

XLIFF 2.0 Public Review submitted comments tracker

This is where we are tracking the comments received during the XLIFF 2.0 Public Reviews. All items marked **open01** are now frozen. All items marked **open02** are now active.

PR #	Comment #	Comment Title	Commenter	Date rec.	Initial e-mail archive URI	Comment/Issue Summary	TC Owner	Actions (to be) Taken	Receipt Acknowledged: URI	TC Resolution (CFDs="Call For Disent")	TypoofChange	Reply URI	Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI
open02	100	Suggest fleshing out samples	Bryan Schaubel	2013 20 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00012.html	suggest some of the samples that use comments to represent where text should go, and data types where attribute values should go, should be fleshed out with real text and actual attribute samples. An example is "B.1.4 Example."	Bryan	FIXED: DavidF: fixed Matches, gls and term nd matches annotations examples: Fredrik to add inline examples; etc.	-	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00003.html	-	-	yes
open02	101	fr attributes	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00014.html	There is this PR: "An Agent processing a valid XLIFF Document that contains XLIFF-defined elements that it cannot handle MUST preserve those elements." I think the wording of the PR does not correspond to the original intent. There is no mention of XLIFF-defined attributes, which means that, as of open02, I'm not required to preserve any of the Format Style attributes. Is it the intent? I think the intent was to preserve any XLIFF-defined element or attribute. So assuming the PR is changed, we would have to preserve fcsa/b's attributes. This leads to another issue: The fcsa/b's attributes are allowed on pretty much any element of the core, including <cp>. This means a reader would have to be able to preserve the fcsa/b's attributes of a <cp>-element. The <cp>-element is an escape mechanism, there is no realistic way to preserve fcsa/b's on something that will be converted to character in the parent document. - if the PR is to protect only elements: nothing to change. - if it is to protect elements and attributes: - it needs to be updated (and the PR for custom namespaces too) - fcsa/b's should be removed from <cp>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00060.html	-	-	-
open02	102	description for <note>	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00015.html	"A comment that contains information about <source>-, <target>-, <segment>-or <unit>-elements." Actually note can be on <group>-and <file>-, but not on <segment>-, so the description above is incorrect. Maybe it need to be more generic (about what is a note rather than where it can occur).	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: clarification and fixed list of what can be commented on	N/A	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	editorial	● https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/op/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201311/msg00168.html	yes
open02	103	splitting of modules and extended elements	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00016.html	For <file> we have: - Zero or one <skeleton>-element followed by: - Zero or one <notes>-element followed by: - Zero or one <endmetadata>-elements followed by: - Zero, one or more <resourceData>-elements followed by: - Zero or one <ultraprofiles>-elements followed by: - Zero or one <caldata>-elements followed by: - Zero or one <valvalidation>-elements followed by: - One or more <units>-or <group>-elements in any order followed by: - Zero, one or more elements from any namespace. For a processor that implements only the core, extended elements and modules are exactly the same: it tries to preserve both types as it. In <file>-, outputting the module elements before <unit>-<group>-block and the extended elements after the <unit>-<group>-block forces the writer to know about which namespace should be written where. In other word: one cannot implement a processor that is only aware of the core.	DavidF/Tom	IMPLEMENTED: as per resolution Dec 3, 2013	N/A	TBA 20131217	-	-	-
open02	104	location of "info" elements (notes, modules, etc.)	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00017.html	The way the elements carrying information associated to an element is not consistent: - In <file>-, <notes>-etc. comes before <unit>-<group>-. - In <group>-, <notes>-etc. comes after <unit>-<group>-. - In <unit>-<notes>-etc. comes after <segment>-<ignorable>. It would be a bit clearer to have a consistent way to place the same information. Also: From a stream-based processing viewpoint having those info after the main payload (<unit>-, <segment>-) makes things quite complicated. For example you can have a <file>-note applying to the source that is reached only after all <unit>-elements have been parsed. The bottom-line is that XLIFF 2.0 seems to expect the processor to always be a DOM-based parser, where one can access all parts of the file all the time. It makes event-based processing very complicated, almost impossible to implement. And on large documents DOM is not always an option.	DavidF/Tom	IMPLEMENTED: as per resolution Dec 3, 2013	N/A	TBA 20131217	-	-	-
open02	105	Namespace in Validation Module	Yves Savourel	2013 24 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00018.html	None of the 13 snippets of code used as example in the Appendix 1 (Validation Module) is valid. They are all missing namespace information.	RyanDf	IMPLEMENTED: namespace prefix added as required	N/A	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-
