \text{Gap.writerId} \} \]

The Reader is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[ \text{readerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.destGuidPrefix}, \text{Gap.readerId} \} \]

8.3.7.5 Heartbeat

8.3.7.5.1 Purpose

This message is sent from an RTPS Writer to an RTPS Reader to communicate the sequence numbers of changes that the Writer has available.

8.3.7.5.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the Heartbeat message are described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinalFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates whether the Reader is required to respond to the Heartbeat or if it is just an advisory heartbeat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LivelinessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates that the DDS DataWriter associated with the RTPS Writer of the message has manually asserted its LIVELINESS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.37 - Structure of the Heartbeat Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Reader Entity that is being informed of the availability of a set of sequence numbers. Can be set to ENTITYID_UNKNOWN to indicate all readers for the writer that sent the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Writer Entity to which the range of sequence numbers applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firstSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Identifies the first (lowest) sequence number that is available in the Writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lastSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Identifies the last (highest) sequence number that is available in the Writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>A counter that is incremented each time a new Heartbeat message is sent. Provides the means for a Reader to detect duplicate Heartbeat messages that can result from the presence of redundant communication paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.5.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- submessageLength in the Submessage header is too small
- firstSN.value is zero or negative
- lastSN.value is zero or negative
- lastSN.value < firstSN.value

8.3.7.5.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.5.5 Logical Interpretation

The Heartbeat message serves two purposes:

- It informs the Reader of the sequence numbers that are available in the writer’s HistoryCache so that the Reader may request (using an AckNack) any that it has missed.
- It requests the Reader to send an acknowledgement for the CacheChange changes that have been entered into the reader’s HistoryCache such that the Writer knows the state of the reader.

All Heartbeat messages serve the first purpose. That is, the Reader will always find out the state of the writer’s HistoryCache and may request what it has missed. Normally, the RTPS Reader would only send an AckNack message if it is missing a CacheChange.
The **Writer** uses the *FinalFlag* to request the **Reader** to send an acknowledgment for the sequence numbers it has received. If the **Heartbeat** has the *FinalFlag* set, then the **Reader** is not required to send an *AckNack* message back. However, if the *FinalFlag* is not set, then the **Reader** must send an *AckNack* message indicating which *CacheChange* changes it has received, even if the *AckNack* indicates it has received all *CacheChange* changes in the writer’s *HistoryCache*.

The **Writer** sets the *LivelinessFlag* to indicate that the DDS DataWriter associated with the RTPS **Writer** of the message has manually asserted its liveliness using the appropriate DDS operation (see the DDS Specification). The RTPS **Reader** should therefore renew the manual liveliness lease of the corresponding remote DDS DataWriter.

The **Writer** is identified uniquely by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

```
writerGUID = { Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix, Heartbeat.writerId }
```

The **Reader** is identified uniquely by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

```
readerGUID = { Receiver.destGuidPrefix, Heartbeat.readerId }
```

The Heartbeat.readerId can be ENTITYID_UNKNOWN, in which case the **Heartbeat** applies to all **Readers** of that writerGUID within the **Participant**.

### 8.3.7.6 HeartbeatFrag

#### 8.3.7.6.1 Purpose

When fragmenting data and until all fragments are available, the **HeartbeatFrag** Submessage is sent from an RTPS **Writer** to an RTPS **Reader** to communicate which fragments the **Writer** has available. This enables reliable communication at the fragment level.

Once all fragments are available, a regular **Heartbeat** message is used.

#### 8.3.7.6.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the **HeartbeatFrag** message are described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Reader Entity that is being informed of the availability of fragments. Can be set to ENTITYID_UNKNOWN to indicate all readers for the writer that sent the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Writer Entity that sent the Submessage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>Identifies the sequence number of the data change for which fragments are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lastFragmentNum</td>
<td>FragmentNumber</td>
<td>All fragments up to and including this last (highest) fragment are available on the Writer for the change identified by writerSN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3.7.6.3 Validity

This Submessage is *invalid* when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small
- `writerSN.value` is zero or negative
- `lastFragmentNum.value` is zero or negative

### 8.3.7.6.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

### 8.3.7.6.5 Logical Interpretation

The `HeartbeatFrag` message serves the same purpose as a regular `Heartbeat` message, but instead of indicating the availability of a range of sequence numbers, it indicates the availability of a range of fragments for the data change with sequence number `WriterSN`.

The RTPS `Reader` will respond by sending a `NackFrag` message, but only if it is missing any of the available fragments.

The `Writer` is identified uniquely by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{writerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix}, \text{Heartbeat.writerId} \}
\]

The `Reader` is identified uniquely by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{readerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.destGuidPrefix}, \text{Heartbeat.readerId} \}
\]

The `HeartbeatFrag.readerId` can be `ENTITYID_UNKNOWN`, in which case the `HeartbeatFrag` applies to all `Readers` of that Writer GUID within the `Participant`.

### 8.3.7.7 InfoDestination

#### 8.3.7.7.1 Purpose

This message is sent from an RTPS `Writer` to an RTPS `Reader` to modify the GuidPrefix used to interpret the `Reader` entityIds appearing in the Submessages that follow it.

---

Table 8.38 - Structure of the HeartbeatFrag Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>count</code></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>A counter that is incremented each time a new HeartbeatFrag message is sent. Provides the means for a Reader to detect duplicate HeartbeatFrag messages that can result from the presence of redundant communication paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.7.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the InfoDestination message are described in the table below.

Table 8.39 - Structure of the InfoDestination Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidPrefix</td>
<td>GuidPrefix</td>
<td>Provides the GuidPrefix that should be used to reconstruct the GUIDs of all the RTPS Reader entities whose EntityIds appears in the Submessages that follow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.7.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- submessageLength in the Submessage header is too small.

8.3.7.7.4 Change in state of Receiver

```c
if (InfoDestination.guidPrefix != GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN) {
    Receiver.destGuidPrefix = InfoDestination.guidPrefix
} else {
    Receiver.destGuidPrefix = <GuidPrefix_t of the Participant receiving the message>
}
```

8.3.7.7.5 Logical Interpretation

None

8.3.7.8 InfoReply

8.3.7.8.1 Purpose

This message is sent from an RTPS Reader to an RTPS Writer. It contains explicit information on where to send a reply to the Submessages that follow it within the same message.

8.3.7.8.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the InfoReply message are described in the table below.

Table 8.40 - Structure of the InfoReply Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.3.7.8.3 Validity

This Submessage is *invalid* when any of the following is true:

- *submessageLength* in the Submessage header is too small.

### 8.3.7.8.4 Change in state of Receiver

Receiver.unicastReplyLocatorList = InfoReply.unicastLocatorList

if ( MulticastFlag ) {
    Receiver.multicastReplyLocatorList = InfoReply.multicastLocatorList
} else {
    Receiver.multicastReplyLocatorList = <empty>
}

### 8.3.7.8.5 Logical Interpretation

None

### 8.3.7.9 InfoSource

#### 8.3.7.9.1 Purpose

This message modifies the logical source of the Submessages that follow.

---

Table 8.40 - Structure of the InfoReply Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>MulticastFlag</em></td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates whether the Submessage also contains a multicast address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>unicastLocatorList</em></td>
<td>LocatorList</td>
<td>Indicates an alternative set of unicast addresses that the Writer should use to reach the Readers when replying to the Submessages that follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>multicastLocatorList</em></td>
<td>LocatorList</td>
<td>Indicates an alternative set of multicast addresses that the Writer should use to reach the Readers when replying to the Submessages that follow. Only present when the <em>MulticastFlag</em> is set.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.7.9.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the **InfoSource** message are described in the table below.

### Table 8.41 - Structure of the InfoSource Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protocolVersion</td>
<td>ProtocolVersion</td>
<td>Indicates the protocol used to encapsulate subsequent Submessages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendorId</td>
<td>VendorId</td>
<td>Indicates the VendorId of the vendor that encapsulated subsequent Submessages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidPrefix</td>
<td>GuidPrefix</td>
<td>Identifies the Participant that is the container of the RTPS <strong>Writer</strong> entities that are the source of the Submessages that follow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.9.3 Validity

This Submessage is **invalid** when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small.

8.3.7.9.4 Change in state of Receiver

```java
Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix = InfoSource.guidPrefix
Receiver.sourceVersion = InfoSource.protocolVersion
Receiver.sourceVendorId = InfoSource.vendorId
Receiver.unicastReplyLocatorList = { LOCATOR_INVALID }
Receiver.multicastReplyLocatorList = { LOCATOR_INVALID }
haveTimestamp = false
```

8.3.7.9.5 Logical Interpretation

None

8.3.7.9.6 InfoTimestamp

8.3.7.9.7 Purpose

This Submessage is used to send a timestamp which applies to the Submessages that follow within the same message.
8.3.7.9.8 Content

The elements that form the structure of the InfoTimestamp message are described in the table below.

Table 8.42 - Structure of the InfoTimestamp Submessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InvalidateFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Indicates whether subsequent Submessages should be considered as having a timestamp or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timestamp</td>
<td>Timestamp</td>
<td>Present only if the InvalidateFlag is not set in the header. Contains the timestamp that should be used to interpret the subsequent Submessages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.9.9 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- submessageLength in the Submessage header is too small.

8.3.7.10 Change in state of Receiver

```java
if ( !InfoTimestamp.InvalidateFlag ) {
    Receiver.haveTimestamp   = true
    Receiver.timestamp       = InfoTimestamp.timestamp
} else {
    Receiver.haveTimestamp   = false
}
```

8.3.7.11 Logical Interpretation

None

8.3.7.10 NackFrag

8.3.7.10.1 Purpose

The NackFrag Submessage is used to communicate the state of a Reader to a Writer. When a data change is sent as a series of fragments, the NackFrag Submessage allows the Reader to inform the Writer about specific fragment numbers it is still missing.

This Submessage can only contain negative acknowledgements. Note this differs from an AckNack Submessage, which includes both positive and negative acknowledgements. The advantages of this approach include:

- It removes the windowing limitation introduced by the AckNack Submessage.

Given the size of a SequenceNumberSet is limited to 256, an AckNack Submessage is limited to NACKing only those samples whose sequence number does not not exceed that of the first missing sample by more than 256. Any samples below the first missing samples are acknowledged.

NackFrag Submessages on the other hand can be used to NACK any fragment numbers, even fragments more than...
256 apart from those NACKed in an earlier AckNack Submessage. This becomes important when handling samples containing a large number of fragments.

- Fragments can be negatively acknowledged in any order.

8.3.7.10.2 Content

The elements that form the structure of the NackFrag message are described in the table below.

Table 8.43 - Structure of the NackFrag SubMessage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EndiannessFlag</td>
<td>SubmessageFlag</td>
<td>Appears in the Submessage header flags. Indicates endianness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Reader entity that requests to receive certain fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerId</td>
<td>EntityId</td>
<td>Identifies the Writer entity that is the target of the NackFrag message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber</td>
<td>The sequence number for which some fragments are missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmentNumber-State</td>
<td>FragmentNumberSet</td>
<td>Communicates the state of the reader to the writer. The fragment numbers that appear in the set indicate missing fragments on the reader side. The ones that do not appear in the set are undetermined (could have been received or not).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>A counter that is incremented each time a new NackFrag message is sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides the means for a Writer to detect duplicate NackFrag messages that can result from the presence of redundant communication paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.7.10.3 Validity

This Submessage is invalid when any of the following is true:

- `submessageLength` in the Submessage header is too small.
- `writerSN.value` is zero or negative.
- `fragmentNumberState` is invalid (as defined in Section 8.3.5.7).

8.3.7.10.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

8.3.7.10.5 Logical Interpretation

The Reader sends the NackFrag message to the Writer to request fragments from the Writer.

The Writer is uniquely identified by its GUID. The Writer GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:
The Reader is identified uniquely by its GUID. The Reader GUID is obtained using the state of the Receiver:

\[
\text{readerGUID} = \{ \text{Receiver.sourceGuidPrefix, NackFrag.readerId} \}
\]

The sequence number from which fragments are requested is given by \( \text{writerSN} \). The mechanism to explicitly represent fragment numbers depends on the PSM. Typically, a compact representation (such as a bitmap) is used.

### 8.3.7.11 Pad

#### 8.3.7.11.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Submessage is to allow the introduction of any padding necessary to meet any desired memory-alignment requirements. It has no other meaning.

#### 8.3.7.11.2 Content

This Submessage has no contents. It accomplishes its purposes with only the Submessage header part. The amount of padding is determined by the value of \( \text{submessageLength} \).

#### 8.3.7.11.3 Validity

This Submessage is always valid.

#### 8.3.7.11.4 Change in state of Receiver

None

#### 8.3.7.11.5 Logical Interpretation

None

### 8.4 Behavior Module

This module describes the dynamic behavior of the RTPS entities. It describes the valid sequences of message exchanges between RTPS Writer endpoints and RTPS Reader endpoints and the timing constraints of those messages.

#### 8.4.1 Overview

Once an RTPS Writer has been matched with an RTPS Reader, they are both responsible for ensuring that CacheChange changes that exist in the Writer’s HistoryCache are propagated to the Reader’s HistoryCache.

The Behavior Module describes how the matching RTPS Writer and Reader pair must behave in order to propagate CacheChange changes. The behavior is defined in terms of message exchanges using the RTPS Messages defined in Section 8.3.

The Behavior Module is organized as follows:

- Section 8.4.2 lists what requirements all implementations of the RTPS protocol must satisfy in terms of behavior. An implementation that satisfies these requirements is considered compliant and will be interoperable with other compliant implementations.
• As implied above, it is possible for multiple implementations to satisfy the minimum requirements, where each
implementation may choose a different trade-off between memory requirements, bandwidth usage, scalability, and
efficiency. The RTPS specification does not mandate a single implementation with corresponding behavior. Instead, it
defines the minimum requirements for interoperability and then provides two Reference Implementations, the Stateless
and Stateful Reference Implementations, described in Section 8.4.3.

• The protocol behavior depends on such settings as the RELIABILITY QoS and whether keyed topics are used or not.
Section 8.4.4 discusses the possible combinations.

• Section 8.4.5 and Section 8.4.6 define notational conventions and define any new types used in this module.

• Section 8.4.7 through Section 8.4.12 model the two Reference Implementations.

• Section 8.4.14 discusses some optional behavior, including support for fragmented data.

• Finally, Section 8.4.15 provides guidelines for actual implementations.

Note that, as discussed earlier in Section 8.2.9, the Behavior Module does not model the interactions between DDS
Entities and their corresponding RTPS entities. For example, it simply assumes a DDS DataWriter adds and removes
CacheChange changes to and from its RTPS Writer’s HistoryCache. Changes are added by the DDS DataWriter as part
of its write operation and removed when no longer needed. It is important to realize the DDS DataWriter may remove a
CacheChange before it has been propagated to one or more of the matched RTPS Reader endpoints. The RTPS Writer is
not in control of when a CacheChange is removed from the Writer’s HistoryCache. It is the responsibility of the DDS
DataWriter to only remove those CacheChange changes that can be removed based on the communication status and the
DDS DataWriter’s QoS. For example, the HISTORY QoS setting of KEEP_LAST with a depth of 1 allows a DataWriter
to remove a CacheChange if a more recent change replaces the value of the same data-object.

8.4.1.1 Example Behavior

The contents of this Section are not part of the formal specification of the protocol. The purpose of this section is to
provide an intuitive understanding of the protocol.

A typical sequence illustrating the exchanges between an RTPS Writer and a matched RTPS Reader is shown in Figure
8.14. The example sequence in this case uses the Stateful Reference Implementation.
The individual interactions are described below:

1. The DDS user writes data by invoking the `write` operation on the DDS DataWriter.
2. The DDS DataWriter invokes the `new_change` operation on the RTPS Writer to create a new `CacheChange`. Each `CacheChange` is identified uniquely by a `SequenceNumber`.
3. The `new_change` operation returns.
4. The DDS DataWriter uses the `add_change` operation to store the CacheChange into the RTPS Writer’s `HistoryCache`.
5. The `add_change` operation returns.
6. The `write` operation returns, the user has completed the action of writing Data.

Figure 8.14 - Example Behavior
7. The RTPS Writer sends the contents of the *CacheChange* changes to the RTPS Reader using the *Data* Submessage and requests an acknowledgment by also sending a *Heartbeat* Submessage.

8. The RTPS Reader receives the *Data* message and, assuming that the resource limits allow that, places the *CacheChange* into the reader’s *HistoryCache* using the *add_change* operation.

9. The *add_change* operation returns. The *CacheChange* is visible to the DDS DataReader and the DDS user. The conditions for this depend on the *reliabilityLevel* attribute of the RTPS Reader.
   a. For a RELIABLE DDS DataReader, changes in its RTPS Reader’s *HistoryCache* are made visible to the user application only when all previous changes (i.e., changes with smaller sequence numbers) are also visible.
   b. For a BEST_EFFORT DDS DataReader, changes in its RTPS Reader’s *HistoryCache* are made visible to the user only if no future changes have already been made visible (i.e., if there are no changes in the RTPS Receiver’s *HistoryCache* with a higher sequence number).

10. The DDS user is notified by one of the mechanisms described in the DDS Specification (e.g., by means of a listener or a WaitSet) and initiates reading of the data by calling the *take* operation on the DDS DataReader.

11. The DDS DataReader accesses the change using the *get_change* operation on the *HistoryCache*.

12. The *get_change* operation returns the *CacheChange* to the DataReader.

13. The *take* operation returns the data to the DDS user.

14. The RTPS Reader sends an *AckNack* message indicating that the *CacheChange* was placed into the Reader’s *HistoryCache*. The *AckNack* message contains the *GUID* of the RTPS Reader and the *SequenceNumber* of the change. This action is independent from the notification to the DDS user and the reading of the data by the DDS user. It could have occurred before or concurrently with that.

15. The *StatefulWriter* records that the RTPS Reader has received the *CacheChange* and adds it to the set of *acked_changes* maintained by the *ReaderProxy* using the *acked_changes_set* operation.

16. The DDS user invokes the *finish* operation on the DataReader to indicate that it is no longer using the data it retrieved by means of the previous *take* operation. This action is independent from the actions on the writer side as it is initiated by the DDS user.

17. The DDS DataReader uses the *remove_change* operation to remove the data from the HistoryCache.

18. The *remove_change* operation returns

19. The *finish* operation returns

20. The DDS DataWriter uses the operation *is_acked_by_all* to determine which *CacheChanges* have been received by all the RTPS Reader endpoints matched with the *StatefulWriter*.

21. The *is_acked_by_all* returns and indicates that the change with the specified ‘seq_num’ *SequenceNumber* has been acknowledged by all RTPS Reader endpoints.

22. The DDS DataWriter uses the operation *remove_change* to remove the change associated with ‘seq_num’ from the RTPS Writer’s *HistoryCache*. In doing this, the DDS DataWriter also takes into account other DDS QoS such as DURABILITY.

23. The operation *remove_change* returns.
The description above did not model some of the interactions between the DDS DataReader and the RTPS Reader; for example the mechanism used by the RTPS Reader to alert to the DataReader that it should call read or take to check whether new changes have been received (i.e., what causes step 10 to be taken).

Also unmodeled are some interactions between the DDS DataWriter and the RTPS Writer; such as the mechanism used by the RTPS Writer to alert to the DataWriter that it should check whether a particular change has been fully acknowledged such that it can be removed from the HistoryCache (i.e., what causes step 20 above to be initiated).

The aforementioned interactions are not modeled because they are internal to the implementation of the middleware and have no effect on the RTPS protocol.

8.4.2 Behavior Required for Interoperability

This section describes the requirements that all implementations of the RTPS protocol must satisfy in order to be:

- compliant with the protocol specification,
- interoperable with other implementations.

The scope of these requirements is limited to message exchanges between RTPS implementations by different vendors. For message exchanges between implementations by the same vendor, vendors may opt for a non-compliant implementation or may use a proprietary protocol instead.

8.4.2.1 General Requirements

The following requirements apply to all RTPS Entities.

8.4.2.1.1 All communications must take place using RTPS Messages

No other messages can be used than the RTPS Messages defined in Section 8.3. The required contents, validity and interpretation of each Message is defined by the RTPS specification.

Vendors may extend Messages for vendor specific needs using the extension mechanisms provided by the protocol (see Section 8.6). This does not affect interoperability.

8.4.2.1.2 All implementations must implement the RTPS Message Receiver

Implementations must implement the rules followed by the RTPS Message Receiver, as introduced in Section 8.3.4, to interpret Submessages within the RTPS Message and maintain the state of the Message Receiver.

This requirement also includes proper Message formatting by preceding Entity Submessages with Interpreter Submessages when required for proper interpretation of the former, as defined in Section 8.3.7.

8.4.2.1.3 The timing characteristics of all implementations must be tunable

Depending on the application requirements, deployment configuration and underlying transports, the end-user may want to tune the timing characteristics of the RTPS protocol.

Therefore, where the requirements on the protocol behavior allow delayed responses or specify periodic events, implementations must allow the end-user to tune those timing characteristics.
8.4.2.1.4 Implementations must implement the Simple Participant and Endpoint Discovery Protocols

Implementations must implement the Simple Participant and Endpoint Discovery Protocols to enable the discovery of remote Endpoints (see Section 8.5).

RTPS allows the use of different Participant and Endpoint Discovery Protocols, depending on the deployment needs of the application. For the purpose of interoperability, implementations must implement at least the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol and Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol (see Section 8.5.1).

8.4.2.2 Required RTPS Writer Behavior

The following requirements apply to RTPS Writers only. Unless indicated, the requirements apply to both reliable and best-effort Writers.

8.4.2.2.1 Writers must not send data out-of-order

A Writer must send out data samples in the order they were added to its HistoryCache.

8.4.2.2.2 Writers must include in-line QoS values if requested by a Reader

A Writer must honor a Reader’s request to receive data messages with in-line QoS.

8.4.2.2.3 Writers must send periodic HEARTBEAT Messages (reliable only)

A Writer must periodically inform each matching reliable Reader of the availability of a data sample by sending a periodic HEARTBEAT Message that includes the sequence number of the available sample. If no samples are available, no HEARTBEAT Message needs to be sent.

For strict reliable communication, the Writer must continue to send HEARTBEAT Messages to a Reader until the Reader has either acknowledged receiving all available samples or has disappeared. In all other cases, the number of HEARTBEAT Messages sent can be implementation specific and may be finite.

8.4.2.2.4 Writers must eventually respond to a negative acknowledgment (reliable only)

When receiving an ACKNACK Message indicating a Reader is missing some data samples, the Writer must respond by either sending the missing data samples, sending a GAP message when the sample is not relevant, or sending a HEARTBEAT message when the sample is no longer available.

The Writer may respond immediately or choose to schedule the response for a certain time in the future. It can also coalesce related responses so there need not be a one-to-one correspondence between an ACKNACK Message and the Writer’s response. These decisions and the timing characteristics are implementation specific.

8.4.2.3 Required RTPS Reader Behavior

A best-effort Reader is completely passive as it only receives data and does not send messages itself. Therefore, the requirements below only apply to reliable Readers.

8.4.2.3.1 Readers must respond eventually after receiving a HEARTBEAT with final flag not set

Upon receiving a HEARTBEAT Message with final flag not set, the Reader must respond with an ACKNACK Message. The ACKNACK Message may acknowledge having received all the data samples or may indicate that some data samples are missing.
The response may be delayed to avoid message storms.

**8.4.2.3.2 Readers must respond eventually after receiving a HEARTBEAT that indicates a sample is missing**

Upon receiving a HEARTBEAT Message, a Reader that is missing some data samples must respond with an ACKNACK Message indicating which data samples are missing. This requirement only applies if the Reader can accommodate these missing samples in its cache and is independent of the setting of the final flag in the HEARTBEAT Message.

The response may be delayed to avoid message storms.

The response is not required when a liveliness HEARTBEAT has both liveliness and final flags set to indicate it is a liveliness-only message.

**8.4.2.3.3 Once acknowledged, always acknowledged**

Once a Reader has positively acknowledged receiving a sample using an ACKNACK Message, it can no longer negatively acknowledge that same sample at a later point.

Once a Writer has received positive acknowledgement from all Readers, the Writer can reclaim any associated resources. However, if a Writer receives a negative acknowledgement to a previously positively acknowledged sample, and the Writer can still service the request, the Writer should send the sample.

**8.4.2.3.4 Readers can only send an ACKNACK Message in response to a HEARTBEAT Message**

In steady state, an ACKNACK Message can only be sent as a response to a HEARTBEAT Message from a Writer. ACKNACK Messages can be sent from a Reader when it first discovers a Writer as an optimization. Writers are not required to respond to these pre-emptive ACKNACK Messages.

**8.4.3 Implementing the RTPS Protocol**

The RTPS specification states that a compliant implementation of the protocol need only satisfy the requirements presented in Section 8.4.2. Therefore, the behavior of actual implementations may differ as a function of the design trade-offs made by each implementation.

The Behavior Module of the RTPS specification defines two reference implementations:

- **Stateless Reference Implementation:**
  The Stateless Reference Implementation is optimized for scalability. It keeps virtually no state on remote entities and therefore scales very well with large systems. This involves a trade-off, as improved scalability and reduced memory usage may require additional bandwidth usage. The Stateless Reference Implementation is ideally suited for best-effort communication over multicast.

- **Stateful Reference Implementation:**
  The Stateful Reference Implementation maintains full state on remote entities. This approach minimizes bandwidth usage, but requires more memory and may imply reduced scalability. In contrast to the Stateless Reference Implementation, it can guarantee strict reliable communication and is able to apply QoS-based or content-based filtering on the Writer side.

Both reference implementations are described in detail in the sections that follow.

Actual implementations need not necessarily follow the reference implementations. Depending on how much state is maintained, implementations may be a combination of the reference implementations.
For example, the Stateless Reference Implementation maintains minimal info and state on remote Entities. As such, it is not able to perform time-based filtering on the **Writer** side as this requires keeping track of each remote **Reader** and its properties. It is also not able to drop out-of-order samples on the **Reader** side as this requires keeping track of the largest sequence number received from each remote **Writer**. Some implementations may mimic the Stateless Reference Implementation, but choose to store enough additional state to be able to avoid some of the above limitations. The required additional information can be stored in a permanent fashion, in which case the implementation approaches the Stateful Reference Implementation, or can be slowly aged and kept around on an as-needed basis to approximate, to the extent possible, the behavior that would result if the state were maintained.

Regardless of the actual implementation, in order to guarantee interoperability, it is important that all implementations, including both reference implementations, satisfy the requirements presented in Section 8.4.2.

### 8.4.4 The Behavior of a Writer with respect to each matched Reader

The behavior of an RTPS **Writer** with respect to each matched **Reader** depends on:

- The setting of the `reliabilityLevel` attribute in the RTPS **Writer** and RTPS **Reader**. This controls whether a best-effort or a reliable protocol is used.
- The setting of the `topicKind` attribute in the RTPS **Writer** and **Reader**. This controls whether the data being communicated corresponds to a DDS Topic for which a Key has been defined.

Not all possible combinations of the `reliabilityLevel` and `topicKind` attribute are possible. An RTPS **Writer** cannot be matched to an RTPS **Reader** unless the following two conditions apply:

1. Both RTPS **Writer** and **Reader** must have the same value of the `topicKind` attribute. This is because they both relate to the same DDS Topic, which will either be WITH_KEY or NO_KEY.
2. Either the RTPS **Writer** has the `reliabilityLevel` set to RELIABLE, or else both the RTPS **Writer** and RTPS **Reader** have the `reliabilityLevel` set to BEST_EFFORT. This is because the DDS specification states that a BEST_EFFORT DDS DataWriter can only be matched with a BEST_EFFORT DDS DataReader and a RELIABLE DDS DataWriter can be matched with both a RELIABLE and a BEST_EFFORT DDS DataReader.