open02	106	typos in PI warning	Yves Savourel	2013 26 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00020.html	We have: "Please note that Agents using Processing Instruction to implement XLIFF Core or Module features are not compliant XLIFF applications disengaging whether they are otherwise conformant." It should be (re)written between >> <<? "Please note that Agents using processing Instruction to >>implement<< XLIFF Core or Module >>features<< are not compliant XLIFF applications >>disengaging<< >>whether<< they are otherwise conformant." (4 typos in one sentence. ... did we really spell-check the document ☹️) Also a note: I don't understand this warning. How one could "implement" a core or module features with PI since neither uses PIs to define features?	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed Note: This is now the master line item to cover all Typo issues (106, 115, 117, 121, 125, and added typo comments. ● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00043.html (2013.10.18) + ● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00060.html (2013.10.23).	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00043.html)	-	-	-
open02	107	subState and state="initial"	Yves Savourel	2013 27 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00021.html	For the subState attribute we have the constraint: "If the attribute subState is used, the attribute state MUST be specified as well". But state has a default value ("initial"). So if a subState value is designed to work with the "initial" state, as it is still mandatory to explicitly specify state? That seems strange as <segment subState="myValue"> and <segment state="initial subState="myValue"> would be equivalent. If such declaration is not needed, then the constraint need to be re-worled. But event re-worling the constraint wouldn't take way its strangeness: Since there is always a value for state, why do we need that constraint at all? It is already guaranteed that subState will never exist without a state value.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Changed the Constraint as follows: If the attribute subState is used, the attribute state must be explicitly set. In other words the attribute becomes required and the default irrelevant.	N/A	TBA 20131217	-	-	-
open02	108	Format Style attributes again	Yves Savourel	2013 28 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00022.html	It seems to me that the widespread presence of the fcs and fcsa/b's attributes is causing a lot more headache than they are worth for the tools not implementing that module. I've already mentioned that those attributes cannot be preserved in <cp>. I would now add that they are causing issues in <originalData>-. That element serves only the purpose of grouping <data>-in the XLIFF document and there is no reason to preserve it when a tool reads the <data>-elements into its own data model. I would suggest that fcs and fcsa/b's be removed from elements where they are the lone attributes: notes and originalData. I would also suggest to remove them from <data>-where preserving them is complicated and expensive, and their usage likely limited. XLIFF is an exchange format and should be easy to map to third party tool's data model.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00071.html	-	-	-
open02	109	id values for unit and group	Yves Savourel	2013 28 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00023.html	The specification has the following constraints for the id attribute: " When used in <unit>: The value MUST be unique within the parent <group>-or <file>-element." "When used in <group>: The value MUST be unique within the parent <group>-or <file>-element." I strongly recommend those two constraints to be changed as <unit>-ids are unique within a <file>-and <group>-ids are unique within a <file>-. Allowing to have the same id for two or more units (or groups) if they belong to different groups is bound to cause problems. For example a tool using the id's in a database would have to concatenate the ids of all parents groups to ensure it is unique: if the id values are anything like UUIDs, the length of the resulting value can become ridiculously long very quickly.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: unit ids MUST be unique within file, see ● https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/op/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201311/msg00039.html	N/A	CFD: ● https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/op/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201311/msg00039.html	-	-	-
open02	110	xml:space	Yves Savourel	2013 30 Sep	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00024.html	"... (ASCII spaces, tabs and line breaks) are to be treated" Should be "... (ASCII spaces, tabs and line breaks) are to be treated" The term "white-space/white space/public space" is also not spelled consistently across the specification. One addition to this comment: A link to ● http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/#sec-white-space would be nice too.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: The spelling was in fact consistent the only occurrence of "white space" is verbatim citation of the XML Recommendation, added the explicit normative reference	N/A	● https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-
						The current implementation of the matches module (i.e.							

cp0202	111	Proposed changes to matches module	David O'Carroll	2013 30 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00026.html	<p>where the source references the match using mks) does not seem adequate. The only solution at the moment to handle multiple matches for a single source is to have nested msk elements in the source with each one referencing a unique match. I would suggest having the match reference the source instead. This can be achieved by adding two attributes to the match element: <code>segRef</code> and <code>mRef</code>. <code>segRef</code> is a URI pointing to the segment that contains the source for the match. <code>mRef</code> is a URI pointing to some inline marker (mk for a single segment and matching sm:en tags for cross segment matching). It is required to have one and only one of <code>segRef</code> or <code>mRef</code> on the match element. This solution means the source can remain intact in all cases where the segment is the source of the match. It also avoids having to use nested mks in the source when multiple matches are available for a single source. >> I would suggest changing the scope of the <code>id</code> attribute on inline markup. It is currently only unique at segment level. This does not support the current matches implementation or my suggested implementation of matches (which references inline markup ids from a unit level). I would suggest changing the scope of the <code>id</code>'s uniqueness to unit level while preserving the statement "elements and inline elements with the same <code>id</code> in both source and target MUST be corresponding elements." (From the XLIFF 2.0 editors draft on <code>mk's id</code> attribute). >> I would suggest changing the <code>id</code> attribute on the segment element from OPTIONAL to REQUIRED. This way it would be possible to reference the segment <code>id</code> from a module like the matches module. In the case of the matches module it would mean not needing to pollute the segment's source with inline markup used to match translation candidates as the match can reference the segment instead.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: A <code>ref</code> attribute on <code><match></code> has been introduced, analogously also in <code>gls</code> module. Final solution depends on resolving the fragment identification issue	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00028.html	-	-	-	
cp0202	112	Problems validating XLIFF files with 2.0 schemas	Yves Savourel	2013 26 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00051.html	<p>I can't validate XLIFF 2.0 with Oxygen without getting errors in the schemas files. I have <code>xliff_core_2.0.xsd</code> and in a modules folder I have: <code>change_tracking.xsd</code>, <code>glossary.xsd</code>, <code>matches.xsd</code>, <code>metadata.xsd</code>, <code>resource_data.xsd</code>, <code>size_restrictions.xsd</code>, and <code>validation.xsd</code>. All files comes from the links found in the cp0202 specification.</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: Yves agrees with commits made by Tom	N/A	Each commit confirmed to work (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	substantive	-	-	-
cp0202	113	Improve sub-flows	Bryan Schabell	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00066.html	<p>Our example does not mention anything about the uniqueness of <code><unit></code> IDs that are involved in a sub-flow. Therefore if IDs are not unique we could get unexpected results</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Subflows explicitly prevented to be formed across files	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	substantive	-	-	-
cp0202	114	id values constraint specified in two places	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00000.html	<p>In a few places we have the requirement about the uniqueness of the <code>id</code> value defined in the definition of the <code>id</code> attribute and in the definition of the element using the <code>id</code>. It may be better to have it defined in a single place: the attribute definition.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: All <code>id</code> value constraints are now on the <code>id</code> attribute and commented out from element descriptions. The final <code>id</code> constraints depend on the final fragment identification solution	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	-
cp0202	115	Typos	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00001.html	<p>... " Directionality - indicates the directionality of content." should be " Directionality - indicates the directionality of content." "Modifiers and Enrichers processing an XLIFF Document" Should be "Modifiers and Enrichers processing an XLIFF Document"</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed Note: Covered all Typo issues. 106 is the master.	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	116	undefined in metadata	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00002.html	<p>Several of the attributes of the metadata module have their default defined like this: Default value: undefined Where "undefined" is styled with <code><code></code> instead of being in normal text, making the word look like a real value rather than the term 'undefined'.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	117	typos	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00003.html	<p>"content of the matagroup applies." Should be "content of the matagroup applies." (and should be styled with <code><code></code>)</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed Note: Covered all Typo issues. 106 is the master.	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	118	no link between type and sub-type values for inline codes	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00004.html	<p>The specification provides a list of values for the type attributes when in inline codes: <code>frnt</code>, <code>uq</code>, <code>quot</code>, <code>lmg</code>, <code>other</code> - It also provides a list of reserved values for subType: <code>XLfB</code>, <code>xlfpb</code>, <code>xlfb</code>, <code>xlfi</code>, <code>xlfa</code>, <code>xlfr</code> - But it doesn't tell which of the type value must be used when one of the subType pre-defined value is used. - I would suggest: <code>xlfb</code>, <code>xlfi</code>, <code>xlfa</code>, <code>xlfr</code>, <code>xlfpb</code> > <code>frnt</code> <code>xlfr</code> > <code>uq</code></p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: mapping Constraint added to subType, mapping as requested	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	-