As mentioned in Section 8.4.3, whether a **Writer** can be matched to a **Reader** does not depend on whether both use the same implementation of the RTPS protocol. That is, a Stateful Writer is able to communicate with a Stateless Reader and vice versa.

Table 8.44 summarizes the legal combinations supported by the protocol. Subsequent sections describe the behavior of each of the combinations listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer properties</th>
<th>Reader properties</th>
<th>Combination name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| topicKind = WITH_KEY  
reliabilityLevel = BEST_EFFORT  
or reliabilityLevel = RELIABLE | topicKind = WITH_KEY  
reliabilityLevel = BEST_EFFORT | WITH_KEY Best-Effort |
| topicKind = NO_KEY  
reliabilityLevel = BEST_EFFORT  
or reliabilityLevel = RELIABLE | topicKind = NO_KEY  
reliabilityLevel = BEST_EFFORT | NO_KEY Best-Effort |
Table 8.44 - Possible combinations of attributes for a matched RTPS Writer and RTPS Reader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer properties</th>
<th>Reader properties</th>
<th>Combination name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topicKind = WITH_KEY</td>
<td>topicKind = WITH_KEY</td>
<td>WITH_KEY Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliabilityLevel = RE</td>
<td>reliabilityLevel = RE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicKind = NO_KEY</td>
<td>topicKind = NO_KEY</td>
<td>NO_KEY Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliabilityLevel = RE</td>
<td>reliabilityLevel = RE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.5 Notational Conventions

The reference implementations are described using UML sequence charts and state-diagrams. These diagrams use some abbreviations to refer to the RTPS Entities. The abbreviations used are listed in Table 8.45.

Table 8.45 - Abbreviations used in the sequence charts and state diagrams of the Behavior Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>DDS DataWriter</td>
<td>DW::write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>DDS DataReader</td>
<td>DR::read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>RTPS Writer</td>
<td>R::heartbeatPeriod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RTPS ReaderProxy</td>
<td>RP::unicastLocatorList</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>RTPS ReaderLocator</td>
<td>RL::locator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>RTPS Reader</td>
<td>R::heartbeatResponseDelay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>RTPS WriterProxy</td>
<td>WP::remoteWriterGuid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>HistoryCache of RTPS Writer</td>
<td>WHC::changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHC</td>
<td>HistoryCache of RTPS Reader</td>
<td>RHC::changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.6 Type Definitions

The Behavior Module introduces the following additional types.

Table 8.46 - Types definitions for the Behavior Module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Type used to hold time-differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should have at least nano-second resolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RTPS Writer Reference Implementations are based on specializations of the RTPS Writer class, first introduced in Section 8.2. This section describes the RTPS Writer and all additional classes used to model the RTPS Writer Reference Implementations. The actual behavior is described in Section 8.4.8 and Section 8.4.9.

### 8.4.7.1 RTPS Writer

RTPS Writer specializes RTPS Endpoint and represents the actor that sends CacheChange messages to the matched RTPS Reader endpoints. The Reference Implementations StatelessWriter and StatefulWriter specialize RTPS Writer and differ in the knowledge they maintain about the matched Reader endpoints.
Figure 8.15 - RTPS Writer Endpoints
Table 8.47 describes the attributes of the RTPS Writer.

### Table 8.47 - RTPS Writer Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pushMode</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Configures the mode in which the Writer operates. If pushMode==true, then the Writer will push changes to the reader. If pushMode==false, changes will only be announced via heartbeats and only be sent as response to the request of a reader.</td>
<td>N/A (automatically configured).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heartbeatPeriod</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that allows the RTPS Writer to repeatedly announce the availability of data by sending a Heartbeat Message.</td>
<td>N/A (automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nackResponseDelay</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that allows the RTPS Writer to delay the response to a request for data from a negative acknowledgment.</td>
<td>N/A (automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nackSuppressionDuration</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that allows the RTPS Writer to ignore requests for data from negative acknowledgments that arrive ‘too soon’ after the corresponding change is sent.</td>
<td>N/A (automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lastChangeSequenceNumber</td>
<td>Sequence Number_t</td>
<td>Internal counter used to assign increasing sequence number to each change made by the Writer.</td>
<td>N/A (used as part of the logic of the virtual machine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer_cache</td>
<td>HistoryCache</td>
<td>Contains the history of CacheChange changes for this Writer.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attributes of the RTPS Writer allow for fine-tuning of the protocol behavior. The operations of the RTPS Writer are described in Table 8.48.

### Table 8.48 - RTPS Writer operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the Writer and all the super classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new_change</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>CacheChange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>ChangeKind_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handle</td>
<td></td>
<td>InstanceHandle_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections provide details on the operations.

#### 8.4.7.1.1 Default Timing-Related Values

The following timing-related values are used as the defaults in order to facilitate ‘out-of-the-box’ interoperability between implementations.

- `nackResponseDelay.sec = 0;`
- `nackResponseDelay.nanosec = 200 * 1000 * 1000; //200 milliseconds`
- `nackSuppressionDuration.sec = 0;`
- `nackSuppressionDuration.nanosec = 0;`

#### 8.4.7.1.2 new

This operation creates a new RTPS Writer.

The newly-created writer ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

```c
this.guid := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.unicastLocatorList := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.multicastLocatorList := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.reliabilityLevel := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.topicKind := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.pushMode := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.heartbeatPeriod := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.nackResponseDelay := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.nackSuppressionDuration := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.lastChangeSequenceNumber := 0;
this.writer_cache := new HistoryCache;
```
8.4.7.1.3 new_change

This operation creates a new CacheChange to be appended to the RTPS Writer’s HistoryCache. The sequence number of the CacheChange is automatically set to be the sequenceNumber of the previous change plus one.

This operation returns the new change.

This operation performs the following logical steps:

```c
++this.lastChangeSequenceNumber;
   a_change := new CacheChange(kind, this.guid, this.lastChangeSequenceNumber,
                                   data, handle);
RETURN a_change;
```

8.4.7.2 RTPS StatelessWriter

Specialization of RTPS Writer used for the Stateless Reference Implementation. The RTPS StatelessWriter has no knowledge of the number of matched readers, nor does it maintain any state for each matched RTPS Reader endpoint. The RTPS StatelessWriter maintains only the RTPS Locator_t list that should be used to send information to the matched readers.

Table 8.49 - RTPS StatelessWriter attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTPS StatelessWriter : RTPS Writer</th>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resendDataPeriod</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that indicates that the StatelessWriter re-</td>
<td>N/A. (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sends all the changes in the writer’s HistoryCache to all the Locators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>periodically each resendPeriod.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reader_locators</td>
<td>ReaderLocator[*]</td>
<td>The StatelessWriter maintains the list of locators to which it sends</td>
<td>N/A (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CacheChanges. This list may include both unicast and multicast locators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RTPS StatelessWriter is useful for situations where (a) the writer’s HistoryCache is small, or (b) the communication is best-effort, or (c) the writer is communicating via multicast to a large number of readers.
The virtual machine interacts with the `StatelessWriter` using the operations in Table 8.50.

### Table 8.50 - StatelessWriter operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>StatelessWriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the StatelessWriter and all the super classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reader_locator_add</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_locator Locator_t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reader_locator_remove</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_locator Locator_t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsent_changes_reset</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8.4.7.2.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS `StatelessWriter`.

In addition to the initialization performed on the RTPS `Writer` super class (Section 8.4.7.1.2), the newly-created `StatelessWriter` ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

```plaintext
  this.readerlocators := <empty>;  # new member
  this.resendDataPeriod := <as specified in the constructor>;
```

#### 8.4.7.2.2 reader_locator_add

This operation adds the `Locator_t a_locator` to the StatelessWriter::reader_locators.

```plaintext
  ADD a_locator TO {this.reader_locators}:
```

#### 8.4.7.2.3 reader_locator_remove

This operation removes the `Locator_t a_locator` from the StatelessWriter::reader_locators.

```plaintext
  REMOVE a_locator FROM {this.reader_locators}:
```

#### 8.4.7.2.4 unsent_changes_reset

This operation modifies the set of ‘unsent_changes’ for all the `ReaderLocators` in the StatelessWriter::reader_locators. The list of unsent changes is reset to match the complete list of changes available in the writer’s `HistoryCache`.

```plaintext
  FOREACH readerLocator in {this.reader_locators} DO
    readerLocator.unsent_changes := {this.writer_cache.changes}
```
8.4.7.3 RTPS ReaderLocator

Value type used by the RTPS StatelessWriter to keep track of the locators of all matching remote Readers.

Table 8.51 - RTPS ReaderLocator attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requested_changes</td>
<td>CacheChange[*]</td>
<td>A list of changes in the writer’s HistoryCache that were requested by remote Readers at this ReaderLocator.</td>
<td>N/A. (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsent_changes</td>
<td>CacheChange[*]</td>
<td>A list of changes in the writer’s HistoryCache that have not been sent yet to this ReaderLocator.</td>
<td>N/A. (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locator</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
<td>Unicast or multicast locator through which the readers represented by this ReaderLocator can be reached.</td>
<td>N/A (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectsInlineQos</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Specifies whether the readers represented by this ReaderLocator expect inline QoS to be sent with every Data Message.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The virtual machine interacts with the ReaderLocator using the operations in Table 8.52.

Table 8.52 - ReaderLocator operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ReaderLocator operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>operation name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute_values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next_requested_change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next_unsent_change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requested_changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requested_changes_set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>req_seq_num_set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsent_changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4.7.4 RTPS StatefulWriter

Specialization of RTPS Writer used for the Stateful Reference Implementation. The RTPS StatefulWriter is configured with the knowledge of all matched RTPS Reader endpoints and maintains state on each matched RTPS Reader endpoint.

By maintaining state on each matched RTPS Reader endpoint, the RTPS StatefulWriter can determine whether all matched RTPS Reader endpoints have received a particular CacheChange and can be optimal in its use of network bandwidth by avoiding to send announcements to readers that have received all the changes in the writer’s HistoryCache. The information it maintains also simplifies QoS-based filtering on the Writer side. The attributes specific to the StatefulWriter are described in Table 8.53.

Table 8.53 - RTPS StatefulWriter Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matched_readers</td>
<td>ReaderProxy[*]</td>
<td>The StatefulWriter keeps track of all the RTPS Readers matched with it. Each matched reader is represented by an instance of the ReaderProxy class.</td>
<td>N/A (Automatically configured)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The virtual machine interacts with the StatefulWriter using the operations in Table 8.54.

Table 8.54 - StatefulWriter Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StatefulWriter operations</th>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>StatefulWriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the StatefulWriter and all the super classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matched_reader_add</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_reader_proxy</td>
<td>ReaderProxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matched_reader_remove</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_reader_proxy</td>
<td>ReaderProxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matched_reader_lookup</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>ReaderProxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_reader_guid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is_acked_by_all</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>bool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_change</td>
<td>CacheChange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4.7.4.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS StatefulWriter. In addition to the initialization performed on the RTPS Writer super class (Section 8.4.7.1.2), the newly-created StatefulWriter ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

\[
\text{this.matched_readers} := \text{<empty>};
\]

8.4.7.4.2 is_acked_by_all

This operation takes a CacheChange \(a\_change\) as a parameter and determines whether all the ReaderProxy have acknowledged the CacheChange. The operation will return true if all ReaderProxy have acknowledged the corresponding CacheChange and false otherwise.

\[
\text{return true IF and only IF}
\]
\[
\text{FOREACH proxy IN this.matched_readers}
\]
\[
\text{IF change IN proxy.changes_for_reader THEN}
\]
\[
\text{change.is_relevant == TRUE AND change.status == ACKNOWLEDGED}
\]

8.4.7.4.3 matched_reader_add

This operation adds the ReaderProxy \(a\_reader\_proxy\) to the set StatefulWriter::matched_readers.

\[
\text{ADD a\_reader\_proxy TO \{this.matched_readers\};}
\]

8.4.7.4.4 matched_reader_remove

This operation removes the ReaderProxy \(a\_reader\_proxy\) from the set StatefulWriter::matched_readers.

\[
\text{REMOVE a\_reader\_proxy FROM \{this.matched_readers\};}
\]
\[
\text{delete proxy;}
\]

8.4.7.4.5 matched_reader_lookup

This operation finds the ReaderProxy with GUID_t \(a\_reader\_guid\) from the set StatefulWriter::matched_readers.

\[
\text{FIND proxy IN this.matched_readers SUCH-THAT (proxy.remoteReaderGuid == a\_reader\_guid);}\]
\[
\text{return proxy;}
\]

8.4.7.5 RTPS ReaderProxy

The RTPS ReaderProxy class represents the information an RTPS StatefulWriter maintains on each matched RTPS Reader. The attributes of the RTPS ReaderProxy are described in Table 8.55.

Table 8.55 - RTPS ReaderProxy Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>remoteReaderGuid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>Identifies the remote matched RTPS Reader that is represented by the ReaderProxy.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The matching of an RTPS StatefulWriter with an RTPS Reader means that the RTPS StatefulWriter will send the CacheChange changes in the writer’s HistoryCache to the matched RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy. The matching is a consequence of the match of the corresponding DDS entities. That is, the DDS DataWriter matches a DDS DataReader by Topic, has compatible QoS, and is not being explicitly ignored by the application that uses DDS.

The virtual machine interacts with the ReaderProxy using the operations in Table 8.56.

### Table 8.55 - RTPS ReaderProxy Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of unicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the matched RTPS Reader. The list may be empty.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of multicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the matched RTPS Reader. The list may be empty.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes_for_reader</td>
<td>CacheChange[*]</td>
<td>List of CacheChange changes as they relate to the matched RTPS Reader.</td>
<td>N/A. Used to implement the behavior of the RTPS protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectsInlineQos</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Specifies whether the remote matched RTPS Reader expects in-line QoS to be sent along with any data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isActive</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Specifies whether the remote Reader is responsive to the Writer.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The virtual machine interacts with the ReaderProxy using the operations in Table 8.56.

### Table 8.56 - ReaderProxy Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ReaderProxy operations</th>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>ReaderProxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the ReaderProxy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acked_changes_set</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>committed_seq_num</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next_requested_change</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>ChangeForReader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next_unsent_change</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>ChangeForReader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsent_changes</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>ChangeForReader[*]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This operation creates a new RTPS ReaderProxy. The newly-created reader proxy ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

```plaintext
this.attributes := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.changes_for_reader := RTPS::Writer.writer_cache.changes;
FOR_EACH change_for_reader IN (this.changes_for_reader) DO {
    IF ( DDS_FILTER(this, change_for_reader) THEN change_for_reader.is_relevant := FALSE;
    ELSE change_for_reader.is_relevant := TRUE;
        IF ( RTPS::Writer.pushMode == true) THEN change_for_reader.status := UNSENT;
        ELSE change_for_reader.status := UNACKNOWLEDGED;
    }
```

The above logic indicates that the newly-created ReaderProxy initializes its set of ‘changes_for_reader’ to contain all the CacheChanges in the Writer’s HistoryCache.

The change is marked as ‘irrelevant’ if the application of any of the DDS-DataReader filters indicates the change is not relevant to that particular reader. The DDS specification indicates that a DataReader may provide a time-based filter as well as a content-based filter. These filters should be applied in a manner consistent with the DDS specification to select any changes that are irrelevant to the DataReader.

The status is set depending on the value of the RTPS Writer attribute ‘pushMode.’

### 8.4.7.5.2 acked_changes_set

This operation changes the ChangeForReader status of a set of changes for the reader represented by ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy.’ The set of changes with sequence number smaller than or equal to the value ‘committed_seq_num’ have their status changed to ACKNOWLEDGED.

```plaintext
FOR_EACH change in this.changes_for_reader
    SUCH-THAT (change.sequenceNumber <= committed_seq_num) DO
        change.status := ACKNOWLEDGED;
```

### 8.4.7.5.3 next_requested_change

This operation returns the ChangeForReader for the ReaderProxy that has the lowest sequence number among the changes with status ‘REQUESTED.’ This represents the next repair packet that should be sent to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy in response to a previous AckNack message (see Section 8.3.7.1) from the Reader.
next_seq_num := MIN {change.sequenceNumber SUCH-THAT change IN this.requested_changes()}
return change IN this.requested_changes() SUCH-THAT (change.sequenceNumber == next_seq_num);

8.4.7.5.4 next_unsent_change

This operation returns the CacheChange for the ReaderProxy that has the lowest sequence number among the changes with status 'UNSENT.' This represents the next change that should be sent to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.

next_seq_num := MIN { change.sequenceNumber SUCH-THAT change IN this.unsent_changes() }; return change IN this.unsent_changes() SUCH-THAT (change.sequenceNumber == next_seq_num);

8.4.7.5.5 requested_changes

This operation returns the subset of changes for the ReaderProxy that have status ‘REQUESTED.’ This represents the set of changes that were requested by the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy using an ACKNACK Message.

return change IN this.changes_for_reader SUCH-THAT (change.status == REQUESTED);

8.4.7.5.6 requested_changes_set

This operation modifies the ChangeForReader status of a set of changes for the RTPS Reader represented by ReaderProxy 'this.' The set of changes with sequence numbers 'req_seq_num_set' have their status changed to REQUESTED.

FOR_EACH seq_num IN req_seq_num_set DO
  FIND change_for_reader IN this.changes_for_reader
  SUCH-THAT (change_for_reader.sequenceNumber==seq_num)
  change_for_reader.status := REQUESTED;
END

8.4.7.5.7 unsent_changes

This operation returns the subset of changes for the ReaderProxy the have status 'UNSENT.' This represents the set of changes that have not been sent to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.

return change IN this.changes_for_reader SUCH-THAT (change.status == UNSENT);

8.4.7.5.8 unacked_changes

This operation returns the subset of changes for the ReaderProxy that have status 'UNACKNOWLEDGED.' This represents the set of changes that have not been acknowledged yet by the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.

return change IN this.changes_for_reader SUCH-THAT (change.status == UNACKNOWLEDGED);
8.4.7.6 RTPS ChangeForReader

The RTPS ChangeForReader is an association class that maintains information of a CacheChange in the RTPS Writer HistoryCache as it pertains to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy. The attributes of the RTPS ChangeForReader are described in Table 8.57.

Table 8.57 - RTPS ChangeForReader Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>ChangeForReaderStatus Kind</td>
<td>Indicates the status of a CacheChange relative to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.</td>
<td>N/A. Used by the protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isRelevant</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Indicates whether the change is relevant to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.</td>
<td>The determination of irrelevant changes is affected by DDS DataReader TIME_BASED_FILTER QoS and also by the use of DDS ContentFilteredTopics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.8 RTPS StatelessWriter Behavior

8.4.8.1 Best-Effort StatelessWriter Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatelessWriter with respect to each ReaderLocator is described in Figure 8.16.
Figure 8.16 - Behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort StatelessWriter with respect to each ReaderLocator

The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.58.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured with a ReaderLocator</td>
<td>idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>idle</td>
<td>GuardCondition: RL::unsent_changes() != &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td>pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition: RL::unsent_changes() == &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td>idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition: RL::can_send() == true</td>
<td>pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>any state</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured to no longer have the ReaderLocator</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.8.1.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Best-Effort StatelessWriter ‘the_rtps_writer’ with an RTPS ReaderLocator. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataReader that matches the DDS DataWriter that is related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the ReaderLocator constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```cpp
    a_locator := new ReaderLocator( locator, expectsInlineQos );
    the_rtps_writer.reader_locator_add( a_locator );
```
8.4.8.1.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RL}::\text{unsent}_{\text{changes}}() \neq \langle\text{empty}\rangle]\) indicating that there are some changes in the RTPS **Writer HistoryCache** that have not been sent to the RTPS **ReaderLocator**.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.8.1.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RL}::\text{unsent}_{\text{changes}}() == \langle\text{empty}\rangle]\) indicating that all changes in the RTPS **Writer HistoryCache** have been sent to the RTPS **ReaderLocator**. Note that this does not indicate that the changes have been received, only that an attempt was made to send them.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.8.1.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RL}::\text{can}_{\text{send}}() == \text{true}]\) indicating that the RTPS **Writer** ‘the_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS **ReaderLocator** ‘the_reader_locator.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
a_change := the_reader_locator.next_unsent_change();
DATA = new DATA(a_change);
IF (the_reader_locator.expectsInlineQos) {
    DATA.inlineQos := the_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
}
DATA.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
send to the_reader_locator.locator, DATA;
```

After the transition, the following post-conditions hold:

\((a\_change \text{ BELONGS-TO } the\_reader\_locator.\text{unsent}\_changes()) == \text{FALSE})

8.4.8.1.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS **Writer** ‘the_rtps_writer’ to no longer send to the RTPS **ReaderLocator** ‘the_reader_locator.’ This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataReader with the DDS DataWriter related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
the_rtps_writer.reader_locator_remove(the_reader_locator);
delete the_reader_locator;
```

8.4.8.2 Reliable StatelessWriter Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY reliable RTPS **StatelessWriter** with respect to each **ReaderLocator** is described in Figure 8.17. For a NO_KEY reliable **StatelessWriter**, the protocol remains identical.
The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.59.

**Table 8.59 - Transitions for the Reliable StatelessWriter behavior with respect to each ReaderLocator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured with a ReaderLocator</td>
<td>announcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T2         | announcing | GuardCondition:  
|            |         | RL::unsent_changes() != <empty>                | pushing    |
Table 8.59 - Transitions for the Reliable StatelessWriter behavior with respect to each ReaderLocator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>announcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RL::unsent_changes() == &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RL::can_send() == true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>announcing</td>
<td>after(W::heartbeatPeriod)</td>
<td>announcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>ACKNACK message is received</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>must_repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RL::requested_changes() != &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>must_repair</td>
<td>ACKNACK message is received</td>
<td>must_repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>must_repair</td>
<td>after(W::nackResponseDelay)</td>
<td>repairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>repairing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>repairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RL::can_send() == true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>repairing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RL::requested_changes() == &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>any state</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured to no longer have the ReaderLocator</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.8.2.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reliable StatelessWriter ‘the_rtps_writer’ with an RTPS ReaderLocator. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (8.5, 'Discovery Module') as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataReader that matches the DDS DataWriter that is related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the ReaderLocator constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
    a_locator := new ReaderLocator( locator, expectsInlineQos );
    the_rtps_writer.reader_locator_add( a_locator );
```

8.4.8.2.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::unsent_changes() != <empty>] indicating that there are some changes in the RTPS Writer HistoryCache that have not been sent to the ReaderLocator. The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.
8.4.8.2.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::unsent_changes == <empty>] indicating that all changes in the RTPS Writer HistoryCache have been sent to the ReaderLocator. Note that this does not indicate that the changes have been received, only that there has been an attempt made to send them. The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.8.2.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::can_send() == true] indicating that the RTPS Writer ‘the_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS ReaderLocator ‘the_reader_locator.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
a_change := the_reader_locator.next_unsent_change();
DATA = new DATA(a_change);
IF (the_reader_locator.expectsInlineQos) {
    DATA.inlineQos := the_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
}
DATA.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
sendto the_reader_locator.locator, DATA;
```

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

```
( a_change BELONGS-TO the_reader_locator.unsent_changes() ) == FALSE
```

8.4.8.2.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the firing of a periodic timer configured to fire each W::heartbeatPeriod.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine for the Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ and ReaderLocator ‘the_reader_locator.’

```plaintext
seq_num_min := the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.get_seq_num_min();
seq_num_max := the_rtps_writer.writer_cache.get_seq_num_max();
HEARTBEAT := new HEARTBEAT(the_rtps_writer.writerGuid, seq_num_min, seq_num_max);
HEARTBEAT.FinalFlag := SET;
HEARTBEAT.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
sendto the_reader_locator, HEARTBEAT;
```

8.4.8.2.6 Transition T6

This transition is triggered by the reception of an ACKNACK message destined to the RTPS StatelessWriter ‘the_rtps_writer’ originating from some RTPS Reader.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
FOREACH reply_locator_t IN { Receiver.unicastReplyLocatorList,
    Receiver.multicastReplyLocatorList }
    reader_locator := the_rtps_writer.reader_locator_lookup(reply_locator_t);
    reader_locator.requested_changes_set(ACKNACK.readerSNState.set);
```

Note that the processing of this message uses the reply locators in the RTPS Receiver. This is the only source of information for the StatelessWriter to determine where to send the reply to. Proper functioning of the protocol requires that the RTPS Reader inserts an InfoReply Submessage ahead of the AckNack such that these fields are properly set.
8.4.8.2.7 Transition T7

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::requested_changes() != <empty>] indicating that there are changes that have been requested by some RTPS Reader reachable at the RTPS ReaderLocator. The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.8.2.8 Transition T8

This transition is triggered by the reception of an ACKNACK message destined to the RTPS StatelessWriter ‘the_rtps_writer’ originating from some RTPS Reader. The transition performs the same logical actions performed by Transition T6 (Section 8.4.8.2.6).

8.4.8.2.9 Transition T9

This transition is triggered by the firing of a timer indicating that the duration of W::nackResponseDelay has elapsed since the state must_repair was entered. The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.8.2.10 Transition T10

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::can_send() == true] indicating that the RTPS Writer ‘the_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS ReaderLocator ‘the_reader_locator.’ The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine.

```
  a_change := the_reader_locator.next_requested_change();
  IF a_change IN the_writer.writer_cache.changes {
    DATA = new DATA(a_change);
    IF (the_reader_locator.expectsInlineQos) {
      DATA.inlineQos := the_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
    }
    DATA.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
    sendto the_reader_locator.locator, DATA;
  }
  ELSE {
    GAP = new GAP(a_change.sequenceNumber);
    GAP.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
    sendto the_reader_locator.locator, GAP;
  }
```

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

```
  ( a_change BELONGS-TO the_reader_locator.requested_changes() ) == FALSE
```

Note that it is possible that the requested change had already been removed from the HistoryCache by the DDS DataWriter. In that case, the StatelessWriter sends a GAP Message.

8.4.8.2.11 Transition T11

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RL::requested_changes() == <empty>] indicating that there are no further changes requested by an RTPS Reader reachable at the RTPS ReaderLocator. The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.
8.4.8.2.12 Transition T12

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ to no longer send to the RTPS ReaderLocator ‘the_reader_locator.’ This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataReader with the DDS DataWriter related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
the_rtps_writer.reader_locator_remove(the_reader_locator);
delete the_reader_locator;
```

8.4.9 RTPS StatefulWriter Behavior

8.4.9.1 Best-Effort StatefulWriter Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatefulWriter with respect to each matched RTPS Reader is described in Figure 8.18. The behavior of a NO_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatefulWriter is identical.

![Figure 8.18 - Behavior of WITH_KEY Best-Effort StatefulWriter with respect to each matched Reader](image)
The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.60.

**Table 8.60 - Transitions for Best-effort Stateful Writer behavior with respect to each matched Reader**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured with a matched RTPS Reader</td>
<td>idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>idle</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP::unsent_changes() != &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>idle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP::unsent_changes() == &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>GuardCondition:</td>
<td>pushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RP::can_send() == true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>A new change was added to the RTPS Writer’s HistoryCache.</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>any state</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured to no longer be matched with the RTPS Reader</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.4.9.1.1 Transition T1**

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS **Writer** ‘the_rtps_writer’ with a matching RTPS **Reader**. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataReader that matches the DDS DataWriter that is related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the **ReaderProxy** constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
    a_reader_proxy := new ReaderProxy( remoteReaderGuid,
                                      expectsInlineQos,
                                      unicastLocatorList,
                                      multicastLocatorList);

    the_rtps_writer.matched_reader_add(a_reader_proxy);
```

The **ReaderProxy** ‘a_reader_proxy’ is initialized as discussed in Section 8.4.7.5. This includes initializing the set of unsent changes and applying DDS_FILTER to each of the changes.

**8.4.9.1.2 Transition T2**

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::unsent_changes() != <empty>] indicating that there are some changes in the RTPS **Writer HistoryCache** that have not been sent to the RTPS **Reader** represented by the **ReaderProxy**.

Note that for a Best-Effort **Writer**, W::pushMode == true, as there are no acknowledgements. Therefore, the **Writer** always pushes out data as it becomes available.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

**8.4.9.1.3 Transition T3**

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::unsent_changes() == <empty>] indicating that all changes in the RTPS **Writer HistoryCache** have been sent to the RTPS **Reader** represented by the **ReaderProxy**. Note that this does not indicate that the changes have been received, only that there has been an attempt made to send them.
The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

### 8.4.9.1.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RP}::\text{can\_send()} == \text{true}]\) indicating that the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
a_change := the_reader_proxy.next_unsent_change();
a_change.status := UNDERWAY;
if (a_change.is_relevant) {
    DATA = new DATA(a_change);
    if (the_reader_proxy.expectsInlineQos) {
        DATA.inlineQos := the_rtps_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
    }
    DATA.readerId := ENTITYID_UNKNOWN;
    send DATA;
}
```

The above logic is not meant to imply that each DATA Submessage is sent in a separate RTPS Message. Rather multiple Submessages can be combined into a single RTPS message.

After the transition, the following post-conditions hold:

\[(a\_change \text{ BELONGS-TO the_reader_proxy.unsent\_changes()} ) == \text{FALSE}\]

### 8.4.9.1.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the addition of a new CacheChange ‘a_change’ to the HistoryCache of the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ by the corresponding DDS DataWriter. Whether the change is relevant to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy’ is determined by the DDS_FILTER.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
ADD a_change TO the_reader_proxy.changes_for_reader;
IF (DDSFILTER(the_reader_proxy, change)) THEN change.is_relevant := FALSE;
ELSE change.is_relevant := TRUE;
IF (the_rtps_writer.pushMode == true) THEN change.status := UNSENT;
ELSE change.status := UNACKNOWLEDGED;
```

### 8.4.9.1.6 Transition T6

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ to no longer be matched with the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy’. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataReader with the DDS DataWriter related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
the_rtps_writer.matched_reader_remove(the_reader_proxy);
delete the_reader_proxy;
```
8.4.9.2 Reliable StatefulWriter Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Reliable RTPS StatefulWriter with respect to each matched RTPS Reader is described in Figure 8.19. The behavior of a NO_KEY Reliable RTPS StatefulWriter is identical.

Submessages are used instead of Data Submessages.
Figure 8.19 - Behavior of WITH_KEY Reliable StatefulWriter with respect to each matched Reader
The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.61.

### Table 8.61 - Transitions for Reliable StatefulWriter behavior with respect to each matched Reader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Writer is configured with a matched RTPS Reader</td>
<td>announcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T2         | announcing | GuardCondition:  
RP::unsent_changes() != <empty>                                  | pushing    |
| T3         | pushing  | GuardCondition:  
RP::unsent_changes() == <empty>                                     | announcing |
| T4         | pushing  | GuardCondition:  
RP::can_send() == true                                               | pushing    |
| T5         | announcing | GuardCondition:  
RP::unacked_changes() == <empty>                                     | idle       |
| T6         | idle     | GuardCondition:  
RP::unacked_changes() != <empty>                                     | announcing |
| T7         | announcing | after(W::heartbeatPeriod)                                             | announcing |
| T8         | waiting  | ACKNACK message is received                                           | waiting    |
| T9         | waiting  | GuardCondition:  
RP::requested_changes() != <empty>                                    | must_repair|
| T10        | must_repair | ACKNACK message is received                                           | must_repair|
| T11        | must_repair | after(W::nackResponseDelay)                                           | repairing  |
| T12        | repairing | GuardCondition:  
RP::can_send() == true                                               | repairing  |
| T13        | repairing | GuardCondition:  
RP::requested_changes() == <empty>                                    | waiting    |
| T14        | ready    | A new change was added to the RTPS Writer’s HistoryCache.             | ready      |
| T15        | ready    | A change was removed from the RTPS Writer’s HistoryCache.             | ready      |
| T16        | any state | RTPS Writer is configured to no longer be matched with the RTPS Reader | final      |

#### 8.4.9.2.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reliable StatefulWriter `the_rtps_writer` with a matching RTPS Reader. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataReader that matches the DDS DataWriter that is related to `the_rtps_writer`.

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the ReaderProxy constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:
a_reader_proxy := new ReaderProxy(remoteReaderGuid,
   expectsInlineQos,
   unicastLocatorList,
   multicastLocatorList);

the_rtps_writer.matched_reader_add(a_reader_proxy);

The ReaderProxy ‘a_reader_proxy’ is initialized as discussed in Section 8.4.7.5. This includes initializing the set of unsent changes and applying a filter to each of the changes.

8.4.9.2.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::unsent_changes() != <empty>] indicating that there are some changes in the RTPS Writer HistoryCache that have not been sent to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.9.2.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::unsent_changes() == <empty>] indicating that all changes in the RTPS Writer HistoryCache have been sent to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy. Note that this does not indicate that the changes have been received, only that there has been an attempt made to send them.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.9.2.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::can_send() == true] indicating that the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy’.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```
  a_change := the_reader_proxy.next_unsent_change();
  a_change.status := UNDERWAY;
  if (a_change.is_relevant) {
    DATA = new DATA(a_change);
    IF (the_reader_proxy.expectsInlineQos) {
      DATA.inlineQos := the_rtps_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
    }
    DATA.readerId := ENTITYID UNKNOWN;
    send DATA;
  }
  else {
    GAP = new GAP(a_change.sequenceNumber);
    GAP.readerId := ENTITYID UNKNOWN;
    send GAP;
  }
```

The above logic is not meant to imply that each DATA or GAP Submessage is sent in a separate RTPS Message. Rather multiple Submessages can be combined into a single RTPS message.

The above illustrates the simplified case where a GAP Submessage includes a single sequence number. This would result in potentially many Submessages in cases where many sequence numbers in close proximity refer to changes that are not relevant to the Reader. Efficient implementations will combine multiple ‘irrelevant’ sequence numbers as much as possible into a single GAP message.
After the transition, the following post-conditions hold:

\[
\{ \text{a\_change} \text{ \textbf{BELONGS-TO} \text{ the\_reader\_proxy.\text{unsent\_changes}()} \} = \text{FALSE}
\]

8.4.9.2.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RP::unacked\_changes()} == <\text{empty}>]\) indicating that all changes in the RTPS \textbf{Writer HistoryCache} have been acknowledged by the RTPS \textbf{Reader} represented by the \textbf{ReaderProxy}.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.9.2.6 Transition T6

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RP::unacked\_changes()} != <\text{empty}>]\) indicating that there are changes in the RTPS \textbf{Writer HistoryCache} have not been acknowledged by the RTPS \textbf{Reader} represented by the \textbf{ReaderProxy}.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.9.2.7 Transition T7

This transition is triggered by the firing of a periodic timer configured to fire each \texttt{W::heartbeatPeriod}.

The transition performs the following logical actions for the \textbf{StatefulWriter} ‘\texttt{the\_rtps\_writer}’ in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{seq\_num\_min} & := \text{the\_rtps\_writer.writer\_cache.get\_seq\_num\_min}(); \\
\text{seq\_num\_max} & := \text{the\_rtps\_writer.writer\_cache.get\_seq\_num\_max}(); \\
\text{HEARTBEAT} & := \text{new HEARTBEAT} (\text{the\_rtps\_writer.writerGuid}, \text{seq\_num\_min}, \text{seq\_num\_max}); \\
\text{HEARTBEAT.FinalFlag} & := \text{NOT\_SET}; \\
\text{HEARTBEAT.readerId} & := \text{ENTITYID\_UNKNOWN}; \\
\text{send} \text{ HEARTBEAT}; \\
\end{align*}
\]

8.4.9.2.8 Transition T8

This transition is triggered by the reception of an \texttt{ACKNACK} Message destined to the RTPS \textbf{StatefulWriter} ‘\texttt{the\_rtps\_writer}’ originating from the RTPS \textbf{Reader} represented by the \textbf{ReaderProxy} ‘\texttt{the\_reader\_proxy}.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{the\_rtps\_writer.acked\_changes\_set} (\text{ACKNACK.readerSNState.base} - 1); \\
\text{the\_reader\_proxy.requested\_changes\_set} (\text{ACKNACK.readerSNState.set}); \\
\end{align*}
\]

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

\[
\text{MIN} \{ \text{change.sequenceNumber} \text{ IN } \text{the\_reader\_proxy.\text{unacked\_changes}()} \} \geq \text{ACKNACK.readerSNState.base} - 1
\]

8.4.9.2.9 Transition T9

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([\text{RP::requested\_changes()} != <\text{empty}>]\) indicating that there are changes that have been requested by the RTPS \textbf{Reader} represented by the \textbf{ReaderProxy}.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.
8.4.9.2.10 Transition T10

This transition is triggered by the reception of an ACKNACK message destined to the RTPS StatefulWriter ‘the_writer’ originating from the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy.’

The transition performs the same logical actions as Transition T8 (Section 8.4.9.2.8).

8.4.9.2.11 Transition T11

This transition is triggered by the firing of a timer indicating that the duration of W::nackResponseDelay has elapsed since the state must_repair was entered.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.9.2.12 Transition T12

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::can_send == true] indicating that the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ has the resources needed to send a change to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```c
a_change := the_reader_proxy.next_requested_change();
a_change.status := UNDERWAY;
if (a_change.is_relevant) {
    DATA = new DATA(a_change, the_reader_proxy.remoteReaderGuid);
    IF (the_reader_proxy.expectsInlineQos) {
        DATA.inlineQos := the_rtps_writer.related_dds_writer.qos;
    }
    send DATA;
} else {
    GAP = new GAP(a_change.sequenceNumber, the_reader_proxy.remoteReaderGuid);
    send GAP;
}
```

The above logic is not meant to imply that each DATA or GAP Submessage is sent in a separate RTPS message. Rather multiple Submessages can be combined into a single RTPS message.

The above illustrates the simplified case where a GAP Submessage includes a single sequence number. This would result in potentially many Submessages in cases where many sequence numbers in close proximity refer to changes that are not relevant to the Reader. Efficient implementations will combine multiple ‘irrelevant’ sequence numbers as much as possible into a single GAP message.

After the transition the following post-condition holds:

```c
(a_change BELONGS-TO the_reader_proxy.requested_changes()) == FALSE
```

8.4.9.2.13 Transition T13

This transition is triggered by the guard condition [RP::requested_changes() == <empty>] indicating that there are no more changes requested by the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.
8.4.9.2.14 Transition T14

This transition is triggered by the addition of a new CacheChange ‘a_change’ to the HistoryCache of the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ by the corresponding DDS DataWriter. Whether the change is relevant to the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy’ is determined by the DDS_FILTER.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```
ADD a_change TO the_reader_proxy.changes_for_reader;
IF (DDS_FILTER(the_reader_proxy, change)) THEN a_change.is_relevant := FALSE;
ELSE a_change.is_relevant := TRUE;
IF (the_rtps_writer.pushMode == true) THEN a_change.status := UNSENT;
ELSE a_change.status := UNACKNOWLEDGED;
```

8.4.9.2.15 Transition T15

This transition is triggered by the removal of a CacheChange ‘a_change’ from the HistoryCache of the RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ by the corresponding DDS DataWriter. For example, when using HISTORY QoS set to KEEP_LAST with depth == 1, a new change will cause the DDS DataWriter to remove the previous change from the HistoryCache.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```
a_change.is_relevant := FALSE;
```

8.4.9.2.16 Transition T16

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Writer ‘the_rtps_writer’ to no longer be matched with the RTPS Reader represented by the ReaderProxy ‘the_reader_proxy.’ This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataReader with the DDS DataWriter related to ‘the_rtps_writer.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```
the_rtps_writer.matched_reader_remove(the_reader_proxy);
delete the_reader_proxy;
```

8.4.9.3 ChangeForReader illustrated

The ChangeForReader keeps track of the communication status (attribute status) and relevance (attribute is_relevant) of each CacheChange with respect to a specific remote RTPS Reader, identified by the corresponding ReaderProxy.

The attribute is_relevant is initialized to TRUE or FALSE when the ChangeForReader is created, depending on the DDS QoS and Filters that may apply. A ChangeForReader that initially has is_relevant set to TRUE may have the setting modified to FALSE when the corresponding CacheChange has become irrelevant for the RTPS Reader because of a later CacheChange. This can happen, for example, when the DDS QoS of the related DDS DataWriter specifies a HISTORY kind KEEP_LAST and a later CacheChange modifies the value of the same data-object (identified by the instanceHandle attribute of the CacheChange) making the previous CacheChange irrelevant.

The behavior of the RTPS StatelessWriter described in Figure 8.20 and Figure 8.21 modifies each ChangeForReader as a side-effect of the operation of the protocol. To further define the protocol, it is illustrative to examine the Finite State Machine representing the value of the status attribute for any given ChangeForReader. This is shown in Figure 8.22 below for a Reliable StatelessWriter. A Best-Effort StatelessWriter uses only a subset of the state-diagram.
Figure 8.20 - Changes in the value of the status attribute of each ChangeForReader

The states have the following meanings:

- **<New>**: a `CacheChange` with `SequenceNumber_t` ‘seq_num’ is available in the `HistoryCache` of the RTPS `StatefulWriter` but this has not been announced yet or sent to the RTPS `Reader` represented by the `ReaderProxy`.

- **<Unsent>**: the `StatefulWriter` has never sent a DATA or GAP with this seq_num to the RTPS `Reader` and it intends to do so in the future.

- **<Requested>**: the RTPS `Reader` has requested via an ACKNACK message that the change is sent again. The `StatefulWriter` intends to send the change again in the future.

- **<Underway>**: the `CacheChange` has been sent and the `StatefulWriter` will ignore new requests for this `CacheChange`.

- **<Unacknowledged>**: the `CacheChange` should be received by the RTPS `Reader`, but this has not been acknowledged by the RTPS `Reader`. As the message could have been lost, the RTPS `Reader` may request the `CacheChange` to be sent again.

- **<Acknowledged>**: the RTPS `StatefulWriter` knows that the RTPS `Reader` has received the `CacheChange` with `SequenceNumber_t` ‘seq_num’.

The following describes the main events that trigger transitions in the State Machine. Note that this state-machine just keeps track of the ‘status’ attribute of a particular `ChangeForReader` and does not perform any specific actions nor send any messages.

- **new ChangeForReader (seq_num)**: The `ReaderProxy` has created a `ChangeForReader` association class to track the state of a `CacheChange` with `SequenceNumber_t` seq_num.
• [W::pushMode == true]: The setting of the StatefulWriter’s attribute W::pushMode determines whether the status is changed to <Unsent> or else is changed to <Unacknowledged>. A Best-Effort Writer always uses W::pushMode == true.

• received NACK(seq_num): The StatefulWriter has received an ACKNACK message where seq_num belongs to the ACKNACK.readerSNState, indicating the RTPS Reader has not received the CacheChange and wants the StatefulWriter to send it again.

• sent DATA(seq_num): The StatefulWriter has sent a DATA message containing the CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num.

• sent GAP(seq_num): The StatefulWriter has sent a GAP where seq_num is in the GAP’s irrelevant_sequence_number_list, which means that the seq_num is irrelevant to the RTPS Reader.

• received ACK(seq_num): The Writer has received an ACKNACK with ACKNACK.readerSNState.base > seq_num. This means the CacheChange with sequence number seq_num has been received by the RTPS Reader.

8.4.10 RTPS Reader Reference Implementations

The RTPS Reader Reference Implementations are based on specializations of the RTPS Reader class, first introduced in Section 8.2. This section describes the RTPS Reader and all additional classes used to model the RTPS Reader Reference Implementations. The actual behavior is described in Section 8.4.11 and Section 8.4.12.
8.4.10.1 RTPS Reader

RTPS Reader specializes RTPS Endpoint and represents the actor that receives CacheChange messages from one or more RTPS Writer endpoints. The Reference Implementations StatelessReader and StatefulReader specialize RTPS Reader and differ in the knowledge they maintain about the matched Writer endpoints.

Figure 8.21 - RTPS Reader endpoints
The configuration attributes of the RTPS Reader are listed in Table 8.62 and allow for fine-tuning of the protocol behavior. The operations on an RTPS Reader are listed in Table 8.63.

**Table 8.62 - RTPS Reader configuration attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heartbeatResponseDelay</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that allows the RTPS Reader to delay the sending of a positive or negative acknowledgment (see Section 8.4.12.2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heartbeatSuppressionDuration</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>Protocol tuning parameter that allows the RTPS Reader to ignore HEARTBEATs that arrive ‘too soon’ after a previous HEARTBEAT was received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reader_cache</td>
<td>History Cache</td>
<td>Contains the history of CacheChange changes for this RTPS Reader.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectsInlineQos</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Specifies whether the RTPS Reader expects in-line QoS to be sent along with any data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.63 - RTPS Reader operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the Reader and all the super classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections provide details on the operations.

**8.4.10.1.1 Default Timing-Related Values**

The following timing-related values are used as the defaults in order to facilitate ‘out-of-the-box’ interoperability between implementations.

```plaintext
heartbeatResponseDelay.sec = 0;
heartbeatResponseDelay.nanosec = 500 * 1000 * 1000; // 500 milliseconds
heartbeatSuppressionDuration.sec = 0;
heartbeatSuppressionDuration.nanosec = 0;
```
8.4.10.1.2 new

This operation creates a new RTPS Reader.

The newly-created reader ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

```
this.guid := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.unicastLocatorList := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.multicastLocatorList := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.reliabilityLevel := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.topicKind := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.expectsInlineQos := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.heartbeatResponseDelay := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.reader_cache := new HistoryCache;
```

8.4.10.2 RTPS StatelessReader

Specialization of RTPS Reader. The RTPS StatelessReader has no knowledge of the number of matched writers, nor does it maintain any state for each matched RTPS Writer.

In the current Reference Implementation, the StatelessReader does not add any configuration attributes or operations to those inherited from the Reader super class. Both classes are therefore identical. The virtual machine interacts with the StatelessReader using the operations in Table 8.64.

Table 8.64 - StatelessReader operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StatelessReader operations</th>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>StatelessReader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the StatelessReader and all the super classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.10.2.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS StatelessReader. The initialization is performed as on the RTPS Reader super class (Section 8.4.10.1.2).
8.4.10.3 RTPS StatefulReader

Specialization of RTPS Reader. The RTPS StatefulReader keeps state on each matched RTPS Writer. The state kept on each writer is encapsulated in the RTPS WriterProxy class.

**Table 8.65 - RTPS StatefulReader Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matched_writers</td>
<td>WriteProxy[*]</td>
<td>Used to maintain state on the remote Writers matched up with the Reader.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The virtual machine interacts with the StatefulReader using the operations in Table 8.66.

**Table 8.66 - StatefulReader Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>StatefulReader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matched_writer_add</td>
<td>a_writer_proxy</td>
<td>WriterProxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matched_writer_remove</td>
<td>a_writer_proxy</td>
<td>WriterProxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matched_writer_lookup</td>
<td>a_writer_guid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.10.3.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS StatefulReader. The newly-created stateful reader ‘this’ is initialized as follows:

```plaintext
this.attributes := <as specified in the constructor>;
this.matched_writers := <empty>;
```

8.4.10.3.2 matched_writer_add

This operation adds the WriterProxy a_writer_proxy to the StatefulReader::matched_writers.

```plaintext
ADD a_writer_proxy TO {this.matched_writers};
```
8.4.10.3.3 matched_writer_remove

This operation removes the WriterProxy a_writer_proxy from the set StatefulReader::matched_writers.

```
REMOVE a_writer_proxy FROM {this.matched_writers};
delete a_writer_proxy;
```

8.4.10.3.4 matched_writer_lookup

This operation finds the WriterProxy with GUID_t a_writer_guid from the set StatefulReader::matched_writers.

```
FIND proxy IN this.matched_writers SUCH-THAT (proxy.remoteWriterGuid == a_writer_guid);
return proxy;
```

8.4.10.4 RTPS WriterProxy

The RTPS WriterProxy represents the information an RTPS StatefulReader maintains on each matched RTPS Writer. The attributes of the RTPS WriterProxy are described in Table 8.67.

The association is a consequence of the matching of the corresponding DDS Entities as defined by the DDS specification, that is the DDS DataReader matching a DDS DataWriter by Topic, having compatible QoS, belonging to a common partition, and not being explicitly ignored by the application that uses DDS.

**Table 8.67 - RTPS WriterProxy Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>remoteWriterGuid</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>Identifies the matched Writer.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of unicast (address, port) combinations that can be used to send messages to the matched Writer or Writers. The list may be empty.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of multicast (address, port) combinations that can be used to send messages to the matched Writer or Writers. The list may be empty.</td>
<td>N/A. Configured by discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes_from_writer</td>
<td>CacheChange[*]</td>
<td>List of CacheChange changes received or expected from the matched RTPS Writer.</td>
<td>N/A. Used to implement the behavior of the RTPS protocol.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The virtual machine interacts with the `WriterProxy` using the operations in Table 8.68.

### Table 8.68 - WriterProxy Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>operation name</th>
<th>parameter list</th>
<th>parameter type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>WriterProxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attribute_values</td>
<td>Set of attribute values required by the WriterProxy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available_changes_max</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrelevant_change_set</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_seq_num</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost_changes_update</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first_available_seq_num</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing_changes</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing_changes_update</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>last_available_seq_num</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received_change_set</td>
<td>&lt;return value&gt;</td>
<td>void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a_seq_num</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.4.10.4.1 new

This operation creates a new RTPS `WriterProxy`.

The newly-created writer proxy `‘this’` is initialized as follows:

```plaintext
    this.attributes := <as specified in the constructor>;
    this.changes_from_writer := <all past and future samples from the writer>;
```

The `changes_from_writer` of the newly-created `WriterProxy` is initialized to contain all past and future samples from the `Writer` represented by the `WriterProxy`. This is a conceptual representation only, used to describe the Stateful Reference Implementation. The `ChangeFromWriter` status of each `CacheChange` in `changes_from_writer` is initialized to UNKNOWN, indicating the StatefulReader initially does not know whether any of these changes actually already exist. As discussed in Section 8.4.12.3, the status will change to RECEIVED or MISSING as the StatefulReader receives the actual changes or is informed about their existence via a HEARTBEAT message.

### 8.4.10.4.2 available_changes_max

This operation returns the maximum `SequenceNumber_t` among the `changes_from_writer` changes in the RTPS `WriterProxy` that are available for access by the DDS `DataReader`. 
The condition to make any *CacheChange* ‘a_change’ available for ‘access’ by the DDS DataReader is that there are no changes from the RTPS *Writer* with *SequenceNumber_t* smaller than or equal to ‘a_change.sequenceNumber’ that have status MISSING or UNKNOWN. In other words, the available_changes_max and all previous changes are either RECEIVED or LOST.

Logical action in the virtual machine:

```java
seq_num := MAX { change.sequenceNumber SUCH-TTHAT
    { change IN this.changes_from_writer
        AND ( change.status == RECEIVED
            OR change.status == LOST ) } }

return seq_num;
```

### 8.4.10.4.3 irrelevant_change_set

This operation modifies the status of a *ChangeFromWriter* to indicate that the *CacheChange* with the *SequenceNumber_t* ‘a_seq_num’ is irrelevant to the RTPS *Reader*.

Logical action in the virtual machine:

```java
FIND change FROM this.changes_from_writer SUCH-TTHAT ( change.sequenceNumber == a_seq_num );
change.status := RECEIVED;
change.is_relevant := FALSE;
```

### 8.4.10.4.4 lost_changes_update

This operation modifies the status stored in *ChangeFromWriter* for any changes in the *WriterProxy* whose status is MISSING or UNKNOWN and have sequence numbers lower than ‘first_available_seq_num.’ The status of those changes is modified to LOST indicating that the changes are no longer available in the *WriterHistoryCache* of the RTPS *Writer* represented by the RTPS *WriterProxy*.

Logical action in the virtual machine:

```java
FOREACH change IN this.changes_from_writer SUCH-TTHAT ( change.status == UNKNOWN OR change.status == MISSING AND seq_num < first_available_seq_num ) DO {
    change.status := LOST;
}
```

### 8.4.10.4.5 missing_changes

This operation returns the subset of changes for the *WriterProxy* that have status ‘MISSING.’ The changes with status ‘MISSING’ represent the set of changes available in the *HistoryCache* of the RTPS *Writer* represented by the RTPS *WriterProxy* that have not been received by the RTPS *Reader*.

```java
return { change IN this.changes_from_writer SUCH-TTHAT change.status == MISSING };
```

### 8.4.10.4.6 missing_changes_update

This operation modifies the status stored in *ChangeFromWriter* for any changes in the *WriterProxy* whose status is UNKNOWN and have sequence numbers smaller or equal to ‘last_available_seq_num.’ The status of those changes is modified from UNKNOWN to MISSING indicating that the changes are available at the *WriterHistoryCache* of the RTPS *Writer* represented by the RTPS *WriterProxy* but have not been received by the RTPS *Reader*.
Logical action in the virtual machine:

```java
FOREACH change IN this.changes_from_writer
    SUCH-THAT ( change.status == UNKNOWN
            AND seq_num <= last_available_seq_num ) DO {
        change.status := MISSING;
    }
```

**8.4.10.4.7 received_change_set**

This operation modifies the status of the ChangeFromWriter that refers to the CacheChange with the SequenceNumber_t 'a_seq_num.' The status of the change is set to ‘RECEIVED,’ indicating it has been received.

Logical action in the virtual machine:

```java
FIND change FROM this.changes_from_writer SUCH-THAT change.sequenceNumber == a_seq_num;
change.status := RECEIVED
```

**8.4.10.5 RTPS ChangeFromWriter**

The RTPS ChangeFromWriter is an association class that maintains information of a CacheChange in the RTPS Reader HistoryCache as it pertains to the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy.

The attributes of the RTPS ChangeFromWriter are described in Table 8.69.

**Table 8.69 - RTPS ChangeFromWriter Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>relation to DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>ChangeFromWriter StatusKind</td>
<td>Indicates the status of a CacheChange relative to the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy.</td>
<td>N/A. Used by the protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is_relevant</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Indicates whether the change is relevant to the RTPS Reader.</td>
<td>The determination of irrelevant changes is affected by DDS DataReader TIME_BASED_FILTER QoS and also by the use of DDS ContentFilteredTopics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.4.11 RTPS StatelessReader Behavior**

**8.4.11.1 Best-Effort StatelessReader Behavior**

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatelessReader is independent of any writers and is described in Figure 8.22.

The behavior of a NO_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatelessReader is identical.
Figure 8.22 - Behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort StatelessReader

The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.70.

Table 8.70 - Transitions for Best-effort StatelessReader behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is created</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>DATA message is received</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is deleted</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.11.1.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the creation of an RTPS StatelessReader ‘the_rtps_reader.’ This is the result of the creation of a DDS DataReader as described in Section 8.2.9.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.11.1.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the reception of a DATA message by the RTPS Reader ‘the_rtps_reader.’ The DATA message encapsulates the change ‘a_change.’ The encapsulation is described in Section 8.3.7.2.

The stateless nature of the StatelessReader prevents it from maintaining the information required to determine the highest sequence number received so far from the originating RTPS Writer. The consequence is that in those cases the corresponding DDS DataReader may be presented duplicate or out-of order changes. Note that if the DDS DataReader is configured to order data by ‘source timestamp,’ any available data will still be presented in-order when accessing the data through the DDS DataReader.

As mentioned in Section 8.4.3, actual stateless implementations may try to avoid this limitation and maintain this information in non-permanent fashion (using for example a cache that expires information after a certain time) to approximate, to the extent possible, the behavior that would result if the state were maintained.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:
8.4.11.1.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the destruction of an RTPS Reader ‘the_rtps_reader.’ This is the result of the destruction of a DDS DataReader as described in Section 8.2.9.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.11.2 Reliable StatelessReader Behavior

This combination is not supported by the RTPS protocol. In order to implement the reliable protocol, the RTPS Reader must keep some state on each matched RTPS Writer.