cp0202	119	definition and spelling of 'quot' type	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00005.html	<p>The type value 'quot' is defined as "Inline quotation". Could the definition be more explicit and have an example? And also maybe the value could be 'quote' rather than 'quot'?</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: value changed to "quote", example and clarification added	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	substantive	-	-	-
cp0202	120	wrong agent?	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00006.html	<p>The specification has the following PR for the type attribute: "Writers updating the attribute type MUST also update or delete subType." Shouldn't this be a PR for Modifiers rather than Writers? The same goes for the PR on subState: "Writers updating the attribute state MUST also update or delete subState." Shouldn't this be a PR for Modifiers rather than Writers?</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: fixed the agent as requested	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	-
cp0202	121	Typos	Lucia Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00007.html	<p>PAGE SPELLING MISTAKE: 9 processing / 10 W.K. Note, 15th September 1997, / 11 process / 14 contained / 14 content / 14 terms of documents / 15 processing / 27 Directionality / 35 Bailey / 38, 122, element, / 39 others / 40 are it be treated, / 41 Please note that Agents using Processing Instruction to implement XLIFF Core or Module features are not compliant XLIFF applications disregarding whether they are otherwise conformant. / 41 discouraged / 47 formatting / 46, 48, 57, 58 a content, / 49 equivalent / 58 formatting / 58 extensin / 59 Constraint / 59 Integrity / 59 (twice) preserved. / 60 Note that when splitting or joining segments that have both source and target content it is advisable to keep the resulting segments linguistically aligned, which is likely to require human linguistic expertise and hence manual resegmentation. If the linguistically correct alignment cannot be guaranteed, discarding the target content and resegmenting the resulting source segments is worth considering. / 61 fulfill / 61 appeared / 61 Transformations / 74 because / 59 Integrity / 76 language, / 77 translation candidates / 79, 88 attributes / 82 prescribe / 82 Requirements / 88 matagroup / 91 attribute / 100 element / 104 attributes / 106, 107 perform / 107 storage / 108 (twice) element / 59 (twice) preserved. / 60 linguistic expertise and hence manual resegmentation. / 108 (inverted commas) "xliffcodepoints" / 108, 109 (inverted commas) "maximum" as "minimum and maximum" / 109 (inverted commas) size ("minimize, jmaxsize") / 109 (inverted commas) H.1.5.2 Storage restriction profiles "xliffref", "xliffatt16" and "xliffatt32" / 110 this module can be used is / 119 The allowed values are listed in / 122 symbolified, / 122 elements / 122 extensions / 122 Markers / 122 references / 123 Recommendation / 122 (twice) specification / 123 definitions / 123 response</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed Note: Covered all Typo issues. 106 is the master.	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	123	empty skeleton and no href	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00008.html	<p>withdrawn (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00009.html)</p>	WITHDRAWN	WITHDRAWN	N/A	WITHDRAWN	none	N/A	-	yes
cp0202	124	Alphabetical order - Attributes	Lucia Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00010.html	<p>There are some small editorial issues in the attributes section (2.3.1, "name" in page 25 is not in alphabetical order. The hyperlink takes you to "dc". - 2. There are two "original" in that list in page 25. The hyperlink in the first "original" takes you to "name". I suppose this mistake is related to the previous one. - 3. <code>dataRef</code>, <code>dataRefEnd</code> and <code>dataStart</code> in page 32 are not in alphabetical order within the other attributes; they appear after "name" and before "order" [BTW: One more correction for the spec: in the section 2.3.1 in the list of attribute the link on the 'original' attribute points to the section for the 'name' attribute instead of the section for the 'original' attribute.]</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	125	typo	Lucia Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00011.html	<p>Small typo in page 73: subType, it should be subType.</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed Note: Covered all Typo issues. 106 is the master.	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	-
cp0202	126	ref in msk	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00012.html	<p>There is the following PR: "When used in a term annotation, the value is referring to a <code><glossentry></code> element or another URI providing information about the term." - the link on <code><glossentry></code> is broken. <code><glossentry></code> should probably be <code><glsGlossentry></code> - the value of <code>ref</code> is the URI and therefore doesn't refer to "another URI" but to another resource. - I would rephrase this as "When used in a term annotation, the URI value is referring to a resource providing information about the term, for example a</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: the issue largely gone due to other related changes	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	-