8.4.12 RTPS StatefulReader Behavior

8.4.12.1 Best-Effort StatefulReader Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatefulReader with respect to each matched Writer is described in Figure 8.23.

The behavior of a NO_KEY Best-Effort RTPS StatefulReader is identical.

![Figure 8.23 - Behavior of the WITH_KEY Best-Effort StatefulReader with respect to each matched Writer](image_url)

The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.71.

**Table 8.71 - Transitions for Best-Effort StatefulReader behavior with respect to each matched writer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is configured with a matched RTPS Writer</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4.12.1.1 Transition T1

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reader ‘the_rtps_reader’ with a matching RTPS Writer. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataWriter that matches the DDS DataReader that is related to ‘the_rtps_reader.’

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the WriterProxy constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
a_writer_proxy := new WriterProxy(remoteWriterGuid, unicastLocatorList, multicastLocatorList);
the_rtps_reader.matched_writer_add(a_writer_proxy);
```

The WriterProxy is initialized with all past and future samples from the Writer as discussed in Section 8.4.10.4.

8.4.12.1.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the reception of a DATA message by the RTPS Reader ‘the_rtps_reader.’ The DATA message encapsulates the change ‘a_change.’ The encapsulation is described in Section 8.3.7.2.

The Best-Effort reader checks that the sequence number associated with the change is strictly greater than the highest sequence number of all changes received in the past from this RTPS Writer (WP::available_changes_max()). If this check fails, the RTPS Reader discards the change. This ensures that there are no duplicate changes and no out-of-order changes.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
a_change := new CacheChange(DATA);
writer_guid := {Receiver.SourceGuidPrefix, DATA.writerId};
writer_proxy := the_rtps_reader.matched_writer_lookup(writer_guid);
expected_seq_num := writer_proxy.available_changes_max() + 1;
if ( a_change.sequenceNumber >= expected_seq_num ) {  
    the_rtps_reader.reader_cache.add_change(a_change);
    writer_proxy.received_change_set(a_change.sequenceNumber);
    if ( a_change.sequenceNumber > expected_seq_num ) {  
        writer_proxy.lost_changes_update(a_change.sequenceNumber);
    }
}  
```

After the transition the following post-conditions hold:

```
writer_proxy.available_changes_max() >= a_change.sequenceNumber
```
8.4.12.1.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reader ‘the_rtps_reader’ to no longer be matched with the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy ‘the_writer_proxy.’ This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataWriter with the DDS DataReader related to ‘the_rtps_reader.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```plaintext
the_rtps_reader.matched_writer_remove(the_writer_proxy);
delete the_writer_proxy;
```

8.4.12.2 Reliable StatefulReader Behavior

The behavior of the WITH_KEY Reliable RTPS StatefulReader with respect to each matched RTPS Writer is described in Figure 8.24. The behavior of a NO_KEY Reliable RTPS StatefulReader is identical.

![Behavior of the Reliable StatefulReader with respect to each matched Writer](image-url)

**Figure 8.24 - Behavior of the Reliable StatefulReader with respect to each matched Writer**
The state-machine transitions are listed in Table 8.72.

**Table 8.72 - Transitions for Reliable reader behavior with respect to a matched writer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>state</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>initial1</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is configured with a matched RTPS Writer.</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>HEARTBEAT message is received.</td>
<td>if (HB.FinalFlag == NOT_SET) then must_send_ack else if (HB.LivelinessFlag == NOT_SET) then may_send_ack else waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>may_send_ack</td>
<td>GuardCondition: WP::missing_changes() == &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>may_send_ack</td>
<td>GuardCondition: WP::missing_changes() != &lt;empty&gt;</td>
<td>must_send_ack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>must_send_ack</td>
<td>after(R::heartbeatResponseDelay)</td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>initial2</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is configured with a matched RTPS Writer.</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>HEARTBEAT message is received.</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>DATA message is received.</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>GAP message is received.</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>any state</td>
<td>RTPS Reader is configured to no longer be matched with the RTPS Writer.</td>
<td>final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.4.12.2.1 Transition T1**

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reliable StatefulReader ‘the_rtps_reader’ with a matching RTPS Writer. This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of the discovery of a DDS DataWriter that matches the DDS DataReader that is related to ‘the_rtps_reader.’

The discovery protocol supplies the values for the WriterProxy constructor parameters.

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
a_writer_proxy := new WriterProxy(remoteWriterGuid, unicastLocatorList, multicastLocatorList);
the_rtps_reader.matched_writer_add(a_writer_proxy);
```

TheWriterProxy is initialized with all past and future samples from the Writer as discussed in Section 8.4.10.4.
8.4.12.2.2 Transition T2

This transition is triggered by the reception of a HEARTBEAT message destined to the RTPS StatefulReader ‘the_reader’ originating from the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy ‘the_writer_proxy.’

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine. Note however that the reception of a HEARTBEAT message causes the concurrent transition T7 (Section 8.4.12.2.7), which performs logical actions.

8.4.12.2.3 Transition T3

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([W::missing_changes() == <empty>]\) indicating that all changes known to be in the HistoryCache of the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy have been received by the RTPS Reader.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.12.2.4 Transition T4

This transition is triggered by the guard condition \([W::missing_changes() != <empty>]\) indicating that there are some changes known to be in the HistoryCache of the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy, which have not been received by the RTPS Reader.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.12.2.5 Transition T5

This transition is triggered by the firing of a timer indicating that the duration of R::heartbeatResponseDelay has elapsed since the state must_send_ack was entered.

The transition performs the following logical actions for the WriterProxy ‘the_writer_proxy’ in the virtual machine:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{missing_seq_num_set.base} &:= \text{the_writer_proxy.available_changes_max()} + 1; \\
\text{missing_seq_num_set.set} &:= <\text{empty}>; \\
\text{FOREACH change IN the_writer_proxy.missing_changes()} DO \\
&\quad \text{ADD change.sequenceNumber TO missing_seq_num_set.set;} \\
&\quad \text{send ACKNACK(missing_seq_num_set);} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The above logical action does not express the fact that the PSM mapping of the ACKNACK message will be limited in its capacity to contain sequence numbers. In the case where the ACKNACK message cannot accommodate the complete list of missing sequence numbers it should be constructed such that it contains the subset with smaller value of the sequence number.

8.4.12.2.6 Transition T6

Similar to T1 (Section 8.4.12.2.1) this transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS Reliable StatefulReader ‘the_rtps_reader’ with a matching RTPS Writer.

The transition performs no logical actions in the virtual machine.

8.4.12.2.7 Transition T7

This transition is triggered by the reception of a HEARTBEAT message destined to the RTPS StatefulReader ‘the_reader’ originating from the RTPS Writer represented by the WriterProxy ‘the_writer_proxy.’
The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
the_writer_proxy.missing_changes_update(HEARTBEAT.lastSN);
the_writer_proxy.lost_changes_update(HEARTBEAT.firstSN);
```

### 8.4.12.2.8 Transition T8

This transition is triggered by the reception of a DATA message destined to the RTPS `StatefulReader` ‘the_reader’ originating from the RTPS `Writer` represented by the `WriterProxy` ‘the_writer_proxy.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
a_change := new CacheChange(DATA);
the_reader.reader_cache.add_change(a_change);
the_writer_proxy.received_change_set(a_change.sequenceNumber);
```

Any filtering is done when accessing the data using the DDS DataReader read or take operations, as described in Section 8.2.9.

### 8.4.12.2.9 Transition T9

This transition is triggered by the reception of a GAP message destined to the RTPS `StatefulReader` ‘the_reader’ originating from the RTPS `Writer` represented by the `WriterProxy` ‘the_writer_proxy.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
FOREACH seq_num IN [GAP.gapStart, GAP.gapList.base-1] DO {
  the_writer_proxy.irrelevant_change_set(seq_num);
}
FOREACH seq_num IN GAP.gapList DO {
  the_writer_proxy.irrelevant_change_set(seq_num);
}
```

### 8.4.12.2.10 Transition T10

This transition is triggered by the configuration of an RTPS `Reader` ‘the_rtps_reader’ to no longer be matched with the RTPS `Writer` represented by the `WriterProxy` ‘the_writer_proxy.’ This configuration is done by the Discovery protocol (Section 8.5) as a consequence of breaking a pre-existing match of a DDS DataWriter with the DDS DataReader related to ‘the_rtps_reader.’

The transition performs the following logical actions in the virtual machine:

```java
the_rtps_reader.matched_writer_remove(the_writer_proxy);
delete the_writer_proxy;
```

### 8.4.12.3 ChangeFromWriter illustrated

The `ChangeFromWriter` keeps track of the communication status (attribute `status`) and relevance (attribute `is_relevant`) of each `CacheChange` with respect to a specific remote RTPS `Writer`.

The behavior of the RTPS `StatefulReader` described in Figure 8.24 modifies each `ChangeFromWriter` as a side-effect of the operation of the protocol. To further define the protocol it is illustrative to examine the State Machine representing the value of the `status` attribute for any given `ChangeFromWriter`. This is shown in Figure 8.25 for a Reliable `StatefulReader`. A Best-Effort `StatefulReader` uses only a subset of the state-diagram.
Figure 8.25 - Changes in the value of the status attribute of each ChangeFromWriter

The states have the following meanings:

- **<Unknown>**: A CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num may or may not be available yet at the RTPS Writer.
- **<Missing>**: The CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num is available in the RTPS Writer and has not been received yet by the RTPS Reader.
- **<Requested>**: The CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num was requested from the RTPS Writer, a response might be pending or underway.
- **<Received>**: The CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num was received: as a DATA if the seq_num is relevant to the RTPS Reader or as a GAP if the seq_num is irrelevant.
- **<Lost>**: The CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num is no longer available at the RTPS Writer. It will not be received.

The following describes the main events that trigger transitions in the State Machine. Note that this state-machine just keeps track of the 'status' attribute of a particular ChangeForReader and does not perform any specific actions nor send any messages.

- new ChangeFromWriter(seq_num): The WriterProxy has created a ChangeFromWriter association class to track the state of a CacheChange with SequenceNumber_t seq_num.
- received HB(firstSN <= seq_num <= lastSN): The Reader has received a HEARTBEAT with HEARTBEAT.firstSN <= seq_num <= HEARTBEAT.lastSN, indicating a CacheChange with that sequence number is available from the RTPS Writer.
- sent NACK(seq_num): The Reader has sent an ACKNACK message containing the seq_num inside the ACKNACK.readerSNState, indicating the RTPS Reader has not received the CacheChange and is requesting it is sent again.
- received GAP(seq_num): The Reader has received a GAP message where seq_num is inside GAP.gapList, which means that the seq_num is irrelevant to the RTPS Reader.
• received DATA(seq_num) : The Reader has received a DATA message with DATA.sequenceNumber == seq_num.

• received HB(firstSN > seq_num) : The Reader has received a HEARTBEAT with HEARTBEAT.firstSN > seq_num, indicating the CacheChange with that sequence number is no longer available from the RTPS Writer.

8.4.13 Writer Liveliness Protocol

The DDS specification requires the presence of a liveliness mechanism. RTPS realizes this requirement with the Writer Liveliness Protocol. The Writer Liveliness Protocol defines the required information exchange between two Participants in order to assert the liveliness of Writers contained by the Participants.

All implementations must support the Writer Liveliness Protocol in order to be interoperable.

8.4.13.1 General Approach

The Writer Liveliness Protocol uses pre-defined built-in Endpoints. The use of built-in Endpoints means that once a Participant knows of the presence of another Participant, it can assume the presence of the built-in Endpoints made available by the remote Participant and establish the association with the locally matching built-in Endpoints.

The protocol used to communicate between built-in Endpoints is the same as used for application-defined Endpoints.

8.4.13.2 Built-in Endpoints Required by the Writer Liveliness Protocol

The built-in Endpoints required by the Writer Liveliness Protocol are the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter and BuiltinParticipantMessageReader. The names of these Endpoints reflect the fact that they are general-purpose. These Endpoints are used for liveliness but can be used for other data in the future.

The RTPS Protocol reserves the following values of the EntityId_t for these built-in Endpoints:

ENTITYID_P2P_BUILTIN_PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_WRITER
ENTITYID_P2P_BUILTIN_PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_READER

The actual value for each of these EntityId_t instances is defined by each PSM.

8.4.13.3 BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter and BuiltinParticipantMessageReader QoS

For interoperability, both the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter and BuiltinParticipantMessageReader use the following QoS values:

• reliability.kind = RELIABLE_RELIABILITY_QOS
• durability.kind = TRANSIENT_LOCAL_DURABILITY
• history.kind = KEEP_LAST_HISTORY_QOS
• history.depth = 1

8.4.13.4 Data Types Associated with Built-in Endpoints used by Writer Liveliness Protocol

Each RTPS Endpoint has a HistoryCache that stores changes to the data-objects associated with the Endpoint. This is also true for the RTPS built-in Endpoints. Therefore, each RTPS built-in Endpoint depends on some DataType that represents the logical contents of the data written into its HistoryCache.
Figure 8.26 defines the ParticipantMessageData datatype associated with the RTPS built-in Endpoint for the DCPSParticipantMessage Topic.

![ParticipantMessageData](image)

**Figure 8.26 - ParticipantMessageData**

### 8.4.13.5 Implementing Writer Liveliness Protocol Using the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter and BuiltinParticipantMessageReader

The liveliness of a subset of Writers belonging to a Participant is asserted by writing a sample to the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter. If the Participant contains one or more Writers with a liveliness of AUTOMATIC_LIVELINESS_QOS, then one sample is written at a rate faster than the smallest lease duration among the Writers sharing this QoS. Similarly, a separate sample is written if the Participant contains one or more Writers with a liveliness of MANUAL_BY_PARTICIPANT_LIVELINESS_QOS at a rate faster than the smallest lease duration among these Writers. The two instances are orthogonal in purpose so that if a Participant contains Writers of each of the two liveliness kinds described, two separate instances must be periodically written. The instances are distinguished using their DDS key, which is comprised of the participantGuidPrefix and kind fields. Each of the two types of liveliness QoS handled through this protocol will result in a unique kind field and therefore form two distinct instances in the HistoryCache.

In both liveliness cases the participantGuidPrefix field contains the GuidPrefix_t of the Participant that is writing the data (and therefore asserting the liveliness of its Writers).

The DDS liveliness kind MANUAL_BY_TOPIC_LIVELINESS_QOS is not implemented using the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter and BuiltinParticipantMessageReader. It is discussed in Section 8.7.2.2.3.

### 8.4.14 Optional Behavior

This section describes optional features of the RTPS protocol. Optional features may not be supported by all RTPS implementations. An optional feature does not affect basic interoperability, but is only available if all implementations involved support it.

#### 8.4.14.1 Large Data

As described in Section 7.6, RTPS poses very few requirements on the underlying transport. It is sufficient that the transport offers a connectionless service capable of sending packets best-effort.

That said, a transport may impose its own limitations. For example, it may limit the maximum packet size (e.g., 64K for UDP) and hence the maximum RTPS Submessage size. This mainly affects the Data Submessage, as it limits the maximum size of the serializedData or also, the maximum serialized size of the data type used.

In order to address this limitation, Section 8.3.7 introduces the following Submessages to enable fragmenting large data:

- DataFrag
- HeartbeatFrag
- NackFrag
The following sections list the corresponding behavior required for interoperability.

8.4.14.1.1 How to select the fragment size

The fragment size is determined by the Writer and must meet the following requirements:

- All transports available to the Writer must be able to accommodate DataFrag Submessages containing at least one fragment. This means the transport with the smallest maximum message size determines the fragment size.

- The fragment size must be fixed for a given Writer and is identical for all remote Readers. By fixing the fragment size, the data a fragment number refers to does not depend on a particular remote Reader. This simplifies processing negative acknowledgements (NackFrag) from a Reader.

- The fragment size must satisfy 1KB < fragment size < 64 KB.

Note the fragment size is determined by all transports available to the Writer, not simply the subset of transports required to reach all currently known Readers. This ensures newly discovered Readers, regardless of the transport transport they can be reached on, can be accommodated without having to change the fragment size, which would violate the above requirements.

8.4.14.1.2 How to send fragments

If fragmentation is required, a Data Submessage is replaced by a sequence of DataFrag Submessages. The protocol behavior for sending DataFrag Submessages matches that for sending regular Data Submessages with the following additional requirements:

- DataFrag Submessages are sent in order, where ordering is defined by increasing fragment numbers. Note this does not guarantee in order arrival.

- Data must only be fragmented if required. If multiple transports are available to the Writer and some transports do not require fragmentation, a regular Data Submessage must be sent on those transports instead. Likewise, for variable size data types, a regular Data Submessage must be used if fragmentation is not required for a particular sequence number.

- For a given sequence number, if in-line QoS parameters are used, they must be included with the first DataFrag Submessage (containing the fragment with fragment number equal to 1). They may also be included with subsequent DataFrag submessages for this sequence number, but this is not required.

If a transport can accommodate multiple fragments of the given fragment size, it is recommended that implementations concatenate as many fragments as possible into a single DataFrag message.

When sending multiple DataFrag messages, flow control may be required to avoid flooding the network. Possible approaches include a leaky bucket or token bucket flow control scheme. This is not part of the RTPS specification.

8.4.14.1.3 How to re-assemble fragments

DataFrag Submessages contain all required information to re-assemble the serialized data. Once all fragments have been received, the same protocol behavior applies as for a regular Data Submessage.

Note that implementations must be able to handle out-of-order arrival of DataFrag submessages.

8.4.14.1.4 Reliable Communication

The protocol behavior for reliably sending DataFrag Submessages matches that for sending regular Data Submessages with the following additional requirements:
• The semantics for a Heartbeat Submessage remain unchanged: a Heartbeat message must only include those sequence numbers for which all fragments are available.

• The semantics for an AckNack Submessage remain unchanged: an AckNack message must only positively acknowledge a sequence number when all fragments were received for that sequence number. Likewise, a sequence number must be negatively acknowledged only when all fragments are missing.

• In order to negatively acknowledge a subset of fragments for a given sequence number, a NackFrag Submessage must be used. When data is fragmented, a Heartbeat may trigger both AckNack and NackFrag Submessages.

Additional considerations:

• As mentioned above, a Heartbeat Submessage can only include a sequence number once all fragments for that sequence number are available. If a Writer wants to inform a Reader on the partial availability of fragments for a given sequence number, a HeartbeatFrag Submessage can be used instead. Fragment level reliability may be helpful for very large data and when using flow control.

• A NackFrag Submessage can only be sent in response to a Heartbeat of HeartbeatFrag submessage.

8.4.15 Implementation Guidelines

The contents of this section are not part of the formal specification of the protocol. The purpose of this section is to provide guidelines for high-performance implementations of the protocol.

8.4.15.1 Implementation of ReaderProxy and WriterProxy

The PIM models the ReaderProxy as maintaining an association with each CacheChange in the Writer’s HistoryCache. This association is modeled as being mediated by the association class ChangeForReader. The direct implementation of this model would result in a lot of information being maintained for each ReaderProxy. In practice, what is required is that the ReaderProxy is able to implement the operations used by the protocol and this does not require the use of explicit associations.

For example, the operations unsent_changes() and next_unsent_change() can be implemented by having the ReaderProxy maintain a single sequence number ‘highestSeqNumSent.’ The highestSeqNumSent would record the highest value of the sequence number of any CacheChange sent to the ReaderProxy. Using this the operation unsent_changes() could be implemented by looking up all changes in the HistoryCache and selecting the ones with sequenceNumber greater than highestSeqNumSent. The implementation of next_unsent_change() would also look at the HistoryCache and return the CacheChange that has the next-highest sequence number greater than highestSeqNumSent. These operations could be done efficiently if the HistoryCache maintains an index by sequenceNumber.

The same techniques can be used to implement, requested_changes(), requested_changes_set(), and next_requested_change(). In this case, the implementation can maintain a sliding window of sequence numbers (which can be efficiently represented by a SequenceNumber_t lowestRequestedChange and a fixed-length bitmap) to store whether a particular sequence number is currently requested. Requests that do not fit in the window can be ignored as they correspond to sequence numbers higher than the ones in the window and the reader can be relied on re-sending the request later if it is still missing the change.

Similar techniques can be used to implement acked_changes_set() and unacked_changes().
8.4.15.2 Efficient use of Gap and AckNack Submessages

Both Gap and AckNack Submessages are designed such that they can contain information about a set of sequence numbers. For simplicity, the virtual machine used in the protocol description did not always attempt to fully use these Submessages to store all the sequence numbers for which they would apply. The result would be that sometimes multiple Gap or AckNack messages would be sent when, a more efficient implementation, would have combined these Submessages into a single one. All these implementations are compliant with the protocol and interoperable. However, implementations that combine multiple Gap and AckNack Submessages and take advantage of the ability of these Submessages to contain a set of sequence number will be more efficient in both bandwidth and CPU usage.

8.4.15.3 Coalescing multiple Data Submessages

The RTPS protocol allows multiple Submessages to be coalesced into a single RTPS message. This means that they will all share a single RTPS Header and be sent in a single ‘network-transport transaction.’ Most network-transports have a relatively-large fixed overhead compared with the extra cost of additional bytes in the message. Therefore, implementations that combine Submessages into a single RTPS message will in general make better utilization of CPU and bandwidth.

A particularly common case is the coalescing of multiple Data Submessages into a single RTPS message. The need for this can occur in a response to an AckNack requesting multiple changes or as a result of multiple changes made on the writer side that have not yet been propagated to the reader. In all these cases, it is generally beneficial to coalesce the Submessages into fewer RTPS messages.

Note that the coalescing of Data Submessages is not restricted to Submessages originating from the same RTPS Writer. It is also possible to coalesce Submessages originating from multiple RTPS Writer entities. RTPS Writer entities that correspond to DDS DataWriter entities belonging to the same DDS Publisher are prime candidates for this.

8.4.15.4 Piggybacking HeartBeat Submessages

The RTPS protocol allows Submessages of different kinds to be coalesced into a single RTPS message. A particularly useful case is the piggybacking of HeartBeat Submessages following Data Submessages. This allows the RTPS Writer to explicitly request an acknowledgment of the changes it sent without the additional traffic needed to send a separate HeartBeat.

8.4.15.5 Sending to unknown readerId

As described in the Messages Module, it is possible to send RTPS Messages where the readerId is left unspecified (ENTITYID_UNKNOWN). This is required when sending these Messages over Multicast, but also allows to send a single Message over unicast to reach multiple Readers within the same Participant. Implementations are encouraged to use this feature to minimize bandwidth usage.

8.4.15.6 Reclaiming Finite Resources from Unresponsive Readers

An implementation likely has finite resources to work with. For a Writer, reclaiming queue resources should happen when all Readers have acknowledged a sample in the queue and resources limits dictate that the old sample entry is to be used for a new sample.

There may be scenarios where an alive Reader becomes unresponsive and will never acknowledge the Writer. Instead of blocking on the unresponsive Reader, the Writer should be allowed to deem the Reader as ‘Inactive’ and proceed in updating its queue. The state of a Reader is either Active or Inactive. Active Readers have sent ACKNACKs that have been recently received. The Writer should determine the inactivity of a Reader by using a mechanism based on the rate
and number of ACKNACKs received. Then samples that have been acknowledged by all Active Readers can be freed, and the Writer can reclaim those resources if necessary. Note that strict reliability is not guaranteed when a Reader becomes Inactive.

### 8.4.15.7 Setting Count of Heartbeats and ACKNACKs

The Count element of a HEARTBEAT differentiate between logical HEARTBEATS. A received HEARTBEAT with the same Count as a previously received HEARTBEAT can be ignored to prevent triggering a duplicate repair session. So, an implementation should ensure that sample logical HEARTBEATS are tagged with the same Count.

New HEARTBEATS should have Counts greater than all older HEARTBEATS. Then, received HEARTBEATS with Counts not greater than any previously received can be ignored.

The same logic applies for Counts of ACKNACKs.

### 8.5 Discovery Module

The RTPS Behavior Module assumes RTPS Endpoints are properly configured and paired up with matching remote Endpoints. It does not make any assumptions on how this configuration took place and only defines how to exchange data between these Endpoints.

In order to be able to configure Endpoints, implementations must obtain information on the presence of remote Endpoints and their properties. How to obtain this information is the subject of the Discovery Module.

The Discovery Module defines the RTPS discovery protocol. The purpose of the discovery protocol is to allow each RTPS Participant to discover other relevant Participants and their Endpoints. Once remote Endpoints have been discovered, implementations can configure local Endpoints accordingly to establish communication.

The DDS specification equally relies on the use of a discovery mechanism to establish communication between matched DataWriters and DataReaders. DDS implementations must automatically discover the presence of remote entities, both when they join and leave the network. This discovery information is made accessible to the user through DDS built-in topics.

The RTPS discovery protocol defined in this Module provides the required discovery mechanism for DDS.

#### 8.5.1 Overview

The RTPS specification splits up the discovery protocol into two independent protocols:

1. **Participant** Discovery Protocol
2. **Endpoint** Discovery Protocol

A Participant Discovery Protocol (PDP) specifies how Participants discover each other in the network. Once two Participants have discovered each other, they exchange information on the Endpoints they contain using an Endpoint Discovery Protocol (EDP). Apart from this causality relationship, both protocols can be considered independent.

Implementations may choose to support multiple PDPs and EDPs, possibly vendor-specific. As long as two Participants have at least one PDP and EDP in common, they can exchange the required discovery information. For the purpose of interoperability, all RTPS implementations must provide at least the following discovery protocols:

1. Simple Participant Discovery Protocol (SPDP)
2. Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol (SEDP)

Both are basic discovery protocols that suffice for small to medium scale networks. Additional PDPs and EDPs that are geared towards larger networks may be added to future versions of the specification.

Finally, the role of a discovery protocol is to provide information on discovered remote Endpoints. How this information is used by a Participant to configure its local Endpoints depends on the actual implementation of the RTPS protocol and is not part of the discovery protocol specification. For example, for the reference implementations introduced in Section 8.4.7, the information obtained on the remote Endpoints allows the implementation to configure:

- The RTPS ReaderLocator objects that are associated with each RTPS StatelessWriter.
- The RTPS ReaderProxy objects associated with each RTPS StatefulWriter
- The RTPS WriterProxy objects associated with each RTPS StatefulReader

The Discovery Module is organized as follows:

- The SPDP and SEDP rely on pre-defined RTPS built-in Writer and Reader Endpoints to exchange discovery information. Section 8.5.2 introduces these RTPS built-in Endpoints.
- The SPDP is discussed in Section 8.5.3.
- The SEDP is discussed in Section 8.5.4.

8.5.2 RTPS Built-in Discovery Endpoints

The DDS specification specifies that discovery takes place using “built-in” DDS DataReaders and DataWriters with pre-defined Topics and QoS.

There are four pre-defined built-in Topics: “DCPSParticipant,” “DCPSSubscription,” “DCPSPublication,” and “DCPSTopic.” The DataTypes associated with these Topics are also specified by the DDS specification and mainly contain Entity QoS values.

For each of the built-in Topics, there exists a corresponding DDS built-in DataWriter and DDS built-in DataReader. The built-in DataWriters are used to announce the presence and QoS of the local DDS Participant and the DDS Entities it contains (DataReaders, DataWriters and Topics) to the rest of the network. Likewise, the built-in DataReaders collect this information from remote Participants, which is then used by the DDS implementation to identify matching remote Entities. The built-in DataReaders act as regular DDS DataReaders and can also be accessed by the user through the DDS API.

The approach taken by the RTPS Simple Discovery Protocols (SPDP and SEDP) is analogous to the built-in Entity concept. RTPS maps each built-in DDS DataWriter or DataReader to an associated built-in RTPS Endpoint. These built-in Endpoints act as regular Writer and Reader Endpoints and provide the means to exchange the required discovery information between Participants using the regular RTPS protocol defined in the Behavior Module.

The SPDP, which concerns itself with how Participants discover each other, maps the DDS built-in Entities for the “DCPSParticipant” Topic. The SEDP, which specifies how to exchange discovery information on local Topics, DataWriters and DataReaders, maps the DDS built-in Entities for the “DCPSSubscription,” “DCPSPublication” and “DCPSTopic” Topics.
8.5.3 The Simple Participant Discovery Protocol

The purpose of a PDP is to discover the presence of other Participants on the network and their properties.

A Participant may support multiple PDPs, but for the purpose of interoperability, all implementations must support at least the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol.

8.5.3.1 General Approach

The RTPS Simple Participant Discovery Protocol (SPDP) uses a simple approach to announce and detect the presence of Participants in a domain.

For each Participant, the SPDP creates two RTPS built-in Endpoints: the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` and the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader`.

The `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` is an RTPS Best-Effort `StatelessWriter`. The `HistoryCache` of the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` contains a single data-object of type `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData`. The value of this data-object is set from the attributes in the `Participant`. If the attributes change, the data-object is replaced.

The `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` periodically sends this data-object to a pre-configured list of locators to announce the Participant’s presence on the network. This is achieved by periodically calling `StatelessWriter::unsent_changes_reset`, which causes the StatelessWriter to resend all changes present in its HistoryCache to all locators. The periodic rate at which the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` sends out the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` defaults to a PSM specified value. This period should be smaller than the leaseDuration specified in the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` (see also Section 8.5.3.3.2).

The pre-configured list of locators may include both unicast and multicast locators. Port numbers are defined by each PSM. These locators simply represent possible remote Participants in the network, no Participant need actually be present. By sending the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` periodically, Participants can join the network in any order.

The `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader` receives the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` announcements from the remote Participants. The contained information includes what Endpoint Discovery Protocols the remote Participant supports. The proper Endpoint Discovery Protocol is then used for exchanging Endpoint information with the remote Participant.

Implementations can minimize any start-up delays by sending an additional `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` in response to receiving this data-object from a previously unknown Participant, but this behavior is optional. Implementations may also enable the user to choose whether to automatically extend the pre-configured list of locators with new locators from newly discovered Participants. This enables a-symmetric locator lists. These last two features are optional and not required for the purpose of interoperability.

8.5.3.2 SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData

The `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` defines the data exchanged as part of the SPDP.
Figure 8.27 illustrates the contents of the **SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData**. As shown in the figure, the **SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData** specializes the **ParticipantProxy** and therefore includes all the information necessary to configure a discovered **Participant**. The **SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData** also specializes the DDS-defined DDS::ParticipantBuiltinTopicData providing the information the corresponding DDS built-in DataReader needs.

The attributes of the **SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData** and their interpretation are described in Table 8.73.

**Table 8.73 - RTPS SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>protocolVersion</td>
<td>ProtocolVersion_t</td>
<td>Identifies the RTPS protocol version used by the Participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidPrefix</td>
<td>GuidPrefix_t</td>
<td>The common GuidPrefix_t of the Participant and all the Endpoints contained within the Participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vendorId</td>
<td>VendorId_t</td>
<td>Identifies the vendor of the DDS middleware that contains the Participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectsInlineQos</td>
<td>bool</td>
<td>Describes whether the Readers within the Participant expect that the QoS values that apply to each data modification are encapsulated with each Data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attribute</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metatrafficUnicast LocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of unicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the built-in Endpoints contained in the Participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metatrafficMulticast LocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>List of multicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the built-in Endpoints contained in the Participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaultUnicast LocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[1..*]</td>
<td>Default list of unicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the user-defined Endpoints contained in the Participant. These are the unicast locators that will be used in case the Endpoint does not specify its own set of Locators, so at least one Locator must be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaultMulticast LocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>Default list of multicast locators (transport, address, port combinations) that can be used to send messages to the user-defined Endpoints contained in the Participant. These are the multicast locators that will be used in case the Endpoint does not specify its own set of Locators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availableBuiltin Endpoints</td>
<td>BuiltinEndpointSet_t[*]</td>
<td>All Participants must support the SEDP. This attribute identifies the kinds of built-in SEDP Endpoints that are available in the Participant. This allows a Participant to indicate that it only contains a subset of the possible built-in Endpoints. See also Section 8.5.4.3. Possible values for BuiltinEndpointSet_t are: PUBLICATIONS_READER, PUBLICATIONS_WRITER, SUBSCRIPTIONS_READER, SUBSCRIPTIONS_WRITER, TOPIC_READER, TOPIC_WRITER Vendor specific extensions may be used to denote support for additional EDPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaseDuration</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>How long a Participant should be considered alive every time an announcement is received from the Participant. If a Participant fails to send another announcement within this time period, the Participant can be considered gone. In that case, any resources associated to the Participant and its Endpoints can be freed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manualLivelinessCount</td>
<td>Count_t</td>
<td>Used to implement MANUAL_BY_PARTICIPANT liveness QoS. When liveliness is asserted, the manualLivelinessCount is incremented and a new SPDPtransmittedParticipantData is sent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.73 - RTPS SPDPtransmittedParticipantData attributes**
As mentioned in Section 8.5.3.1, the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` lists the Endpoint Discovery Protocols supported by the Participant. The attributes shown in Table 8.73 only reflect the mandatory SEDP. There are currently no other Endpoint Discovery Protocols defined by the RTPS specification. In order to extend `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData` to include additional EDPs, the standard RTPS extension mechanisms can be used. Please refer to Section 9.6.2 for additional information.

### 8.5.3.3 The built-in Endpoints used by the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol

Figure 8.28 illustrates the built-in Endpoints introduced by the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol.

![Figure 8.28 - The built-in Endpoints used by the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol](image)

The Protocol reserves the following values of the `EntityId_t` for the SPDP built-in Endpoints:

```plaintext
ENTITYID_SPDP_BUILTIN_PARTICIPANT_WRITER
ENTITYID_SPDP_BUILTIN_PARTICIPANT_READER
```
8.5.3.3.1 SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter

The relevant attribute values for configuring the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` are shown in Table 8.74.

**Table 8.74 - Attributes of the RTPS StatelessWriter used by the SPDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>&lt;auto-detected&gt; Transport-kinds and addresses are either auto-detected or configured by the application. Ports are a parameter to the SPDP initialization or else are set to a PSM-specified value that depends on the domainId.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>&lt;parameter to the SPDP initialization&gt; Defaults to a PSM-specified value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliabilityLevel</td>
<td>ReliabilityKind_t</td>
<td>BEST_EFFORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicKind</td>
<td>TopicKind_t</td>
<td>WITH_KEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resendPeriod</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
<td>&lt;parameter to the SPDP initialization&gt; Defaults to a PSM-specified value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerLocators</td>
<td>ReaderLocator[*]</td>
<td>&lt;parameter to the SPDP initialization&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5.3.3.2 SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader

The `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader` is configured with the attribute values shown in Table 8.75.

**Table 8.75 - Attributes of the RTPS StatelessReader used by the SPDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>&lt;auto-detected&gt; Transport-kinds and addresses are either auto-detected or configured by the application. Ports are a parameter to the SPDP initialization or else are set to a PSM-specified value that depends on the domainId.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multicastLocatorList</td>
<td>Locator_t[*]</td>
<td>&lt;parameter to the SPDP initialization&gt; Defaults to a PSM-specified value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliabilityLevel</td>
<td>ReliabilityKind_t</td>
<td>BEST_EFFORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topicKind</td>
<td>TopicKind_t</td>
<td>WITH_KEY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The **HistoryCache** of the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader` contains information on all active discovered participants; the key used to identify each data-object corresponds to the **Participant GUID**.

Each time information on a participant is received by the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader`, the SPDP examines the HistoryCache looking for an entry with a key that matches the Participant GUID. If an entry with a matching key is not there, a new entry is added keyed by the GUID of the Participant.

Periodically, the SPDP examines the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader` HistoryCache looking for stale entries defined as those that have not been refreshed for a period longer than their specified `leaseDuration`. Stale entries are removed.

### 8.5.3.4 Logical ports used by the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol

As mentioned above, each `SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter` uses a pre-configured list of locators to announce a Participant’s presence on the network.

In order to enable plug-and-play interoperability, the pre-configured list of locators must use the following well-known logical ports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Locators configured using this port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPDP_WELL_KNOWN_UNICAST_PORT</td>
<td>entries in <code>SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader.unicastLocatorList</code>, unicast entries in <code>SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter.readerLocators</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPDP_WELL_KNOWN_MULTICAST_PORT</td>
<td>entries in <code>SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader.multicastLocatorList</code>, multicast entries in <code>SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter.readerLocators</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual value for the logical ports is defined by the PSM.

### 8.5.4 The Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol

An Endpoint Discovery Protocol defines the required information exchange between two **Participants** in order to discover each other’s **Writer** and **Reader** Endpoints.

A Participant may support multiple EDPs, but for the purpose of interoperability, all implementations must support at least the **Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol**.

#### 8.5.4.1 General Approach

Similar to the SPDP, the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol uses pre-defined built-in Endpoints. The use of pre-defined built-in Endpoints means that once a **Participant** knows of the presence of another **Participant**, it can assume the presence of the built-in Endpoints made available by the remote participant and establish the association with the locally-matching built-in Endpoints.

The protocol used to communicate between built-in Endpoints is the same as used for application-defined Endpoints. Therefore, by reading the built-in **Reader** Endpoints, the protocol virtual machine can discover the presence and QoS of the DDS Entities that belong to any remote **Participants**. Similarly, by writing the built-in **Writer** Endpoints a **Participant** can inform the other **Participants** of the existence and QoS of local DDS Entities.
The use of built-in topics in the SEDP therefore reduces the scope of the overall discovery protocol to the determination of which Participants are present in the system and the attribute values for the ReaderProxy and WriterProxy objects that correspond to the built-in Endpoints of these Participants. Once that is known, everything else results from the application of the RTPS protocol to the communication between the built-in RTPS Readers and Writers.

8.5.4.2 The built-in Endpoints used by the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol

The SEDP maps the DDS built-in Entities for the “DCPSSubscription,” “DCPSPublication,” and “DCPSTopic” Topics. According to the DDS specification, the reliability QoS for these built-in Entities is set to ‘reliable.’ The SEDP therefore maps each corresponding built-in DDS DataWriter or DataReader into corresponding reliable RTPS Writer and Reader Endpoints.

For example, as illustrated in Figure 8.30, the DDS built-in DataWriters for the “DCPSSubscription,” “DCPSPublication,” and “DCPSTopic” Topics can be mapped to reliable RTPS StatefulWriters and the corresponding DDS built-in DataReaders to reliable RTPS StatefulReaders. Actual implementations need not use the stateful reference implementation. For the purpose of interoperability, it is sufficient that an implementation provides the required built-in Endpoints and reliable communication that satisfies the general requirements listed in Section 8.4.2.

Figure 8.30 - Example mapping of the DDS Built-in Entities to corresponding RTPS built-in Endpoints

The RTPS Protocol reserves the following values of the EntityId_t for the built-in Endpoints:

```
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_WRITER
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_READER
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_WRITER
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_READER
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_TOPIC_WRITER
ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_TOPIC_READER
```

The actual value for the reserved EntityId_t is defined by each PSM.

8.5.4.3 Built-in Endpoints required by the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol

Implementations are not required to provide all built-in Endpoints.
As mentioned in the DDS specification, Topic propagation is optional. Therefore, it is not required to implement the `SEDPbuiltinTopicsReader` and `SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter` built-in Endpoints and for the purpose of interoperability, implementations should not rely on their presence in remote Participants.

As far as the remaining built-in Endpoints are concerned, a Participant is only required to provide the built-in Endpoints required for matching up local and remote Endpoints. For example, if a DDS Participant will only contain DDS DataWriters, the only required RTPS built-in Endpoints are the `SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter` and the `SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader`. The `SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader` and the `SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter` built-in Endpoints serve no purpose in this case.

The SPDP specifies how a Participant informs other Participants about what built-in Endpoints it has available. This is discussed in Section 8.5.3.2.

### 8.5.4.4 Data Types associated with built-in Endpoints used by the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol

Each RTPS Endpoint has a `HistoryCache` that stores changes to the data-objects associated with the Endpoint. This also applies to the RTPS built-in Endpoints. Therefore, each RTPS built-in Endpoint depends on some DataType that represents the logical contents of the data written into its `HistoryCache`.

Figure 8.31 defines the `DiscoveredWriterData`, `DiscoveredReaderData`, and `DiscoveredTopicData` DataTypes associated with the RTPS built-in Endpoints for the “DCPSPublication,” “DCPSSubscription,” and “DCPSTopic” Topics. The DataType associated with the “DCPSParticipant” Topic is defined in Section 8.5.3.2.

The DataType associated with each RTPS built-in Endpoint contains all the information specified by DDS for the corresponding built-in DDS Entity. For this reason, `DiscoveredReaderData` extends the DDS-defined DDS::SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData, `DiscoveredWriterData` extends DDS::PublicationBuiltinTopicData, and `DiscoveredTopicData` extends DDS::TopicBuiltinTopicData.

In addition to the data needed by the associated built-in DDS Entities, the “Discovered” DataTypes also include all the information that may be needed by an implementation of the protocol to configure the RTPS Endpoints. This information is contained in the RTPS `ReaderProxy` and `WriterProxy`.
Figure 8.31 - Data types associated with built-in Endpoints used by the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol
An implementation of the protocol need not necessarily send all information contained in the DataTypes. If any information is not present, the implementation can assume the default values, as defined by the PSM. The PSM also defines how the discovery information is represented on the wire.

The RTPS built-in Endpoints used by the SEDP and their associated DataTypes are shown in Figure 8.32.

Figure 8.32 - Built-in Endpoints and the DataType associated with their respective HistoryCache

The contents of the HistoryCache for each built-in Endpoint can be described in terms of the following aspects: DataType, Cardinality, Data-object insertion, Data-object modification, and Data-object deletion.

- **DataType.** The type of the data stored in the cache. This is partly defined by the DDS specification.
  - **Cardinality.** The number of different data-objects (each with a different key) that can potentially be stored in the cache.
  - **Data-object insertion.** Conditions under which a new data-object is inserted into the cache.
  - **Data-object modification.** Conditions under which the value of an existing data-object is modified.
  - **Data-object deletion.** Conditions under which an existing data-object is removed from the cache.

It is illustrative to describe the HistoryCache for each of the built-in Endpoints.

**8.5.4.4.1 SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter and SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader**

Table 8.77 describes the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter and SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DataType</td>
<td>DiscoveredWriterData</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.77 - Contents of the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter and SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality</td>
<td>The number of DataWriters contained by the DomainParticipant. There is a one-to-one correspondence between each DataWriter in the participant and a data-object that describes the DataWriter stored in the WriterHistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object insertion</td>
<td>Each time a DataWriter is created in the DomainParticipant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object modification</td>
<td>Each time the QoS of an existing DataWriter is modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object deletion</td>
<td>Each time an existing DataWriter belonging to the DomainParticipant is deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5.4.4.2 SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter and SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader

Table 8.78 describes the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter and SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader.

Table 8.78 - Contents of the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter and SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DataType</td>
<td>DiscoveredReaderData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality</td>
<td>The number of DataReaders contained by the DomainParticipant. There is a one-to-one correspondence between each DataReader in the Participant and a data-object that describes the DataReaders stored in the WriterHistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object insertion</td>
<td>Each time a DataReader is created in the DomainParticipant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object modification</td>
<td>Each time the QoS of an existing DataReader is modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object deletion</td>
<td>Each time an existing DataReader belonging to the DomainParticipant is deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5.4.4.3 SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter and SEDPbuiltinTopicsReader

Table 8.79 describes the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter and builtinTopicsReader.

Table 8.79 - Contents of the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter and SEDPbuiltinTopicsReader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DataType</td>
<td>DiscoveredTopicData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality</td>
<td>The number of Topics created by the DomainParticipant. There is a one-to-one correspondence between each Topic created by the DomainParticipant and a data-object that describes the Topic stored in the WriterHistoryCache for the builtinTopicsWriter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object insertion</td>
<td>Each time a Topic is created in the DomainParticipant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**8.5.5 Interaction with the RTPS virtual machine**

To further illustrate the SPDP and SEDP, this section describes how the information provided by the SPDP can be used to configure the SEDP built-in Endpoints in the RTPS virtual machine.

### 8.5.5.1 Discovery of a new remote Participant

Using the `SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader`, a local Participant ‘local_participant’ discovers the existence of another Participant described by the `DiscoveredParticipantData participant_data`. The discovered Participant uses the SEDP.

The pseudo code below configures the local SEDP built-in Endpoints within `local_participant` to communicate with the corresponding SEDP built-in *Endpoints* in the discovered Participant.

Note that how the *Endpoints* are configured depends on the implementation of the protocol. For the stateful reference implementation, this operation performs the following logical steps:

```java
IF ( PUBLICATIONS_READER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
    guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_READER>;
    writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter;
    proxy = new ReaderProxy( guid,
        participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
        participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
    writer.matched_reader_add(proxy);
ENDIF

IF ( PUBLICATIONS_WRITER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
    guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_WRITER>;
    reader = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader;
    proxy = new WriterProxy( guid,
        participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
        participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
    reader.matched_writer_add(proxy);
ENDIF

IF ( SUBSCRIPTIONS_READER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
    guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_READER>;
    writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter;
    proxy = new ReaderProxy( guid,
        participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
        participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
    writer.matched_reader_add(proxy);
ENDIF

IF ( SUBSCRIPTIONS_WRITER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
    guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_WRITER>;
    reader = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader;
```

### Table 8.79 - Contents of the HistoryCache for the SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter and SEDPbuiltinTopicsReader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aspect</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object modification</td>
<td>Each time the QoS of an existing Topic is modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Object deletion</td>
<td>Each time an existing Topic belonging to the DomainParticipant is deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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proxy = new WriterProxy( guid,
              participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
              participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
reader.matched_writer_add(proxy);
ENDIF

IF ( TOPICS_READER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
  guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_TOPICS_READER>;
  writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter;
  proxy = new ReaderProxy( guid,
              participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
              participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
  writer.matched_reader_add(proxy);
ENDIF

IF ( TOPICS_WRITER IS_IN participant_data.availableEndpoints ) THEN
  guid = <participant_data.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_TOPICS_WRITER>;
  reader = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinTopicsReader;
  proxy = new WriterProxy( guid,
              participant_data.metatrafficUnicastLocatorList,
              participant_data.metatrafficMulticastLocatorList);
  reader.matched_writer_add(proxy);
ENDIF

8.5.5.2 Removal of a previously discovered Participant

Based on the remote Participant’s leaseDuration, a local Participant ‘local_participant’ concludes that a previously discovered Participant with GUID_t participant_guid is no longer present. The Participant ‘local_participant’ must reconfigure any local Endpoints that were communicating with Endpoints in the Participant identified by the GUID_t participant_guid.

For the stateful reference implementation, this operation performs the following logical steps:

guid = <participant_guid.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_READER>;
writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinPublicationsWriter;
proxy = writer.matched_reader_lookup(guid);
writer.matched_reader_remove(proxy);

guid = <participant_guid.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_PUBLICATIONS_WRITER>;
reader = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinPublicationsReader;
proxy = reader.matched_writer_lookup(guid);
reader.matched_writer_remove(proxy);

guid = <participant_guid.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_READER>;
writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsWriter;
proxy = writer.matched_reader_lookup(guid);
writer.matched_reader_remove(proxy);

guid = <participant_guid.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_SUBSCRIPTIONS_WRITER>;
reader = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinSubscriptionsReader;
proxy = reader.matched_writer_lookup(guid);
reader.matched_writer_remove(proxy);

guid = <participant_guid.guidPrefix, ENTITYID_SEDP_BUILTIN_TOPICS_READER>;
writer = local_participant.SEDPbuiltinTopicsWriter;
8.5.6 Supporting Alternative Discovery Protocols

The requirements on the Participant and Endpoint Discovery Protocols may vary depending on the deployment scenario. For example, a protocol optimized for speed and simplicity (such as a protocol that would be deployed in embedded devices on a LAN) may not scale well to large systems in a WAN environment.

For this reason, the RTPS specification allows implementations to support multiple PDPs and EDPs. There are many possible approaches to implementing a Discovery Protocol including the use of static discovery, file based discovery, a central look-up service, etc. The only requirement imposed by RTPS for the purpose of interoperability is that all RTPS implementations support at least the SPDP and SEDP. It is expected that over time, a collection of interoperable Discovery Protocols will be developed to address specific deployment needs.

If an implementation supports multiple PDPs, each PDP may be initialized differently and discover a different set of remote Participants. Remote Participants using a different vendor’s RTPS implementation must be contacted using at least the SPDP to ensure interoperability. There is no such requirement when the remote Participant uses the same RTPS implementation.

Even when the SPDP is used by all Participants, remote Participants may still use different EDPs. Which EDPs a Participant supports is included in the information exchanged by the SPDP. All Participants must support at least the SEDP, so they always have at least one EDP in common. However, if two Participants both support another EDP, this alternative protocol can be used instead. In that case, there is no need to create the SEDP built-in Endpoints, or if they already exist, no need to configure them to match the new remote Participant. This approach enables a vendor to customize the EDP if desired without compromising interoperability.

8.6 Versioning and Extensibility

Implementations of this version of the RTPS protocol should be able to process RTPS Messages not only with the same major version but possibly higher minor versions.

8.6.1 Allowed Extensions within this major Version

Within this major version, future minor versions of the protocol can augment the protocol in the following ways:

- Additional Submessages with other submessageIds can be introduced and used anywhere in an RTPS Message. An implementation should skip over unknown Submessages using the submessageLength field in the SubmessageHeader.
- Additional fields can be added to the end of a Submessage that was already defined in the current minor version. An implementation should skip over additional fields using the submessageLength field in the SubmessageHeader.
- Additional built-in Endpoints with new IDs can be added. An implementation should ignore any unknown built-in Endpoints.
Additional parameters with new `parameterIds` can be added. An implementation should ignore any unknown parameters.

All such changes require an increase of the minor version number.

### 8.6.2 What cannot change within this major Version

The following items cannot be changed within the same major version:

- A Submessage cannot be deleted.
- A Submessage cannot be modified except as described in Section 8.6.1.
- The meaning of `submessageIds` cannot be modified.

All such changes require an increase in the major version number.

### 8.7 Implementing DDS QoS and advanced DDS features using RTPS

The RTPS protocol and its extension mechanisms provide the core functionality required to implement DDS. This section defines how to use RTPS to implement the DDS QoS parameters.

In addition, this section defines the RTPS protocol extensions required for implementing the following advanced DDS features:

- Content-filtered Topics, see Section 8.7.3
- Coherent Sets, see Section 8.7.5

All extensions are based on the standard extension mechanisms provided by RTPS.

This section forms a normative part of the specification for the purpose of interoperability.

#### 8.7.1 Adding in-line Parameters to Data Submessages

`Data` and `DataFrag` Submessages optionally contain a `ParameterList` SubmessageElement for storing in-line QoS parameters and other information.

In case a `Reader` does not keep a list of matching remote `Writers` or the QoS parameters they were configured with (i.e., is a stateless `Reader`), a `Data` Submessage with in-line QoS parameters contains all the information needed to enable the `Reader` to apply all `Writer`-specific QoS parameters.

A stateless `Reader`'s need for receiving in-line QoS to get information on remote `Writers` is the justification for requiring a `Writer` to send in-line QoS if the `Reader` requests them (Section 8.4.2.2.2).

For immutable QoS, all RxO QoS are sent in-line to allow a stateless `Reader` to reject samples in case of incompatible QoS. Mutable QoS relevant to the `Reader` are sent in-line so they may take effect immediately, regardless of the amount of state kept on the `Reader`. Note that a stateful `Reader` has the option of relying on its cached information of remote `Writers` rather than the received in-line QoS.

A stateless `Reader` uses the discovery protocol to announce to remote `Writers` that it expects to receive QoS parameters in-line, as discussed in the Discovery Module (Section 8.5). If in-line QoS parameters are expected, implementations must also include the topic name as an in-line parameter. This ensures that on the receiving side, the Submessage can be passed to all `Readers` for that topic, including the stateless `Readers`.
Independent of whether *Readers* expect in-line QoS parameters, a *Data* Submessage may also contain in-line parameters related to coherent sets and content-filtered topics. This is described in more detail in the sections that follow.

For improved performance, stateful implementations may ignore in-line QoS and instead rely solely on cached values obtained through Discovery. Note that not parsing in-line QoS may delay the point in time when a new WoS takes effect, as it first must be propagated through Discovery.

### 8.7.2 DDS QoS Parameters

Table 8.80 provides an overview of which QoS parameters affect the RTPS wire protocol and which can appear as in-line QoS. The parameters that affect the wire protocol are discussed in more detail in the subsections below.

**Table 8.80 - Implementing DDS QoS Parameters using the RTPS Wire Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QoS</th>
<th>Effect on RTPS Protocol</th>
<th>May appear as in-line QoS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USER_DATA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC_DATA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP_DATA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURABILITY</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURABILITY_SERVICE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEADLINE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATENCY_BUDGET</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP_STRENGTH</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVELINESS</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME_BASED_FILTER</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTITION</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIABILITY</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT_PRIORITY</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFESPAN</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION_ORDER</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCE_LIMITS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTITY_FACTORY</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITER_DATA_LIFECYCLE</td>
<td>See Section 8.7.2.2.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.80 - Implementing DDS QoS Parameters using the RTPS Wire Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QoS</th>
<th>Effect on RTPS Protocol</th>
<th>May appear as in-line QoS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READER_DATA_LIFECYCLE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.7.2.1 In-line DDS QoS Parameters

Table 8.80 lists the standard DDS QoS parameters that may appear in-line.

If a Reader expects to receive in-line QoS parameters and any of these QoS parameters are missing, it will assume the default value for that QoS parameter, where the default is defined by DDS.

In-line parameters are added to data submessages to make them self-describing. In order to achieve self-describing messages, not only the parameters defined in Table 8.80 have to be sent with the submessage, but also a parameter TOPIC_NAME. This parameter contains the name of the topic that the submessage belongs to.

8.7.2.2 DDS QoS Parameters that affect the wire protocol

8.7.2.2.1 DURABILITY

While volatile and transient-local durability do not affect the RTPS protocol, support for transient and persistent durability may. This is not covered in the current version of the specification.

8.7.2.2.2 PRESENTATION

Section 8.7.5 defines how to implement the coherent access policy of the PRESENTATION QoS.

The other aspects of this QoS do not affect the RTPS protocol.

8.7.2.2.3 LIVELINESS

Implementations must follow the approaches below:

- DDS_AUTOMATIC_LIVELINESS_QOS : liveliness is maintained through the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter.
  For a given Participant, in order to maintain the liveliness of its Writer Entities with LIVELINESS QoS set to AUTOMATIC, implementations must refresh the Participant’s liveliness (i.e., send the ParticipantMessageData, see Section 8.4.13.5) at a rate faster than the smallest lease duration among the Writers.

- DDS_MANUAL_BY_PARTICIPANT_LIVELINESS_QOS : liveliness is maintained through the BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter. If the Participant has any MANUAL_BY_PARTICIPANT Writers, implementations must check periodically to see if write(), assert_liveliness(), dispose(), or unregister_instance() was called for any of them. The period for this check equals the smallest lease duration among the Writers. If any of the operations were called, implementations must refresh the Participant’s liveliness (i.e., send the ParticipantMessageData, see Section 8.4.13.5).

- DDS_MANUAL_BY_TOPIC_LIVELINESS_QOS : liveliness is maintained by sending data or an explicit Heartbeat message with liveliness flag set.
  The standard RTPS Messages that result from calling write(), dispose(), or unregister_instance() on a Writer Entity suffice to assert the liveliness of a Writer with LIVELINESS QoS set to MANUAL_BY_TOPIC. When assert_liveliness() is called, the Writer must send a Heartbeat Message with final flag and liveliness flag set.
8.7.2.2.4 TIME_BASED_FILTER

Implementations may optimize bandwidth usage by applying a time based filter on the Writer side. That way, data that would be dropped on the Reader side is never sent.

When one or more data updates are filtered out on the Writer side, implementations must send a Gap Submessage instead, indicating which samples were filtered out. This Submessage must be sent before the next update and notifies the Reader the missing updates were filtered out and not simply lost.

8.7.2.2.5 RELIABILITY

Implementations must meet the reliable RTPS protocol requirements for interoperability, defined in Section 8.4.2.

8.7.2.2.6 DESTINATION_ORDER

In order to implement the DDS_BY_SOURCE_TIMESTAMP_DESTINATIONORDER_QOS policy, implementations must include an InfoTimestamp Submessage with every update from a Writer.

8.7.2.2.7 WRITER_DATA_LIFECYCLE

If autodispose_unregistered_instances is enabled, Data Messages that unregister an instance must also dispose it. This restricts the allowable values of the DisposedFlag and UnregisteredFlag flags.

8.7.3 Content-filtered Topics

Content-filtered topics make it possible for a DDS DataReader to request the middleware to filter out data samples based on their contents.

When filtering on the Reader side only, samples which do not pass the filter are simply dropped by the middleware. In this case, no further extensions to RTPS are needed.

In many cases, implementations will benefit from filtering on the Writer side, in addition to filtering on the Reader side. By filtering on the Writer side, a sample that would not pass any Reader side filters will not be sent. This conserves bandwidth. Likewise, when a sample does get sent, a Writer can include information on what filters it passed. This makes it possible to apply a filter only once on the Writer side, as opposed to once for each Reader. Readers will simply check whether a sample was filtered previously on the Writer side. If so, the filter need not be applied.

In order to support Writer side filtering, standard RTPS extension mechanisms are used to:

- include Reader filter information during the Endpoint discovery phase
- include filter results with each data sample

8.7.3.1 Exchanging filter information using the built-in Endpoints

Content-filtered topics are defined on the Reader side. In order to implement Writer side filtering, information on the filter used by a given Reader must be propagated to matching remote Writers. This requires extending the data type associated with RTPS built-in Endpoints.

As illustrated in Figure 8.32, the data types associated with RTPS built-in Endpoints extend the DDS built-in topic data types, which include all relevant QoS. Since DDS does not define content-filtered topics as a Reader QoS policy (instead, DDS defines separate Content-filtered Topics), RTPS adds an additional ContentFilterProperty_t field to DiscoveredReaderData, defined in Table 8.81.
The \textit{ContentFilterProperty\_t} field provides all the required information to enable content filtering on the Writer side. For example, for the default DDSSQL filter class, a valid filter expression for a data type containing members \(a\), \(b\) and \(c\) could be \(((a < 5) \text{ AND } (b == \%0) \text{ AND } (c >= \%1))\) with expression parameters “5” and “3.” In order for the Writer to apply the filter, it must have been configured to handle filters of the specified filter class. If not, the Writer will simply ignore the filter information and not filter any data samples.

DDS allows the user to modify the filter expression parameters at run-time. Each time the parameters are modified, the updated information is exchanged using the Endpoint discovery protocol. This is identical to updating a mutable QoS value.

### 8.7.3.2 Including in-line filter results with each data sample

In general, when applying filtering on the Writer side, a sample is not sent if it does not pass the remote Reader’s filter. In that case, the \textbf{Data} submessage is replaced by a \textbf{Gap} submessage. This ensures the sample is not considered ‘lost’ on the Reader side. This approach matches that of applying a time-based filter on the Writer side. The remainder of the discussion only refers to \textbf{Data} Submessages, but the same approach is followed for \textbf{DataFrag} Submessages.
In some cases, it may still be possible for a Reader to receive a sample that did not pass its filter, for example when sending data using multicast. Another use case is multiple Readers belonging to the same Participant. In that case, the Writer need only send a single RTPS message, destined to ENTITYID_UNKNOWN (see Section 8.4.15.5). Each Reader may use a different filter however, in which case the Writer needs to apply multiple filters before sending the sample.

In both use cases, two options exist:

- The sample passes none of the filters for any of the remote Readers. In that case, the **Data** submessage is again replaced by a **Gap** submessage.
- The sample passes some or all of the filters. In that case, the sample must still be sent and the writer must include information with the **Data** submessage on what filters were applied and the according result.

The **inlineQos** element of the **Data** submessage is used to include the necessary filter information. More specifically, a new parameter is added, containing the information shown in Table 8.82.

**Table 8.82 - Content filter info associated with a data sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>filterResult</td>
<td>FilterResult_t</td>
<td>For each filter signature, the results indicate whether the sample passed the filter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filterSignatures</td>
<td>FilterSignature_t[]</td>
<td>A list of filters that were applied to the sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A filter signature **FilterSignature_t** uniquely identifies a filter and is based on the filter properties listed in Table 8.81. How to represent and calculate a filter signature is defined by the PSM. Whether the sample passed the filters that were applied on the **Writer** side is encoded by the **filterResult_t** attribute, again defined by the PSM.

Note that a filter signature changes when the filter’s expression parameters change. Until it receives updated parameter values, a Writer side filter may be using outdated expression parameters, in which case the in-line filter signature will not match the signature expected by the Reader. As a result, the Reader will ignore the filter results and instead apply its local filter.

**8.7.3.3 Requirements for Interoperability**

Writer side filtering constitutes an optimization and is optional, so it is not required for interoperability.

Samples will always be filtered on the Reader side if

- the Writer side did not apply any filtering.
- the Writer side did not apply the filter expected by the Reader. As mentioned earlier, this may occur if the Writer has not yet been informed about updated filter parameters.
- the Reader side does not support Writer side filtering (and therefore ignores in-line filter information).

Likewise, Writers may not filter samples because

- the implementation does not support Content-filtered Topics (in which case the filter properties of the Reader are ignored).
• the Reader’s filter information was rejected (e.g., unrecognized filter class).
  If an implementation supports Content-filtered Topics, it must at least recognize the “DDSSQL” filter class, as
  mandated by the DDS specification. For all other filter classes, both implementations must allow the user to register the
  same custom filter class.

• other implementation-specific restrictions, such as a resource limit on the number of remote readers each writer is able
  to store filter information for.

8.7.4 Changes in the Instance Lifecycle State

Beyond writing data, a DDS DataWriter can register data object instances (operation register_instance, update their value
(operation write), dispose data-object instances (operation dispose), and unregister them (operation
unregister_instance). Each one of these operations may cause notifications to be dispatched to the matched DDS
DataReaders. The DDS DataReader can determine the nature of the change by inspecting the LifecycleState
instance_state field in the SampleInfo that is returned on the DDS DataReader read or take call.

RTPS uses regular Data Submessages and the in-line QoS parameter extension mechanism to communicate lifecycle
changes. The serialized information within the inline QoS contains the new LifecycleState, that is, whether the instance
has been registered, unregistered, or disposed. The actual details depend on the PIM (e.g., see Section 9.6.3.4).

An implementation of RTPS must use the Data Submessage to communicate a lifecycle changes. When doing so an
implementation of RTPS is allowed to include only the Key of teh Data-Object within the SerializedPayload submessage
element (see Section 8.3.7.2). This is because the Key is sufficient to uniquely identify the Data_Object instance to which
the LifecycleState change applies.

An implementation of RTPS is not required to propagate registration changes until the DDS DataWriter writes the first
value for that Data-Object instance.

8.7.5 Coherent Sets

The DDS specification provides the functionality to define a set of sample updates as a coherent set. A DataReader is
only notified of the arrival of new updates once all updates in the coherent set have been received.

What constitutes a coherent set is defined on the DataWriter side by using the container Publisher to denote the beginning
and end of the coherent set. A coherent set may span only the instances written to by a given DataWriter (access scope
TOPIC) or may span across multiple DataWriters belonging to the same Publisher (access scope GROUP). Please refer to
the DDS specification for additional details.

In order to support coherent sets, RTPS uses the in-line QoS parameter extension mechanism to include additional
information in-line with each Data Submessage. The additional information denotes membership to a particular coherent
set. The remainder of the discussion only refers to Data Submessages, but the same approach is followed for DataFrag
Submessages.

For access scope TOPIC, all Data Submessages belonging to the same coherent set have strict monotonically increasing
sequence numbers (as they originated from the same Writer). Therefore, a coherent set is uniquely identified by the
sequence number of the first sample update belonging to the coherent set. All sample updates belonging to the same
coherent set contain an in-line QoS parameter with this same sequence number. This approach also allows the Reader to
easily determine when the coherent set started.

The end of a Writer’s coherent set is defined by the arrival of one of the following:
• A **Data** Submessage from this **Writer** that belongs to a new coherent set.

• A **Data** Submessage from this **Writer** that does not contain a coherent set in-line QoS parameter or alternatively, contains a coherent set in-line QoS parameter with value SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN. Both approaches are equivalent.

Note that a **Data** Submessage need not necessarily contain serializedPayload. This makes it possible to notify the **Reader** about the end of a coherent set before the next data is written by the **Writer**.

Finally, the extensions required for access scope GROUP are not yet defined.

### 8.7.6 Directed Write

Direct peer-to-peer communications may be enabled within the publish-subscribe framework of DDS by tagging samples with the handles of the intended recipient(s).

RTPS supports directed writes by using the in-line QoS parameter extension mechanism. The serialized information denotes the GUIDs of the targeted reader(s).

When a writer sends a directed sample, only recipients with a matching GUID accept the sample; all other recipients acknowledge but absorb the sample, as if it were a GAP message.

### 8.7.7 Property Lists

Property lists are lists of user-definable properties applied to a DDS Entity. An entry in the list is a generica name-value pair. A user defines a pair to be a property for a DDS Participant, DataWriter, or DataReader. This extensible list enable non-DDS-specified properties to be applied.

The RTPS protocol supports Property Lists as in-line parameters. Properties can then be propagated during Discovery or as in-line QoS.

### 8.7.8 Original Writer Info

A service supporting the Persistent level of DDS Durability QoS needs to send the data that has been received and stored on behalf of the persistent writer.

This service that forwards messages needs to indicate that the forwarded message belongs to the message-stream of another writer, such that if the reader receives the same messages from another source (for example, another forwarding service or the original writer), it can treat them as duplicates.

The RTPS protocol supports this forwarding of messages by including information of the original writer.
When a RTPS Reader receives this information, it will treat it as a normal CacheChange, but once the CacheChange is ready to be committed to the DDS DataReader, it will not commit it. Instead, it will hand it off to the HistoryCache of the RTPS Reader that is communicating with the RTPS Writer indicated in the ORIGINAL_WRITER_INFO in-line QoS and treat it as having the sequence number which appears there and the ParameterList also included in the ORIGINAL_WRITER_INFO.

**Table 8.83 - Original writer info**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attribute</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>originalWriterGUID</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
<td>The GUID of the RTPS Writer that first generated the message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originalWriterSN</td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t</td>
<td>The Sequence Number of the CacheChange as sent from the original writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>originalWriterQoS</td>
<td>ParameterList</td>
<td>The list of in-line parameters that should apply to the CacheChange as sent by the RTPS Writer that first generated the sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.7.9 Key Hash

The Key Hash provides a hint for the key that uniquely identifies the data-object that is being changed within the set of objects that have been registered by the DDS DataWriter.

Nominally the key is part of the serialized data of a data submessage. Using the key hash benefits implementations by providing a faster alternative than deserializing the full key from the received data-object.

When the key hash is not received by a DataReader, it should be computed from the data itself. If there is no data in the submessage, then a default zero-valued key hash should be used by the DataReader.

A KeyHash, if present, shall be computed as described in Section 9.6.3.3.
Platform Specific Model (PSM) : UDP/IP

9.1 Introduction

This chapter defines the Platform Specific Model (PSM) that maps the Protocol PIM to UDP/IP. The goal for this PSM is to provide a mapping with minimal overhead directly on top of UDP/IP.

The suitability of UDP/IP as a transport for DDS applications stems from several factors:

- Universal availability. Being a core part of the IP stack, UDP/IP is available on virtually all operating systems.
- Light-weight. UDP/IP is a very simple protocol that adds minimal services on top of IP. Its use enables the use of IP-based networks with the minimal possible overhead.
- Best-effort. UDP/IP provides a best-effort service that maps well to Quality-of-service needs of many real-time data streams. In the situations where it is needed, the RTPS protocol provides the mechanism to attain reliable delivery on top of the best-effort service provided by UDP.
- Connectionless. UDP/IP offers a connectionless service; this allows multiple RTPS endpoints to share a single operating-system UDP resource (socket/port) while allowing for interleaving of messages effectively providing an out-of-band mechanism for each separate data-stream.
- Predictable behavior. Unlike TCP, UDP does not introduce timers that would cause operations to block for varying amounts of time. As such, it is simpler to model the impact of using UDP on a real-time application.
- Scalability and multicast support. UDP/IP natively supports multicast which allows efficient distribution of a single message to a large number of recipients.

9.2 Notational Conventions

9.2.1 Name Space

All the definitions in this document are part of the “RTPS” name-space. To facilitate reading and understanding, the name-space prefix has been left out of the definitions and classes in this document.

9.2.2 IDL Representation of Structures and CDR Wire Representation

The following sections often define structures, such as:

```c
struct {
    octet[3] entityKey;
    octet entityKind;
} EntityId_t;
```

These definitions use the OMG IDL (Interface Definition Language). When these structures are sent on the wire, they are encoded using the corresponding CDR representation.

9.2.3 Representation of Bits and Bytes

This document often uses the following notation to represent an octet or byte:
In this notation, the leftmost bit (bit 7) is the most significant bit ("MSB") and the rightmost bit (bit 0) is the least significant bit ("LSB").

Streams of bytes are ordered per lines of 4 bytes each as follows:

```
0...2...........7.............15...................23............31
```

In this representation, the byte that comes first in the stream is on the left. The bit on the extreme left is the MSB of the first byte; the bit on the extreme right is the LSB of the 4th byte.

### 9.3 Mapping of the RTPS Types

#### 9.3.1 The Globally Unique Identifier (GUID)

The GUID is an attribute present in all RTPS Entities that uniquely identifies them within the DDS domain (see Section 8.2.4.1). The PIM defines the GUID as composed of a `GuidPrefix_t` prefix capable of holding 12 bytes, and an `EntityId_t` `entityId` capable of holding 4 bytes. This section defines how the PSM maps those structures.

##### 9.3.1.1 Mapping of the GuidPrefix_t

The PSM maps the `GuidPrefix_t` to the following structure:

```c
typedef octet[12] GuidPrefix_t;
```

The reserved constant GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN defined by the PIM is mapped to:

```
#define GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN {0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00}
```

##### 9.3.1.2 Mapping of the EntityId_t

Section 8.2.4.3 states that the `EntityId_t` is the unique identification of the `Endpoint` within the `Participant`.

The PSM maps the `EntityId_t` to the following structure:

```c
struct {
    octet[3] entityKey;
    octet entityKind;
} EntityId_t;
```

The reserved constant ENTITYID_UNKNOWN defined by the PIM is mapped to:

```
#define ENTITYID_UNKNOWN {0x00, 0x00, 0x00, 0x00}
```
The \textit{entityKind} field within \textit{EntityId\_t} encodes the kind of \textit{Entity} (\textit{Participant}, \textit{Reader}, \textit{Writer}) and whether the \textit{Entity} is a built-in \textit{Entity} (fully pre-defined by the Protocol, automatically instantiated), a user-defined \textit{Entity} (defined by the Protocol, but instantiated by the user only as needed by the application) or a vendor-specific \textit{Entity} (defined by a vendor-specific extension to the Protocol, can therefore be ignored by another vendor’s implementation).

When not pre-defined (see below), the \textit{entityKey} field within the \textit{EntityId\_t} can be chosen arbitrarily by the middleware implementation as long as the resulting \textit{EntityId\_t} is unique within the \textit{Participant}.

The information on whether the object is a built-in entity, a vendor-specific entity, or a user-defined entity is encoded in the two most-significant bits of the \textit{entityKind}. These two bits are set to:

- ‘00’ for user-defined entities.
- ‘11’ for built-in entities.
- ‘01’ for vendor-specific entities.

The information on the kind of \textit{Entity} is encoded in the last six bits of the \textit{entityKind} field. Table 9.1 provides a complete list of the possible values of the \textit{entityKind} supported in version 2.1 of the protocol. These are fixed in this major version (2) of the protocol. New \textit{entity Kinds} may be added in higher minor versions of the protocol in order to extend the model with new kinds of \textit{Entities}.

Table 9.1 - \textit{entityKind} octet of an \textit{EntityId\_t}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Entity</th>
<th>User-defined Entity</th>
<th>Built-in Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0x00</td>
<td>0xc0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0xc1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer (with Key)</td>
<td>0x02</td>
<td>0xc2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer (no Key)</td>
<td>0x03</td>
<td>0xc3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader (no Key)</td>
<td>0x04</td>
<td>0xc4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader (with Key)</td>
<td>0x07</td>
<td>0xc7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3.1.3 Predefined EntityIds

As mentioned above, the entity IDs for built-in entities are fully predefined by the RTPS Protocol.

The PIM specifies that the \textit{EntityId\_t} of a \textit{Participant} has the pre-defined value ENTITYID\_PARTICIPANT (Section 8.2.4.2). The corresponding PSM mapping of all pre-defined \textit{Entity} IDs appears in Table 9.2. The meaning of these \textit{Entity} IDs cannot change in this major version (2) of the protocol, but future minor versions may add additional reserved \textit{Entity} IDs.

Table 9.2 - \textit{EntityId\_t} values fully predefined by the RTPS Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Corresponding value for entityId_t (NAME = value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>participant</td>
<td>ENTITYID_PARTICIPANT = {00,00,01,c1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDP_builtin_TopicWriter</td>
<td>ENTITYID_SED_BUILTIN_TOPIC_WRITER = {00,00,02,c2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3.1.4 Deprecated EntityIds in version 2.1 of the Protocol

The Discovery Protocol used in version 2.1 of the protocol deprecates the EntityIds shown in Table 9.3. These EntityIds should not be used by future versions of the protocol unless they are used with the same meaning as in versions prior to 2.1. Implementations that wish to discover earlier versions should utilize these EntityIds.

Table 9.3 - Deprecated EntityIds in version 2.1 of the protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Corresponding entryId</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>0x05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>0x06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerApplications</td>
<td>{00,00,01,c2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerApplications</td>
<td>{00,00,01,c7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerClients</td>
<td>{00,00,05,c2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerClients</td>
<td>{00,00,05,c7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerServices</td>
<td>{00,00,06,c2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerServices</td>
<td>{00,00,06,c7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerManagers</td>
<td>{00,00,07,c2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>readerManagers</td>
<td>{00,00,07,c7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerApplicationsSelf</td>
<td>{00,00,08,c2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3.1.5 Mapping of the GUID_t

The PSM maps the `GUID_t` to the following structure:

```c
typedef struct {
    GuidPrefix_t guidPrefix;
    EntityId_t entityId;
} GUID_t;
```

The reserved constant `GUID_UNKNOWN` defined by the PIM is mapped to:

```c
#define GUID_UNKNOWN{ GUIDPREFIX_UNKNOWN, ENTITYID_UNKNOWN }
```

9.3.2 Mapping of the Types that Appear Within Submessages or Built-in Topic Data

Table 9.4 specifies the PSM mapping of those types introduced by the PIM that appear within messages sent by the protocol. There is no need to map the types that are used exclusively by the virtual machine, but do not appear in the messages.

**Table 9.4 - PSM mapping of the value types that appear on the wire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mapping of the type</th>
<th>PSM Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Time_t**| `struct {
            long seconds; // time in seconds
            unsigned long fraction; // time in sec/2^32
        } Time_t;`                                                                      | The representation of the time is the one defined by the IETF Network Time Protocol (NTP) Standard (IETF RFC 1305). In this representation, time is expressed in seconds and fraction of seconds using the formula:
        |                                                                                     | `time = seconds + (fraction / 2^32)`             |
| **VendorId_t** | `struct {
            octet[2] vendorId;
        } VendorId_t;`                                                                         | Mapping of the reserved values:
|                                                      | `#define TIME_ZERO {0, 0}`                                                               | `#define TIME_INVALID {-1, 0xffffffff}`          |
|                                                      | `#define TIME_INFINITY {0xffffffff, 0xffffffff}`                                        | `#define VENDORID_UNKNOWN {0,0}`                  |
|                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                 |
SequenceNumber_t  
Mapping of the type  
```c
struct {
    long high;
    unsigned long low;
} SequenceNumber_t;
```

Using this structure, the 64-bit sequence number is:
```
seq_num = high * 2^32 + low
```

Mapping of the reserved values:
```
#define SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN {-1,0}
```

FragmentNumber_t 
Mapping of the type  
```c
struct {
    unsigned long value;
} FragmentNumber_t;
```
If the Locator_t kind is LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4, the address contains an IPv4 address. In this case the leading 12 octets of the address must be zero. The last 4 octets are used to store the IPv4 address. The mapping between the dot-notation “a.b.c.d” of an IPv4 address and its representation in the address field of a Locator_t is:

$$\text{address} = (0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,a,b,c,d)$$

If the Locator_t kind is LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6, the address contains an IPv6 address. IPv6 addresses typically use a shorthand hexadecimal notation that maps one-to-one to the 16 octets in the address field. For example the representation of the IPv6 address “FF00:4501:0:0:0:0:0:32” is:

$$\text{address} = (0xff,0,0x45,0x01,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0x32)$$

Mapping of the reserved values:

```c
#define LOCATOR_INVALID
{LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID, LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID,
 LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID}
#define LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID -1
#define LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID
{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0}
#define LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID 0
#define LOCATOR_KIND_RESERVED 0
#define LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4 1
#define LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6 2
```

```c
topicKind_t
;
```

Mapping of the reserved values:

```c
#define NO_KEY 1
#define WITH_KEY 2
```

### Table 9.4 - PSM mapping of the value types that appear on the wire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mapping of the type</th>
<th>PSM Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locator_t</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mapping of the type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>struct {</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long kind;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unsigned long port;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>octet[16] address;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} Locator_t;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Locator_t kind is LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4, the address contains an IPv4 address.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this case the leading 12 octets of the address must be zero. The last 4 octets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are used to store the IPv4 address. The mapping between the dot-notation “a.b.c.d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of an IPv4 address and its representation in the address field of a Locator_t is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\text{address} = (0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,a,b,c,d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Locator_t kind is LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6, the address contains an IPv6 address.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPv6 addresses typically use a shorthand hexadecimal notation that maps one-to-one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the 16 octets in the address field. For example the representation of the IPv6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address “FF00:4501:0:0:0:0:0:32” is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\text{address} = (0xff,0,0x45,0x01,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0x32}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mapping of the reserved values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_INVALID \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID, LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID, LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_KIND_INVALID -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_ADDRESS_INVALID \</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_PORT_INVALID 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_KIND_RESERVED 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv6 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TopicKind_t</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mapping of the type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>struct {</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long value;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} TopicKind_t;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mapping of the reserved values:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define NO_KEY 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define WITH_KEY 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 9.4 - PSM mapping of the value types that appear on the wire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>PSM Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ReliabilityKind_t   | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | struct {
|                     |   long value;
|                     | } ReliabilityKind_t;                                                       |
|                     | **Mapping of the reserved values:**                                        |
|                     | #define BEST_EFFORT 1                                                      |
|                     | #define RELIABLE 3                                                        |
| Count_t             | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | struct {
|                     |   long value;
|                     | } Count_t;                                                                 |
| ProtocolVersion_t   | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | typedef struct {
|                     |   octet major;
|                     |   octet minor;
|                     | } ProtocolVersion_t;                                                      |
|                     | **Mapping of the reserved values:**                                        |
|                     | #define PROTOCOLVERSION_1_0 {1,0}                                          |
|                     | #define PROTOCOLVERSION_1_1 {1,1}                                          |
|                     | #define PROTOCOLVERSION_2_0 {2,0}                                          |
|                     | #define PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1 {2,1}                                          |
|                     | #define PROTOCOLVERSION PROTOCOLVERSION_2_1                                |
|                     | **The Implementations following this version of the document implement protocol version 2.1 (major = 2, minor = 1).** |
| KeyHash             | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | struct {
|                     |   octet[16] value;                                                        |
|                     | } KeyHash_t;                                                               |
| StatusInfo_t        | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | struct {
|                     |   octet[4] value;                                                         |
|                     | } StatusInfo_t;                                                            |
| ParameterId_t       | **Mapping of the type**  
|                     | struct {
|                     |   short value;                                                            |
|                     | } ParameterId_t;                                                           |
Table 9.4 - PSM mapping of the value types that appear on the wire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>PSM Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ContentFilterProperty_t</td>
<td>Mapping of the type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typedef struct {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt; contentFilteredTopicName;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt; relatedTopicName;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt; filterClassName;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string filterExpression;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequence&lt;string&gt; expressionParameters;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} ContentFilterProperty_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContentFilterInfo_t</td>
<td>Mapping of the type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typedef struct {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FilterResult_t filterResult;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequence&lt;FilterSignature_t&gt; filterSignatures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} ContentFilterInfo_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typedef sequence&lt;long&gt; FilterResult_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typedef long[4] FilterSignature_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property_t</td>
<td>struct {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string name;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} Property_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EntityName_t</td>
<td>struct {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>string name;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} EntityName_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OriginalWriterInfo_t</td>
<td>struct {</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUID_t originalWriterGUID;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SequenceNumber_t originalWriterSN;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParameterList originalWriterQos;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>} OriginalWriterInfo_t;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.4 - PSM mapping of the value types that appear on the wire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>PSM Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BuiltinEndpointSet_t</td>
<td>Mapping of the type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typedef unsigned long BuiltinEndpointSet_t;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_ANNOUNCER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 0;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_DETECTOR 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PUBLICATION_ANNOUNCER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 2;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PUBLICATION_DETECTOR 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_SUBSCRIPTION_ANNOUNCER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 4;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_SUBSCRIPTION_DETECTOR 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 5;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_PROXY_ANNOUNCER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_PROXY_DETECTOR 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 7;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_STATE_ANNOUNCER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define DISC_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_STATE_DETECTOR 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 9;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_DATA_WRITER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 10;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#define BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_DATA_READER 0x00000001 &lt;&lt; 11;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the types introduced by the PIM, the UDP PSM introduces the additional types listed in Table 9.5.

### Table 9.5 - Additional types introduced by the UDP PSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LocatorUDPv4_t     | **Description**
|                    | Specialization of Locator_t used to hold UDP IPv4 locators using a more compact representation.
|                    | Equivalent to Locator_t with kind set to LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4.
|                    | Need only be able to hold an IPv4 address and a port number.
|                    | The following values are reserved by the protocol:
|                    | LOCATORUDPv4_INVALID
|                    | **Mapping**
|                    | Mapping of the type
|                    | struct {
|                    |     unsigned long address;
|                    |     unsigned long port;
|                    | } LocatorUDPv4_t;
|                    | The mapping between the dot-notation “a.b.c.d” of an IPv4 address and its representation as an unsigned long is as follows:
|                    | address = (((a*256 + b)*256) + c)*256 + d
|                    | **Mapping of the reserved values:**
|                    | #define LOCATORUDPv4_INVALID {0, 0}

### 9.4Mapping of the RTPS Messages

#### 9.4.1 Overall Structure

Section 8.3.3 in the PIM defined the overall structure of a Message as composed of a leading Header followed by a variable number of Submessages.

The PSM aligns each Submessage on a 32-bit boundary with respect to the start of the Message.
A **Message** has a well-known length. This length is not sent explicitly by the RTPS protocol but is part of the underlying transport with which **Messages** are sent. In the case of UDP/IP, the length of the **Message** is the length of the UDP payload.

## 9.4.2 Mapping of the PIM SubmessageElements

Each RTPS **Submessage** is built from a set of predefined atomic building blocks called “submessage elements,” as defined in Section 8.3.5. This section describes the PSM mapping for each of the **SubmessageElements** defined by the PIM.

### 9.4.2.1 EntityId

The PSM mapping for the **EntityId** SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.1 is given by the following IDL definition:

```idl
typedef EntityId_t EntityId;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the **EntityId** SubmessageElement is:

```
EntityId:
0...2...........8...........16...........24...........32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     octet[4]  value                           |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

### 9.4.2.2 GuidPrefix

The PSM mapping for the **GuidPrefix** SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.1 is given by the following IDL definition:

```idl
typedef GuidPrefix_t GuidPrefix;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the **GuidPrefix** SubmessageElement is:

```
GuidPrefix:
0...2...........8...........16...........24...........32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
+                                                               +
|                      octet[12]  value                         |
+                                                               +
+-------------------+-------------------+-------------------+
```

### 9.4.2.3 VendorId

The PSM mapping for the **VendorId** SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.2 is given by the following IDL definition:

```idl
typedef VendorId_t VendorId;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the **VendorId** SubmessageElement is:
VendorId:
0...2...........8................16
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| octet[2] vendorId |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

9.4.2.4 ProtocolVersion

The PSM mapping for the ProtocolVersion SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.3 is given by the following IDL definition:

typedef ProtocolVersion_t ProtocolVersion;

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the ProtocolVersion SubmessageElement is:

ProtocolVersion:
0...2...........8................16
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| octet major | octet minor |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

9.4.2.5 SequenceNumber

The PSM mapping for the SequenceNumber SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.4 is given by the following IDL definition:

typedef SequenceNumber_t SequenceNumber;

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the SequenceNumber SubmessageElement is:

SequenceNumber:
0...2...........8................16.............24................32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| long             high                       |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| unsigned long    low                        |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+

9.4.2.6 SequenceNumberSet

The PSM maps the SequenceNumberSet SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.5 to the following structure:

struct {
    SequenceNumber_t bitmapBase;
    sequence<long, 8> bitmap;
} SequenceNumberSet;

The above structure offers a compact representation encoding a set of up to 256 sequence numbers. The representation of the SequenceNumberSet includes the first sequence number in the set (bitmapBase) and a bitmap of up to 256 bits. The number of bits in the bitmap is denoted by numBits. The value of each bit in the bitmap indicates whether the SequenceNumber obtained by adding the offset of the bit to the bitmapBase is included (bit=1) or excluded (bit=0) from the SequenceNumberSet.

More precisely a SequenceNumber ‘seqNum’ belongs to the SequenceNumberSet ‘seqNumSet,’ if and only if the following two conditions apply:
seqNumSet.bitmapBase <= seqNum < seqNumSet.bitmapBase + seqNumSet.numBits
1 (bitmap[deltaN/32] & (1 << (31 - deltaN%32))) == (1 << (31 - deltaN%32))

where

deltaN = seqNum - seqNumSet.bitmapBase

A valid SequenceNumberSet must satisfy the following conditions:

- bitmapBase >= 1
- 0 < numBits <= 256
- there are M=(numBits+31)/32 longs containing the pertinent bits

This document uses the following notation for a specific bitmap:

bitmapBase/numBits:bitmap

In the bitmap, the bit corresponding to sequence number bitmapBase is on the left. The ending "0" bits can be represented as one "0."

For example, in bitmap “1234/12:00110”, bitmapBase=1234 and numBits=12. The bits apply as follows to the sequence numbers:

Table 9.6 - Example of bitmap: meaning of “1234/12:00110”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SequenceNumber</th>
<th>Bit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238-1245</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wire representation of the SequenceNumberSet SubmessageElement is:

```
SequenceNumberSet:
0...2...........8..............16.................24...................32
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | SequenceNumber bitmapBase   |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | unsigned long numBits       |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | long bitmap[0]              |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | long bitmap[1]              |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | ...                         |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
|                              | long bitmap[M-1] M = (numBits+31)/32 |
+-------------------------------+-----------------------------+
```
The *numBits* field encodes both the number of significant bits and the number of bitmap elements. Due to this optimization, this SubmessageElement does not follow strict CDR encoding.

### 9.4.2.7 FragmentNumber

The PSM mapping for the *FragmentNumber* SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.6 is given by the following IDL definition:

```
typedef FragmentNumber_t FragmentNumber;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the *FragmentNumber* SubmessageElement is:

```
FragmentNumber:
0...2...........8...........16...........24.............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|               unsigned long    value                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

### 9.4.2.8 FragmentNumberSet

The PSM maps the *FragmentNumberSet* SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.7 to the following structure:

```
struct {
   FragmentNumber_t bitmapBase;
    sequence<long, 8> bitmap;
} FragmentNumberSet;
```

The above structure offers a compact representation encoding a set of up to 256 fragment numbers. The representation of the *FragmentNumberSet* includes the first fragment number in the set (*bitmapBase*) and a *bitmap* of up to 256 bits. The interpretation matches that of a *SequenceNumberSet*.

The wire representation of the *FragmentNumberSet* SubmessageElement is:

```
FragmentNumberSet
0...2...........8...........16...........24.............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   fragmentNumber  bitmapBase                  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   unsigned long  numBits                      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   long      bitmap[0]                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   long      bitmap[1]                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                              ...                              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   long      bitmap[M-1]  M = (numBits+31)/32  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

The *numBits* field encodes both the number of significant bits and the number of bitmap elements. Due to this optimization, this SubmessageElement does not follow strict CDR encoding.
9.4.2.9 Timestamp

The PSM mapping for the Timestamp SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.8 is given by the following IDL definition:

```idl
typedef Time_t Timestamp;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the Timestamp SubmessageElement is:

```
Timestamp:
0...2...........8.............16...........24............31
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                   long             seconds                    |
|---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------|
|                   unsigned long    fraction                   |
|---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------|
```

9.4.2.10 LocatorList

The PSM mapping for the LocatorList SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.11 is given by the following IDL definition:

```idl
typedef sequence<Locator_t, 8> LocatorList;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the LocatorList SubmessageElement is:

```
LocatorList:
0...2...........8.............16...........24............31
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                   unsigned long    numLocators               |
|---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------|
|                   Locator_t        locator_1                 |
|                    ...                                         |
|                   Locator_t        locator_numLocators       |
|---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------|
```

Where each Locator_t has the following wire representation:

```
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                   long             kind                       |
|---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------|
|                   unsigned long    port                       |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                   octet[16]        address                      |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
```

9.4.2.11 ParameterList

A ParameterList contains a list of Parameters, terminated with a sentinel. Each Parameter within the ParameterList starts aligned on a 4-byte boundary with respect to the start of the ParameterList.

The IDL representation for each Parameter is:

```c
typedef short ParameterId_t
struct Parameter {
    ParameterId_t parameterId;
    short length;
    octet value[length];
};
```

The parameterId identifies the type of parameter.

The length encodes the number of octets following the length to reach the ID of the next parameter (or the ID of the sentinel). Because every parameterId starts on a 4-byte boundary, the length is always a multiple of four.

The value contains the CDR encapsulation of the Parameter type that corresponds to the specified parameterId. For alignment purposes, the CDR stream is logically reset for each parameter (i.e., no initial padding is required).

The ParameterList may contain multiple Parameters with the same value for the parameterId. This is used to provide a collection of values for that kind of Parameter.

The use of ParameterList encapsulation makes it possible to extend the protocol and introduce new parameters and still be able to preserve interoperability with earlier versions of the protocol.

The wire representation for the ParameterList is:

```
ParamaterList
.....2...........8.............16............24.................32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| short parameterId_1 | short length_1 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|. octet[length_1] value_1 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| short parameterId_2 | short length_2 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|. octet[length_2] value_2 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|. ... |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| PID_SENTINEL | ignored |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

There are two predefined values of the parameterId used for the encapsulation:

```
#define PID_PAD (0)
```
#define PID_SENTINEL (1)

The PID_SENTINEL is used to terminate the parameter list and its length is ignored. The PID_PAD is used to enforce alignment of the parameter that follows and its length can be anything (as long as it is a multiple of 4).

The complete set of possible values for the parameterId in version 2.1 of the protocol appears in Section 9.6.3.

### 9.4.2.12 SerializedPayload

A **SerializedPayload** SubmessageElement contains the serialized representation of either value of an application-defined data-object or the value of the key that uniquely identifies the data-object.

The specification of the process used to encapsulate the application-level data-type into a serialized byte-stream is not strictly part of the RTPS protocol. For the purpose of interoperability, all implementations must however use a consistent representation (See Chapter 10, ‘Data Encapsulation’).

The wire representation for the **SerializedPayload** is:

```
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>octet[]</td>
<td>serializedPayload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Note that when using CDR, primitive types must be aligned to their length. For example, a long must start on a 4-byte boundary. The boundaries are counted from the start of the CDR stream.

### 9.4.2.13 Count

The PSM maps the **Count** SubmessageElement defined in Section 8.3.5.10 to the structure:

```c
typedef Count_t Count;
```

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the **Count** SubmessageElement is:

```
+------------------------------------------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>long  value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
```

### 9.4.3 Additional SubmessageElements

In addition to the SubmessageElements introduced by the PIM, the UDP PSM introduces the following additional SubmessageElements.
9.4.3.1 LocatorUDPv4

The LocatorUDPv4 SubmessageElement is identical to a LocatorList SubmessageElement containing a single locator of kind LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4. LocatorUDPv4 is introduced to provide a more compact representation when using UDP on IPv4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>field</th>
<th>type</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>LocatorUDPv4_t</td>
<td>A single IPv4 address and port.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PSM maps the LocatorUDPv4 SubmessageElement to the structure:

typedef LocatorUDPv4_t LocatorUDPv4;

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the LocatorUDPv4 SubmessageElement is:

LocatorUDPv4:

```
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                   unsigned long    address                    |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                   unsigned long    port                       |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

9.4.4 Mapping of the RTPS Header

Section 8.3.7 in the PIM specifies that all messages should include a leading RTPS Header. The PSM mapping of the RTPS Header is shown below:

Header:

```
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| 'R'           | 'T'           | 'P'           | 'S'           | ProtocolVersion version | VendorId vendorId |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|               |               |               |               |                       |                 |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| GuidPrefix    | guidPrefix    |               |               |                       |                 |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

The structure of the Header cannot change in this major version (2) of the protocol.
9.4.5 Mapping of the RTPS Submessages

9.4.5.1 Submessage Header

Section 8.3.3.2 in the PIM defined the structure of all Submessages as composed of a leading SubmessageHeader followed by a variable number of SubmessageElements.

The PSM maps the SubmessageHeader into the following structure:

```c
struct {
    octet submessageId;
    octet flags;
    unsigned short submessageLength; /* octetsToNextHeader */
} SubmessageHeader;
```

With the byte stream representation defined in Section 9.2.3, the submessageLength is defined as the number of octets from the start of the contents of the Submessage to the start of the next Submessage header. Given this definition, the remainder of the UDP PSM will refer to submessageLength as octetsToNextHeader. See also Section 9.4.5.1.3.

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the SubmessageHeader is shown below:

```
SubmessageHeader:
0...2...........8...........16...........24...........32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| submessageId  |      flags  |E|   ushort octetsToNextHeader   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| following are the |
- contents of Submessage -
| +-------------------------------+
```

This general structure cannot change in this major version (2) of the protocol. The following sections discuss each member of the SubmessageHeader in more detail.

9.4.5.1.1 SubmessageId

This octet identifies the kind of Submessage. Submessages with IDs 0x00 to 0x7f (inclusive) are protocol-specific. They are defined as part of the RTPS protocol. Version 2.1 defines the following Submessages:

```c
enum SubmessageKind {
    PAD = 0x01, /* Pad */
    ACKNACK = 0x06, /* AckNack */
    HEARTBEAT = 0x07, /* Heartbeat */
    GAP = 0x08, /* Gap */
    INFO_TS = 0x09, /* InfoTimestamp */
    INFO_SRC = 0x0c, /* InfoSource */
    INFO_REPLY_IP4 = 0x0d, /* InfoReplyIp4 */
    INFO_DST = 0x0e, /* InfoDestination */
    INFO_REPLY = 0x0f, /* InfoReply */
    NACK_FRAG = 0x12, /* NackFrag */
    HEARTBEAT_FRAG = 0x13, /* HeartbeatFrag */
    DATA = 0x15, /* Data */
    DATA_FRAG = 0x16, /* DataFrag */
};
```
The meaning of the Submessage IDs cannot be modified in this major version (2). Additional Submessages can be added in higher minor versions. Submessages with ID's 0x80 to 0xff (inclusive) are vendor-specific; they will not be defined by future versions of the protocol. Their interpretation is dependent on the vendorId that is current when the Submessage is encountered.

9.4.5.1.2 flags

Section 8.3.3.2 in the PIM defines the EndiannessFlag as a flag present in all Submessages that indicates the endianness used to encode the Submessage. The PSM maps the EndiannessFlag flag into the least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags. This bit is therefore always present in all Submessages and represents the endianness used to encode the information in the Submessage. The EndiannessFlag is represented with the literal ‘E’. E=0 means big-endian, E=1 means little-endian.

The value of the EndiannessFlag can be obtained from the expression:

$$E = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x01$$

Other bits in the flags have interpretations that depend on the type of Submessage.

In the following descriptions of the Submessages, the character ‘X’ is used to indicate a flag that is unused in version 2.1 of the protocol. Implementations of RTPS version 2.1 should set these to zero when sending and ignore these when receiving. Higher minor versions of the protocol can use these flags.

9.4.5.1.3 octetsToNextHeader

The representation of this field is a CDR unsigned short (ushort).

In case octetsToNextHeader > 0, it is the number of octets from the first octet of the contents of the Submessage until the first octet of the header of the next Submessage (in case the Submessage is not the last Submessage in the Message) OR it is the number of octets remaining in the Message (in case the Submessage is the last Submessage in the Message). An interpreter of the Message can distinguish these two cases as it knows the total length of the Message.

In case octetsToNextHeader==0 and the kind of Submessage is NOT PAD or INFO_TS, the Submessage is the last Submessage in the Message and extends up to the end of the Message. This makes it possible to send Submessages larger than 64k (the size that can be stored in the octetsToNextHeader field), provided they are the last Submessage in the Message.

In case the octetsToNextHeader==0 and the kind of Submessage is PAD or INFO_TS, the next Submessage header starts immediately after the current Submessage header OR the PAD or INFO_TS is the last Submessage in the Message.

9.4.5.2 AckNack Submessage

Section 8.3.7.1 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the AckNack Submessage. The PSM maps the AckNack Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2............7...........15............23............31
+-------------------+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| ACKNACK | X|X|X|X|X|X|F|E| octetsToNextHeader |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                 EntityId             readerId                  |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                 EntityId             writerId                  |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                                                               |
~ SequenceNumberSet    readerSNState                  ~
|                                                               |
```
9.4.5.2.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, The AckNack Submessage introduces the FinalFlag ("Content" on page 46). The PSM maps the FinalFlag flag into the 2nd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags.

The FinalFlag is represented with the literal ‘F’. F=1 means the reader does not require a response from the writer. F=0 means the writer must respond to the AckNack message.

The value of the FinalFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ F = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x02 \]

9.4.5.3 Data Submessage

Section 8.3.7.2 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the Data Submessage. The PSM maps the Data Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
+------------------------+------------------------+------------------------+
| DATA                   | extraFlags             | octetsToInlineQos      |
| Flags                  |                        |                        |
| EntityId               | readerId               |                        |
|                        | writerId               |                        |
| SequenceNumber         | writerSN               |                        |
| ParameterList          | inlineQos              |                        |
|                        | serializedPayload      |                        |
|                        |                        |                        |
```

9.4.5.3.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, The Data Submessage introduces the InlineQosFlag, DataFlag, and Key (see “Contents” on page 50). The PSM maps these flags as follows:

The InlineQosFlag is represented with the literal ‘Q.’ Q=1 means that the Data Submessage contains the inlineQos SubmessageElement.

The value of the InlineQosFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ Q = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x02 \]

The DataFlag is represented with the literal ‘D.’ The value of the DataFlag can be obtained from the expression.

\[ D = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x04 \]
The KeyFlag is represented with the literal ‘K.’ The value of the KeyFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ K = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x08 \]

The DataFlag is interpreted in combination with the KeyFlag as follows:

- D=0 and K=0 means that there is no serializedPayload SubmessageElement.
- D=1 and K=0 means that the serializedPayload SubmessageElement contains the serialized Data.
- D=0 and K=1 means that the serializedPayload SubmessageElement contains the serialized Key.
- D=1 and K=1 is an invalid combination in this version of the protocol.

9.4.5.3.2 extraFlags

The extraFlags field provides space for an additional 16 bits of flags beyond the 8 bits provided as in the submessage header. These additional bits will support evolution of the protocol without compromising backwards compatibility.

This version of the protocol should set all the bits in the extraFlags to zero.

9.4.5.3.3 octetsToInlineQos

The representation of this field is a CDR unsigned short (ushort).

The octetsToInlineQos field contains the number of octets starting from the first octet immediately following this field until the first octet of the inlineQos SubmessageElement. If the inlineQos SubmessageElement is not present (i.e., the InlineQosFlag is not set), then octetsToInlineQos contains the offset to the next field after the inlineQos.

Implementation of the protocol that are processing a received submessage should always use the octetsToInlineQos to skip any submessage headers it does not expect or understand and continue to process the inlineQos SubmessageElement (or the first submessage element that follows inlineQos if the inlineQos is not present). This rule is necessary so that the received will be able to interoperate with senders that use future versions of the protocol which may include additional submessage headers before the inlineQos.

9.4.5.4 DataFrag Submessage

Section 8.3.7.3 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the DataFrag Submessage. The PSM maps the DataFrag Submessage into the following wire representation:
9.4.5.4.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, The DataFrag Submessage introduces the KeyFlag and InlineQosFlag (see “Contents” on page 48). The PSM maps these flags as follows:

The InlineQosFlag is represented with the literal ‘Q’. Q=1 means that the DataFrag Submessage contains the inlineQos SubmessageElement.

The value of the InlineQosFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ Q = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x02 \]

The KeyFlag is represented with the literal ‘K.’

The value of the KeyFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ K = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x04 \]

K=0 means that the serializedPayload SubmessageElement contains the serialized Data.

K=1 means that the serializedPayload SubmessageElement contains the serialized Key.

9.4.5.5 Gap Submessage

Section 8.3.7.4 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the Gap Submessage. The PSM maps the Gap Submessage into the following wire representation:
9.4.5.5 Flags in the Submessage Header

This Submessage has no flags in addition to the EndiannessFlag.

9.4.5.6 HeartBeat Submessage

Section 8.3.7.5 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the HeartBeat Submessage. The PSM maps the HeartBeat Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........7...........15...........23...........31
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| HEARTBEAT |X|X|X|X|X|L|F|E| octetsToNextHeader |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| EntityId | readerId |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| EntityId | writerId |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| SequenceNumber | gapStart |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| SequenceNumber | gapList |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| SequenceNumberSet | gapList |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Count | count |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

9.4.5.6.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, the HeartBeat Submessage introduces the FinalFlag and the LivelinessFlag (“Content” on page 46). The PSM maps the FinalFlag flag into the 2nd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags and the LivelinessFlag into the 3rd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags.

The FinalFlag is represented with the literal ‘F’. F=1 means the Writer does not require a response from the Reader. F=0 means the Reader must respond to the HeartBeat message.

The value of the FinalFlag can be obtained from the expression:
The `LivelinessFlag` is represented with the literal ‘L’. L=1 means the DDS DataReader associated with the RTPS **Reader** should refresh the ‘manual’ liveliness of the DDS DataWriter associated with the RTPS **Writer** of the message.

The value of the `LivelinessFlag` can be obtained from the expression:

\[
L = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x04
\]

### 9.4.5.7 HeartBeatFrag Submessage

Section 8.3.7.6 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the `HeartBeatFrag` Submessage. The PSM maps the `HeartBeatFrag` Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8............16............24............32
+-----------------------------------------------+
| HEARTBEAT_FRAG|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|E|       octetsToNextHeader       |
+-----------------------------------------------+
|   EntityId        readerId                    |
|   EntityId        writerId                    |
|   SequenceNumber   writerSN                   |
|   FragmentNumber   lastFragmentNum            |
|   Count           count                       |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

#### 9.4.5.7.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

The `HeartBeatFrag` Submessage introduces no other flags in addition to the `EndiannessFlag`.

### 9.4.5.8 InfoDestination Submessage

Section 8.3.7.7 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the `InfoDestination` Submessage. The PSM maps the `InfoDestination` Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8............16............24............32
+-----------------------------------------------+
| INFO_DST     |X|X|X|X|X|X|X|E|    octetsToNextHeader   |
+-----------------------------------------------+
|   GuidPrefix  guidPrefix                      |
|   GuidPrefix  guidPrefix                      |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

#### 9.4.5.8.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

This Submessage has no flags in addition to the `EndiannessFlag`.
9.4.5.9 InfoReply Submessage

Section 8.3.7.8 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the InfoReply Submessage. The PSM maps the InfoReply Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8............16............24............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| INFO_REPLY |X|X|X|X|X|M|E|     octetsToNextHeader        |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|               |LocatortList   unicastLocatorList                        |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|               |LocatortList   multicastLocatorList [ only if M==1 ]      |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

9.4.5.9.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, the InfoReply Submessage introduces the MulticastFlag (“Content” on page 46). The PSM maps the MulticastFlag flag into the 2nd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags.

The MulticastFlag is represented with the literal ‘M’. M=1 means the InfoReply also includes a multicastLocatorList.

The value of the MulticastFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ M = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x02 \]

9.4.5.10 InfoSource Submessage

Section 8.3.7.9 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the InfoSource Submessage. The PSM maps the InfoSource Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8............16............24............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| INFO_SRC      |X|X|X|X|X|X|X|E|     octetsToNextHeader        |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|      long                      unused                         |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| ProtocolVersion version       | VendorId vendorId             |
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| GuidPrefix     guidPrefix                   +
+----------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

9.4.5.10.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

This Submessage has no flags in addition to the EndiannessFlag.
9.4.5.11 InfoTimestamp Submessage

Section 8.3.7.9.6 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the InfoTimestamp Submessage. The PSM maps the InfoTimestamp Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8...........16..........24..........32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| INFO_TS       |X|X|X|X|X|X|I|E|     octetsToNextHeader        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|      Timestamp      timestamp                [ only if I==0 ] |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

9.4.5.11.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, the InfoTimestamp Submessage introduces the InvalidateFlag ("Content" on page 46). The PSM maps the InvalidateFlag flag into the 2nd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags.

The InvalidateFlag is represented with the literal ‘I’. I=0 means the InfoTimestamp also includes a timestamp. I=1 means subsequent Submessages should not be considered to have a valid timestamp.

The value of the InvalidateFlag can be obtained from the expression:

```
I = SubmessageHeader.flags & 0x02
```

9.4.5.12 Pad Submessage

Section 8.3.7.11 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the Pad Submessage. The PSM maps the Pad Submessage into the following wire representation:

```
0...2...........8...........16..........24..........32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   PAD         |X|X|X|X|X|X|X|E|     octetsToNextHeader        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

9.4.5.12.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

This Submessage has no flags in addition to the EndiannessFlag.

9.4.5.13 NackFrag Submessage

Section 8.3.7.10 in the PIM defines the logical contents of the NackFrag Submessage. The PSM maps the NackFrag Submessage into the following wire representation:
9.4.5.13.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

This Submessage has no flags in addition to the EndiannessFlag.

9.4.5.14 InfoReplyIp4 Submessage (PSM specific)

The InfoReplyIp4 Submessage is an additional Submessage introduced by the UDP PSM.

Its use and interpretation are identical to those of an InfoReply Submessage containing a single unicast and possibly a single multicast locator, both of kind LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4. It is provided for efficiency reasons and can be used instead of the InfoReply Submessage to provide a more compact representation.

The PSM maps the InfoReplyIp4 Submessage into the following wire representation:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & \ldots & 2 & \ldots & 8 & \ldots & 16 & \ldots & 24 & \ldots & 32 \\
\hline
\text{INFO_REPLY_IP4} & X & X & X & X & X & X & M & E & \text{octetsToNextHeader} \\
\hline
+ & LocatorUDPv4 & unicastLocator & + \\
\hline
+ & LocatorUDPv4 & multicastLocator & [ only if M=1 ] & + \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

9.4.5.14.1 Flags in the Submessage Header

In addition to the EndiannessFlag, the InfoReplyIp4 Submessage introduces the MulticastFlag. The PSM maps the MulticastFlag flag into the 2nd least-significant bit (LSB) of the flags.

The MulticastFlag is represented with the literal ‘M’. M=1 means the InfoReplyIp4 also includes a multicastRLocator.
The value of the MulticastFlag can be obtained from the expression:

\[ M = \text{SubmessageHeader.flags} \& 0x02 \]

9.5 RTPS Message Encapsulation

When RTPS is used over UDP/IP, a Message is the contents (payload) of exactly one UDP/IP Datagram.

9.6 Mapping of the RTPS Protocol

9.6.1 Default Locators

9.6.1.1 Discovery traffic

Discovery traffic is the traffic generated by the Participant and Endpoint Discovery Protocols. For the Simple Discovery Protocols (SPDP and SEDP), discovery traffic is the traffic exchanged between the built-in Endpoints.

The SPDP built-in Endpoints are configured using well-known ports (see Section 8.5.3.4). The UDP PSM maps these well-known ports to the port number expressions listed in Table 9.8.

Table 9.8 - Ports used by built-in Endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discovery traffic type</th>
<th>SPDP well-known port</th>
<th>Default port number expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicast</td>
<td>SPDP WELLKNOWN_MULTICAST_PORT</td>
<td>PB + DG * domainId + d0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicast</td>
<td>SPDP WELLKNOWN_UNICAST_PORT</td>
<td>PB + DG * domainId + d1 + PG * participantId</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where

- domainId = DDS Domain identifier
- participantId = Participant identifier
- PB, DG, d0, d1 = tunable parameters (defined below)

The domainId and participantId identifiers are used to avoid port conflicts among Participants on the same node. Each Participant on the same node and in the same domain must use a unique participantId. In the case of multicast, all Participants in the same domain share the same port number, so the participantId identifier is not used in the port number expression.

To simplify the configuration of the SPDP, participantId values ideally start at 0 and are incremented for each additional Participant on the same node and in the same domain. That way, for a given domain, Participants can announce their presence to up to N remote Participants on a given node, by announcing to port numbers on that node corresponding to participantId 0 through N-1.

The default ports used by the SEDP built-in Endpoints match those used by the SPDP. If a node chooses not to use the default ports for the SEDP, it can include the new port numbers as part of the information exchanged during the SPDP.
9.6.1.2 User traffic

User traffic is the traffic exchanged between user-defined Endpoints (i.e., non built-in Endpoints). As such, it pertains to all the traffic that is not related to discovery. By default, user-defined Endpoints use the port number expressions listed in Table 9.9.

Table 9.9 - Ports used by user-defined Endpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User traffic type</th>
<th>Default port number expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicast</td>
<td>PB + DG * domainId + d2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicast</td>
<td>PB + DG * domainId + d3 + PG * participantId</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User-defined Endpoints may choose to not use the default ports. In that case, remote Endpoints obtain the port number as part of the information exchanged during the Simple Endpoint Discovery Protocol.

9.6.1.3 Default Port Numbers

The port number expressions use the following parameters:

- DG = DomainId Gain
- PG = ParticipantId Gain
- PB = Port Base number
- d0, d1, d2, d3 = additional offsets

Implementations must expose these parameters so they can be customized by the user.

In order to enable out-of-the-box interoperability, the following default values must be used:

- PB = 7400
- DG = 250
- PG = 2
- d0 = 0
- d1 = 10
- d2 = 1
- d3 = 11

Given UDP port numbers are limited to 64K, the above defaults enables the use of about 230 domains with up to 120 Participants per node per domain.

9.6.1.4 Default Settings for the Simple Participant Discovery Protocol

When using the SPDP, each Participant sends announcements to a pre-configured list of locators. What ports to use when configuring these locators is discussed above. This section describes any remaining settings that are required to enable plug-and-play interoperability.

9.6.1.4.1 Default multicast address

In order to enable plug-and-play interoperability, the default pre-configured list of locators must include the following multicast locator (assuming UDPv4):

```
DefaultMulticastLocator = (LOCATOR_KIND_UDPv4, "239.255.0.1", PB + DG * domainId + d0)
```
All **Participants** must announce and listen on this multicast address.