cpn002	127	xml:lang and xml:space	Yves Savouret	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0013.html	<p>The attributes xml:lang and xml:space can be used on <source> and <target>, but because they are in a non-XLIFF namespace, they presumably can also be used on elements that accept extended attributes. Because, per the XML specification, those two attributes work with inheritance, one can set, for example, the xml:space value of a <source> or <target> without declaring the attribute on that element: <code><src id="1" xml:space="preserve"><segment><source>pre-formatted text</source></segment></src></code> <code><src id="1" xml:space="preserve"></segment></src></code> There is no mention of this anywhere in the specification. I'm wondering if it's not worth having some note about this in the xml:space section. The specification also says for xml:space: Default value: default Which is, from an XML viewpoint, incorrect. If it is not specified the value should be the same as the value for the parent element.</p>	Bryan (change to David?)	-	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00130.html	-	-	
cpn002	128	extended attributes	Yves Savouret	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0014.html	<p>The specification says: "The following XLIFF Core elements accept custom attributes": <file> <group> <unit> <mkvs> <cmvs>. The <xliff> element is missing in that list: it also accept custom attributes.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	
cpn002	129	ignorable and fs	Yves Savouret	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0015.html	<p>The section describing the fs: attribute says: "Used in: <file>, <unit>, <ignorable>, <notes>, <notes>, <originalData>, <data>, <cp>, <cc>, <cc>, <sp>, <pc>, <mkvs>, <cmvs> and <cmvs>". It's incorrect: <ignorable>, <cmvs> do not have fs attributes.</p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00072.html	-	-	
cpn002	130	Translation Candidate Annotation	Yves Savouret	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0016.html	<p>The section "2.7.3.1.3 Translation Candidate Annotation" defines a way to associate a give span of content with a <cm:match> element. It uses the type 'match' for this. / While trying to implement validation with a tool supporting the core, I ran into the issue that the tool should not know anything about modules but is suddenly faced with constraints related to a module. For example: to validate that when type equals 'match' the ref attribute points to a proper 'translation candidate' it would have to know about the namespace of <cm:match>, and therefore it would no longer be a core-only processor. / I don't think the 'match' type should be part of the list of pre-defined values for <cm:vs> type. I also think the whole "Translation Candidate Annotation" section should be in the section defining the Translation Candidate module.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Translation Candidates annotation is a core device for pointing to translation candidates analogous to the term annotation. It can be used by the module but really is independent of it, same as the term annotation is independent of the glossary module. This is the case especially after matches got their own ref for pointing back to core.	N/A	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html	-	-
cpn002	131	sections in the specification	Yves Savouret	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0017.html	<p>I've always been puzzled about why the modules are defined in the appendix part of the specification. Things in the appendix are generally "support material". In my opinion the document should be more like this: 1. Introduction 2. Conformance 3. Core (was "Detailed Specification") 4. Translation Candidate Module 5. Glossary Module 6. Format Style Module 7. Metadata Module 8. Resource Data Module 9. Change Tracking Module 10. Size Restriction Module 11. Validation Module Then the Appendix / Or, if there is a strong need for grouping the modules: 1. Introduction 2. Conformance 3. Core (was "Detailed Specification") 4. Modules 4.1 Translation Candidate Module 4.2. Glossary Module 4.3. Format Style Module 4.4. Metadata Module 4.5. Resource Data Module 4.6. Change Tracking Module 4.7. Size Restriction Module 4.8. Validation Module Then the Appendix</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: As voted by TC, c) use sub-sections	Roll call vote (https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	
cpn002	132	attribute without value description/type	Yves Savouret	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0018.html	<p>The definition of 'category' or 'type' in the metadata module have no type defined (i.e. we don't know if they are text, NMTOKEN, etc.) They are missing a 'value description' field like other attributes have. Something like "Value description: Text."</p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00066.html	-	-	
cpn002	133	Editorial changes	Lucia Morado	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0019.html	<p>-Naming issues in the following attributes (they might be like that for a reason, I don't know): glossentry or glossentry? metagroup or metaGroup? duration or durTime? The table in page 83 has some overlapping issues with its title. Code outside the purple box, pages: 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 77, 80, 81, 84, 89, 96, 97, 101, 103, 110, 111 and 120 -Alphabetical issues: List of attributes in page 73. And the order that they are defined in the subsections (B.1.3.1 and so on) / List of values in Table B.1, page 75. / Attributes in page 88 (section F.1.3) -"application" should go before "category" and "type". / Attributes in page 93 (section F.1.3 and its subsections). / Attributes in page 100 (section G.1.3 and its subsections). "Ref" should go after "property". / Attributes in page 105 (section H.1.4 and its subsections). / Attributes in page 113 (section I.1.3 and its subsections). / Values in table H.1, page 106. / Values in table H.2, page 107. / Values in table I.1, page 119 / ones (in page 37 and 25). / startRef (page 35 and 25).</p>	DavidF	editorial fixes as listed	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	