```
SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter.readerLocators CONTAINS DefaultMulticastLocator
SPDPbuiltinParticipantReader.multicastLocatorList CONTAINS DefaultMulticastLocator
```

### 9.6.1.4.2 Default announcement rate

The default rate by which SPDP periodic announcements are sent equals 30 seconds.

```
SPDPbuiltinParticipantWriter.resendPeriod = {30, 0};
```

## 9.6.2 Data representation for the built-in Endpoints

### 9.6.2.1 Data Representation for the ParticipantMessageData Built-in Endpoints

The Behavior module within the PIM (Section 8.4) defines the DataType **ParticipantMessageData**. This type is the logical content of the **BuiltinParticipantMessageWriter** and **BuiltinParticipantMessageReader** built-in Endpoints.

The PSM maps the **ParticipantMessageData** tpe into the following IDL:

```
struct ParticipantMessageData {
    GuidPrefix_t participantGuidPrefix;
    octet [4] kind;
    sequence<octet> data;
};
```

The following values for the kind field are reserved by RTPS:

```
#define PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_DATA_KIND_UNKNOWN {0x00, 0x00, 0x00, 0x00}
#define PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_DATA_KIND_AUTOMATIC_LIVELINESS_UPDATE {0x00, 0x00, 0x00, 0x01}
#define PARTICIPANT_MESSAGE_DATA_KIND_MANUAL_LIVELINESS_UPDATE {0x00, 0x00, 0x00, 0x02}
```

RTPS also reserves for future use all values of the kind field where the most significant bit is not set. Therefore:

```
kind.value[0] & 0x80 == 0 // reserved by RTPS
kindvalue[0] & 0x80 == 1 // vendor specific kind
```

Implementations can decide the upper length of the data field but must be able to support at least 128 bytes.

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the **ParticipantMessageData** structure is:

```
0...2...........8............16............24............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                       unsigned long data.length                        |
| +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
| |                                                                          |
| | - octet[] data.value          -                                    |
| |                                                                          |
| +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
```

### 9.6.2.2 Simple Discovery Protocol built-in Endpoints

The Discovery Module within the PIM (Section 8.5) defines the DataTypes **SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData**, **DiscoveredWriterData**, **DiscoveredReaderData**, and **DiscoveredTopicData**. These types define the logical contents of the data sent between the RTPS built-in Endpoints.
The PSM maps these types into the following IDL:

```c
struct SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData {
    struct DDS::ParticipantBuiltinTopicData ddsParticipantData;
    struct participantProxy participantProxy;
    Duration_t leaseDuration;
};

struct DiscoveredWriterData {
    struct DDS::PublicationBuiltinTopicData ddsPublicationData;
    struct WriterProxy writerProxy;
};

struct DiscoveredReaderData {
    struct DDS::SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData ddsSubscriptionData;
    struct ReaderProxy readerProxy;
    ContentFilterProperty_t contentFilterProperty;
};

struct DiscoveredTopicData {
    struct DDS::TopicBuiltinTopicData ddsTopicData;
};
```

where each DDS built-in topic data type is defined by the DDS specification.

The discovery data is sent using standard `Data` Submessages. In order to allow for QoS extensibility while preserving interoperability between versions of the protocol, the wire-representation of the `SerializedData` within the `Data` Submessage uses the format of a `ParameterList` SubmessageElement. That is, the `SerializedData` encapsulates each QoS and other information within a separate parameter identified by a `ParameterId`. Within each parameter, the parameter value is encapsulated using CDR.

For example, in order to add a vendor-specific Endpoint Discovery Protocol (EDP) in the `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData`, a vendor could define a vendor-specific `ParameterId` and use it to add a new parameter to the `ParameterList` contained in `SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData`. The presence of this `ParameterId` would denote support for the corresponding EDP. As this is a vendor-specific `ParameterId`, other vendors’ implementations would simply ignore the parameter and the information it contains. The parameter itself would contain any additional data required by the vendor-specific EDP encapsulated using CDR.

For optimization, implementations of the protocol may choose not to include a parameter in the Data submessage if it contains information that is redundant with other parameters already present in that same Data submessage. As a result of this optimization an implementation can omit the serialization of the parameters listed in Table 9.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BuiltInEndpoint</th>
<th>Parameter that may be omitted</th>
<th>Parameter where the information on the omitted parameter can be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData</td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::guidPrefix</td>
<td>ParticipantBuiltinTopicData::key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiscoveredReaderData</td>
<td>ReaderProxy::remoteReaderGuid</td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiscoveredWriterData</td>
<td>ReaderProxy::remoteWriterGuid</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, an implementation of the protocol sending DATA message containing the SPDPdiscoveredParticipantData may omit the parameter that contains the guidPrefix. If the guidPrefix is not present in the DATA message, the implementation of the protocol in the receiver side must derive this value from the “key” parameter which is always present in the DATA message.

9.6.2.2.1 ParameterId space

As described in Section 9.4.2.11, the ParameterId space is 16 bits wide. In order to accommodate vendor specific options and future extensions to the protocol, the ParameterId space is partitioned into multiple subspaces. The ParameterId subspaces are listed in Table 9.11.

Table 9.11 - ParameterId subspaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ParameterId &amp; 8000 (MSB)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reserved ParameterId.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vendor-specific ParameterId. Will not be recognized by other vendors’ implementations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParameterId &amp; 4000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>If the ParameterId is not recognized, skip and ignore the parameter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>If the ParameterId is not recognized, treat the parameter as an incompatible QoS. In this case, no communication will be established between the two Entities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first subspace division enables vendor-specific ParameterIds. Future minor versions of the RTPS protocol can add new parameters up to a maximum ParameterId of 0x7fff. The range 0x8000 to 0xffff is reserved for vendor-specific options and will not be used by any future versions of the protocol.

For backwards compatibility, both subspaces are subdivided again. If a ParameterId is expected, but not present, the protocol will assume the default value. Similarly, if a ParameterId is present but not recognized, the protocol will either skip and ignore the parameter or treat the parameter as an incompatible QoS. The actual behavior depends on the ParameterId value, see Table 9.11.

9.6.2.2.2 ParameterID values

Table 9.12 summarizes the list of ParameterIds used to encapsulate the data for the built-in Entities. Table 9.13 lists the Entities to which each parameterId applies and its default value.

Table 9.12 - ParameterId Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_PAD</td>
<td>0x0000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_SENTINEL</td>
<td>0x0001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_USER_DATA</td>
<td>0x002c</td>
<td>UserDataQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TOPIC_NAME</td>
<td>0x0005</td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE_NAME</td>
<td>0x0007</td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_GROUP_DATA</td>
<td>0x002d</td>
<td>GroupDataQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TOPIC_DATA</td>
<td>0x002e</td>
<td>TopicDataQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DURABILITY</td>
<td>0x001d</td>
<td>DurabilityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DURABILITY_SERVICE</td>
<td>0x001e</td>
<td>DurabilityServiceQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEADLINE</td>
<td>0x0023</td>
<td>DeadlineQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LATENCY_BUDGET</td>
<td>0x0027</td>
<td>LatencyBudgetQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIVENESSNESS</td>
<td>0x001b</td>
<td>LivelinessQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RELIABILITY</td>
<td>0x001A</td>
<td>ReliabilityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIFESPAN</td>
<td>0x002b</td>
<td>LifespanQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DESTINATION_ORDER</td>
<td>0x0025</td>
<td>DestinationOrderQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_HISTORY</td>
<td>0x0040</td>
<td>HistoryQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIDRESOURCE_LIMITS</td>
<td>0x0041</td>
<td>ResourceLimitsQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>0x001f</td>
<td>OwnershipQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERSHIP_STRENGTH</td>
<td>0x0006</td>
<td>OwnershipStrengthQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PRESENTATION</td>
<td>0x0021</td>
<td>PresentationQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTITION</td>
<td>0x0029</td>
<td>PartitionQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TIME_BASED_FILTER</td>
<td>0x0004</td>
<td>TimeBasedFilterQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TRANSPORT_PRIORITY</td>
<td>0x0049</td>
<td>TransportPriorityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PROTOCOL_VERSION</td>
<td>0x0015</td>
<td>ProtocolVersion_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_VENDORID</td>
<td>0x0016</td>
<td>VendorId_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_UNICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x002f</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x0030</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_MULTICAST_IPADDRESS</td>
<td>0x0011</td>
<td>IPv4Address_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x0031</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEFAULT_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x0048</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x0032</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</td>
<td>0x0033</td>
<td>Locator_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_IPADDRESS</td>
<td>0x000c</td>
<td>IPv4Address_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_PORT</td>
<td>0x000e</td>
<td>Port_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_IPADDRESS</td>
<td>0x0045</td>
<td>IPv4Address_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_PORT</td>
<td>0x00d</td>
<td>Port_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_IPADDRESS</td>
<td>0x00b</td>
<td>IPv4Address_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_PORT</td>
<td>0x046</td>
<td>Port_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_EXPECTS_INLINE_QOS</td>
<td>0x043</td>
<td>boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTICIPANT_MANUAL_LIVELINESS_COUNT</td>
<td>0x034</td>
<td>Count_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTICIPANT_BUILTIN_ENDPOINTS</td>
<td>0x044</td>
<td>unsigned long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTICIPANT_LEASE_DURATION</td>
<td>0x002</td>
<td>Duration_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_CONTENT_FILTER_PROPERTY</td>
<td>0x035</td>
<td>ContentFilterProperty_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTICIPANT_GUID</td>
<td>0x050</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTICIPANT_ENTITYID</td>
<td>0x051</td>
<td>EntityId_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_GROUP_GUID</td>
<td>0x052</td>
<td>GUID_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_GROUP_ENTITYID</td>
<td>0x053</td>
<td>EntityId_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_BUILTIN_ENDPOINT_SET</td>
<td>0x058</td>
<td>BuiltinEndpointSet_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PROPERTY_LIST</td>
<td>0x059</td>
<td>sequence&lt;Property_t&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE_MAX_SIZE_SERIALIZED</td>
<td>0x060</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_ENTITY_NAME</td>
<td>0x062</td>
<td>EntityName_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_KEY_HASH</td>
<td>0x070</td>
<td>KeyHash_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_STATUS_INFO</td>
<td>0x071</td>
<td>StatusInfo_t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.13 - ParameterId mapping and default values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Used For Fields</th>
<th>Default</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_PAD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_SENTINEL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_USER_DATA</td>
<td>ParticipantBuiltinTopicData::user_data</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::user_data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::user_data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TOPIC_NAME</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::name</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::topic_name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::topic_name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Used For Fields</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE_NAME</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::type_name</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::type_name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::type_name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_GROUP_DATA</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::group_data</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::group_data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TOPIC_DATA</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::topic_data</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::topic_data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DURABILITY</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::durability</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::durability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DURABILITY_SERVICE</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::durability_service</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::durability_service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEADLINE</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::deadline</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LATENCY_BUDGET</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::latency_budget</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::latency_budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::latency_budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIVELINESS</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::liveliness</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::liveliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::liveliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RELIABILITY</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::reliability</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIFESPAN</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::lifespan</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::lifespan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::lifespan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DESTINATION_ORDER</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::destination_order</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::destination_order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::destination_order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_HISTORY</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::history</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RESOURCE_LIMITS</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::resource_limits</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>TopicBuiltinTopicData::ownership</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERSHIP_STRENGTH</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::ownership_strength</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PRESENTATION</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::presentation</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTITION</td>
<td>PublicationBuiltinTopicData::partition</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::partition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 9.13 - ParameterId mapping and default values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Used For Fields</th>
<th>Default</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_TIME_BASED_FILTER</strong></td>
<td>SubscriptionBuiltinTopicData::time_based_filter</td>
<td>See DDS Specification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_PROTOCOL_VERSION</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::protocolVersion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_VENDORID</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::vendorId</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_UNICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ReaderProxy::unicastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WriterProxy::unicastLocatorList</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ReaderProxy::multicastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WriterProxy::multicastLocatorList</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_MULTICAST_IPADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>ReaderProxy::multicastLocatorList.address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WriterProxy::multicastLocatorList.address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::defaultUnicastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_DEFAULT_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::defaultMulticastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficUnicastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_LOCATOR</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficMulticastLocatorList</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_IPADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::defaultUnicastLocatorList.address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_DEFAULT_UNICAST_PORT</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::defaultUnicastLocatorList.port</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_IPADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficUnicastLocatorList.address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_UNICAST_PORT</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficUnicastLocatorList.port</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_IPADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficMulticastLocatorList.address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_METATRAFFIC_MULTICAST_PORT</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::metatrafficMulticastLocatorList.port</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_EXPECTS_INLINE_QOS</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::expectsInlineQos</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_PARTICIPANT_manualLiveliness_COUNT</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::manualLivelinessCount</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PID_PARTICIPANT_BUILTIN_ENDPOINTS</strong></td>
<td>ParticipantProxy::availableBuiltInEndpoints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6.3 ParameterId Definitions used to Represent In-line QoS

The Messages module within the PIM (Section 8.3) provides the means for the Data (Section 8.3.7.2) and DataFrag (Section 8.3.7.3) Submessages to include QoS policies in-line with the Submessage. The QoS policies are encapsulated using a ParameterList.

Section 8.7.2.1 defines the complete set of parameters that can appear within the inlineQos SubmessageElement. The corresponding set of parameterIds is listed in Table 9.14.
The policies that can appear in-line include a subset of the DataWriter QoS policies (ParameterId defined in Section 9.6.2) and some additional QoS (for which a new ParameterId is defined).

The following sections describe these additional QoS in more detail.

### 9.6.3.1 Content filter info (PID_CONTENT_FILTER_INFO)

Following the CDR encoding, the wire representation of the `ContentFilterInfo_t` (see Table 9.4) in-line QoS is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>IDL description of the contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_PAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_SENTINEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TOPIC_NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td>string&lt;256&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DURABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>DurabilityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>PresentationQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DEADLINE</td>
<td></td>
<td>DeadlineQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LATENCY_BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td>LatencyBudgetQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERHIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>OwnershipQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_OWNERHIPS_STRENGTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>OwnershipStrengthQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIVELINESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LivelinessQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_PARTITION</td>
<td></td>
<td>PartitionQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RELIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>ReliabilityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TRANSPORT_PRIORITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>TransportPriorityQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_LIFESPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>LifespanQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DESTINATION_ORDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>DestinationOrderQosPolicy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_CONTENT_FILTER_INFO</td>
<td>0x0055</td>
<td><code>ContentFilterInfo_t</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_COHERENT_SET</td>
<td>0x0056</td>
<td><code>SequenceNumber_t</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_DIRECTED_WRITE</td>
<td>0x0057</td>
<td><code>sequence&lt;GUID_t&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIDORIGINAL_WRITER_INFO</td>
<td>0x0061</td>
<td><code>OriginalWriterInfo_t</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_KEY_HASH</td>
<td>0x0070</td>
<td><code>KeyHash_t</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_STATUS_INFO</td>
<td>0x0071</td>
<td><code>StatusInfo_t</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The `filterResult` member is encoded as a bitmap. Bit 0 (MSB) corresponds to the first filter signature, bit 1 to the second filter signature, and so on. The content filter info in-line QoS is invalid unless

\[
\text{numBitmaps} = ([\text{numSignatures}/32] + (\text{numSignatures} \mod 32 ? 1 : 0))
\]

The bitmap is interpreted as follows:

**Table 9.15 - Interpretation of filterResult member in content filter info in-line QoS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bit value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sample was filtered by the corresponding filter and did not pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sample was filtered by the corresponding filter and passed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A filter’s signature is calculated as the 128-bit MD5 checksum of all strings in the filter's `ContentFilterProperty_t`. More precisely, all strings are combined into the following character array:

\[
[ \text{contentFilteredTopicName} \ \text{relatedTopicName} \ \text{filterClassName} \ \text{filterExpression} \ \text{expressionParameters}[0] \ \text{expressionParameters}[1] \ ... \ \text{expressionParameters}[\text{numParams} - 1] ]
\]
where each individual string includes its NULL termination character. The filter signature is calculated by taking the MD5 checksum of the above character sequence.

### 9.6.3.2 Coherent set (PID_COHERENT_SET)

The coherent set in-line QoS parameter uses the CDR encoding for SequenceNumber_t.

As defined in Section 8.7.5, all Data and DataFrag Submessages that belong to the same coherent set must contain the coherent set in-line QoS parameter with value equal to the sequence number of the first sample in the set.

For example, assume a coherent set contains sample updates with sequence numbers 3, 4, 5 and 6 from a given Writer. Samples in this coherent set are identified by including the coherent set in-line QoS parameter with value 3. Some example Data submessages that the Writer can use to denote the end of this coherent set are listed in Table 9.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Submessage Elements (subset)</th>
<th>Example 1 (new coherent set)</th>
<th>Example 2 (no coherent set)</th>
<th>Example 3 (no coherent set)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DataFlag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InlineQosFlag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyHashSuffix</td>
<td>Identifies Object</td>
<td>Ignored</td>
<td>Ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writerSN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InlineQos (PID_COHERENT_SET)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SEQUENCENUMBER_UNKNOWN</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SerializedData</td>
<td>Valid data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.6.3.3 KeyHash (PID_KEY_HASH)

The key hash inline parameter contains the CDR encoding of the KeyHash_t. The KeyHash_t is defined as a 16-Byte octet array (see Table 9.4) therefore the key hash inline parameter just copes those 16 Bytes.

The KeyHash_t is computed from the Data as follows using one of two algorithms depending on whether the Data type is such that the maximum size of the sequential CDR encapsulation of all the key fields is guaranteed to be less than 128 bits (the size of the KeyHash_t).

- If the maximum size of the sequential CDR encapsulation of all the key fields is guaranteed to be less than 128 bits, then the KeyHash_t shall be computed as the CDR Big-Endian encapsulation of all the Key fields in sequence. Any unfilled bits in the KeyHash_t after all the key fields have been encapsulated shall be set to zero.
- Otherwise the KeyHash_t shall be computed as a 128 bit MD5 Digest (IETF RFC 1321) applied to the CDR Big-Endian encapsulation of all the Key fields in sequence.

Note that the choice of the algorithm to use depends on the data-type, not on any particular data value.

**Example 1.** Assume the following IDL-described type:
struct TypeWithShortKey {
    long id;  /* assume defined as a key field */
    string name<6>;  /* assume defined as a key field */
    /* other non-key fields */
};

Then we know that the maximum size for the CDR encapsulation of the key fields is 15 Bytes (4 for the ‘id’ field, plus 4 for the length of the string ‘name’ plus at most 7 Bytes for the string (includes extra byte for terminating NUL).

In this example the KeyHash_t shall be computed as:

[CDR(id), CDR(name), <zero fill to 16 bytes> ]

Where CDR(x) represents the big-endian CDR encapsulation of that field.

A concrete data value of this type such as {32, “hello”, ...} would be encapsulated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'h'</td>
<td>'e'</td>
<td>'l'</td>
<td>'l'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'o'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that for clarity use a notation where each byte can be represented either as a hexadecimal number (e.g., 0x20 or as a character (e.g., ‘h’);

Example 2: Assume the following IDL-described type:

```c
struct TypeWithShortKey {
    long id;  /* assume defined as a key field */
    string name<8>;  /* assume defined as a key field */
    /* other non-key fields */
};
```

Then we know that the maximum size for the CDR encapsulation of the key fields is 17 Bytes (4 for the ‘id’ field, plus 4 for the length of the string ‘name’ plus at most 9 Bytes for the string (includes extra byte for terminating NUL).

In this example the KeyHash_t shall be computed as:

MD5 ([CDR(id), CDR (name)])

9.6.3.4 StatusInfo_t (PID_STATUS_INFO)

The status info parameter contains the CDR encoding of the StatusInfo_t. The StatusInfo_t is defined as a 4-Byte octet array (see Table 9.4) therefore the status info inline parameter just copies those 4 Bytes.

The status info parameter may appear in the Data or in the DataFrag submessages.

The StatusInfo_t shall be interpreted as a 32-bit worth of flags with the layout shown below:
0...2..............8..................16..................24..................32
+-------------------------------------------------------------------+
|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|X|U|D|
+-------------------------------------------------------------------+

The flags represented with the literal ‘X’ are unused by this version of the protocol and should be set to zero by the writer and not interpreted by the reader so that they may be used in future versions of the protocol without breaking interoperability.

The flags in the status info provide information on the status of the data-object to which the submessage refers. Specifically the status info is used to communicate changes to the LifecycleState of a data-object instance.

The current version of the protocol defines the DisposeFlag and the UnregisterFlag.

The DisposeFlag is represented with the literal ‘D.’

D=1 indicates that the DDS DataWriter has disposed the instance of the data-object whose Key appears in the submessage.

The UnregisterFlag is represented with the literal ‘U.’

U=1 indicates that the DDS DataWriter has unregistered the instance of the data-object whose Key appears in the submessage.

### 9.6.4 ParameterIds Deprecated by Version 2.1 of the Protocol

Version 2.1 of the protocol deprecates the ParameterIds shown in Table 9.17. These parameters should not be used by future versions of the protocol unless they are used with the same meaning as in versions prior to 2.1. Implementations that wish to interoperate with earlier versions should send and process the parameters in Table 9.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID_PERSISTENCE</td>
<td>0x0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE_CHECKSUM</td>
<td>0x0008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE2_NAME</td>
<td>0x0009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_TYPE2_CHECKSUM</td>
<td>0x000a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_EXPECTS_ACK</td>
<td>0x0010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_MANAGER_KEY</td>
<td>0x0012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_SEND_QUEUE_SIZE</td>
<td>0x0013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RELIABILITY_ENABLED</td>
<td>0x0014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_VARGAPPS_SEQUENCE_NUMBER_LAST</td>
<td>0x0017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RECV_QUEUE_SIZE</td>
<td>0x0018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID_RELIBILITY_OFFERED</td>
<td>0x0019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Data Encapsulation

Data encapsulation is not strictly part of the RTPS protocol. As discussed in Section 8.3.5.12, the RTPS protocol is agnostic to how the data in the SerializedData SubmessageElement is encapsulated. Instead, data encapsulation is the responsibility of the DDS type-plugin, which serializes and de-serializes the data.

For the purpose of interoperability, however, it is important that type-plugins from different DDS implementations encapsulate data in the same way. This additional chapter defines a common data encapsulation scheme to be used by all DDS type-plugins.

10.1 Data Encapsulation

A common approach to data encapsulation is OMG CDR. Depending on the specific data type, it may be desirable to use alternative encapsulation methods. For example, the RTPS built-in Endpoints use the ParameterList encapsulation for exchanging discovery information. The ParameterList encapsulation enables easy extension of the data type while maintaining backwards compatibility. This functionality becomes important when adding new QoS values.

In order to support multiple data encapsulation schemes, some additional information is needed that describes the encapsulation scheme. That is, the SerializedData must include both a data encapsulation scheme identifier and the actual data itself. The DDS type-plugin parses the data encapsulation scheme identifier before deserializing the rest of the data.

For the purpose of interoperability, DDS implementations must support at least CDR encapsulation for application defined data types. The encapsulation of the data associated with built-in Topics must use a ParameterList, as discussed in Section 9.6.2.

10.1.1 Standard Data Encapsulation Schemes

10.1.1.1 Common Approach

All data encapsulation schemes must start with an encapsulation scheme identifier.

octet[2] Identifier

The identifier occupies the first two octets of the serialized data-stream, as shown below:

```
 0...2...........8............16..............24..............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|    Encapsulation Identifier   |               |               |
 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

-----------stream------------->>>>
```

The remaining part of the serialized data stream either contains the actual data or additional encapsulation specific information.
The current pre-defined data encapsulation schemes are listed in Table 10.1.

### Table 10.1 - Pre-defined data encapsulation schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encapsulation Scheme Identifier</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDR_BE</td>
<td>0x0000</td>
<td>OMG CDR Big Endian&lt;br&gt;See Section 10.1.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR_LE</td>
<td>0x0001</td>
<td>OMG CDR Little Endian&lt;br&gt;See Section 10.1.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL_CDR_BE</td>
<td>0x0002</td>
<td>ParameterList (Section 9.4.2.11). Both the parameter list and its parameters are encapsulated using OMG CDR Big Endian.&lt;br&gt;See Section 10.1.1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL_CDR_LE</td>
<td>0x0003</td>
<td>ParameterList (Section 9.4.2.11). Both the parameter list and its parameters are encapsulated using OMG CDR Little Endian.&lt;br&gt;See Section 10.1.1.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional data encapsulation schemes, such as for example XML, may be added in future versions of the specification.

#### 10.1.1.2 OMG CDR

In addition to the encapsulation identifier, the OMG CDR encapsulation specifies the length of the data followed by the data encapsulated using CDR. The same encapsulation scheme is used for both the length and serialized data.

```
0...2...........8...............16..............24..............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|            CDR_BE             |        ushort options         |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                                                               |
~               Serialized Data (CDR Big Endian)                ~
|                                                               |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+

0...2...........8...............16..............24..............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|            CDR_LE             |        ushort options         |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|                                                               |
~               Serialized Data (CDR Little Endian)            ~
|                                                               |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
```

Fragmentation is done after encapsulation of large serialized data, so a SerializedDataFragment may contain the encapsulation header of its opaque and fragmented SerializedData sample.
10.1.1.3 ParameterList

In addition to the encapsulation identifier, the ParameterList encapsulation specifies the length of the data followed by the data encapsulated using a ParameterList. The same CDR encoding is used for both the length and the parameter list.

Fragmentation is done after encapsulation of large serialized data, so aSerializedDataFragment may contain the encapsulation header of its opaque and fragmented SerializedData sample.

10.1.2 Example

10.1.2.1 OMG CDR

Consider the following data type expressed in IDL:

```
struct example {
    long a;
    char b[4];
};
```

For the purpose of this example, let’s assume the following values:

- `a = 1`

The resulting encapsulation when using CDR in big-endian format is shown below:

```
0...2...........8.............16.............24.............32
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|           CDR_BE              |       0x00           0x00     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|       0x00            0x00            0x00           0x01     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|       'a'             'b'             'c'            'd'      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

where

```
CDR_BE = 0x0000
```
The same data instance encoded using CDR in little-endian format results in:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccc}
\text{CDR_LE} & 0x00 & 0x00 \\
0x01 & 0x00 & 0x00 & 0x00 \\
'a' & 'b' & 'c' & 'd'
\end{array}
\]

where

\[
\text{CDR\_LE} = 0x0001
\]
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