cpn002	134	Example in Format Style uses an XLIFF element that does not exist	Bryan Schmeel	2013 04 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0020.html	<p>The Format Style example uses the old XLIFF 1.2 <cc> element. It should use the <gls> element. <cc> <code><gls id="img" fc:val="an:uniface.png" id="> / should be: <gls id="img" fc:val="img" id="> / should be: <gls id="img" fc:val="img" id="></code></p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	
cpn002	135	extensibility wording	Yves Savouret	2013 04 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0022.html	<p>I had to read the following sentences quite a few times before understanding what they mean: "XLIFF Modules extensibility by the Metadata module or custom namespace elements is specified in those modules." "XLIFF Modules extensibility by custom namespace attributes is specified in those modules." I finally understood that they simply mean that extensibility allowed in a given module is defined in the corresponding module section. I would suggest to replace the two sentences by something like "To use what element and attribute extensibility is allowed in a given module, see the corresponding module section."</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Extensibility of XLIFF Modules For extensibility of XLIFF Modules please refer to the relevant Module Sections.	N/A	TRA 20131217	editorial	-
cpn002	136	extended attributes	Yves Savouret	2013 04 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0023.html	<p><notes> is also missing in the list of core elements that may have extended attributes.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	
cpn002	137	XLIFF as a processing format for CAT tools	Bryan Schmeel	2013 04 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg0013.html	<p>I am worried that the statement that XLIFF is only intended for data exchange could endanger tools that use XLIFF as native format. Writer, Writer Agent: "Note: Since XLIFF is intended as an exchange format rather than a processing format, many applications will need to generate XLIFF / Documents from their internal processing XLIFF Documents created by another Extensor". Can this language be recast in order to encourage CAT tools to still use XLIFF as a native format? Improved words from Yves "If some tools choose to use XLIFF in their processing format that is fine and well. We shouldn't discourage it."</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Added the following language in the Introduction: "While the primary focus is on being a lossless interchange format, usage of XLIFF as a processing format is neither encouraged nor discouraged or prohibited." (As a second note to clarify that XLIFF is not forbidden from being a processing format (but is primarily and exchange format))	N/A	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	editorial	-
cpn002	138	schemas ambiguity in core and matches	Tom Comerford	2013 04 Oct	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg0025.html	<p>Element references in the following three element definitions are syntactically ambiguous within the XML schema language: element definition for <file> <code>references / meta:metadata / <durData / <val></code> validation element definition for <file> <code>references / <mk:matches / <gls:glossary / <md:metadata / <res:resourceData / <durData / <val></code> validation element definition for <unit> <code>references: <file></code> <code><originalData / <md:metadata / <file></code> Each element reference is optional in the given context. In all three element definitions these references are followed by <ex:xxx>, which allows any element from any namespace, including any of the referenced elements. This redundancy is explainable: the element references show implementers how those elements can be used. It's also exemplary, by which I mean to suggest that they could as easily be shown in examples and/or in the prose descriptions of how the respective elements can be used. The reason that they SHOULD be in the documentation, and MUST NOT be in the schema, is this: A validating parser cannot unambiguously determine whether any occurrence of the referenced element satisfies the explicit reference, or the wild-card <ex:xxx> token. Thus, strict validation of the schema fails.</p>	DavidF/Tom	IMPLEMENTED: as per resolution Dec 3, 2013	N/A	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00077.html	substantive	-
				2013	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff	<p>I am trying to put <cc:changeTrack> in an example file. I could not find any element in the spec that says it contains <cc:changeTrack>. Do we allow change track anywhere in core? Tom explained: 'ChangeTrack</p>						

cpr002	139	ChangeTrack	Bryan Schnabel	04 Oct	comment/201310img00026.html	is allowed only by wild-card, so it can be used in any of these contexts: <xliff/> /<xliff:skeleton> /<xliff:group> /<xliff:unit> /<xliff:glossentry> /<xliff:trans-unit> /<xliff:trans-unit> /<xliff:trans-unit>	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED- Per CFD	-		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00084.html	-	-	-
cpr002	140	type attribute for group	Yves Savaured	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00029.html	I've noticed that the <group>-element does not have a type attribute. This is something that existed in 1.2 and was used. An example of this would be to lay out a table, with groups of rows and cells. Addendum from Yves: "We don't have a type attribute in unit either."	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED- Per CFD	-		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00063.html	-	-	-
cpr002	141	<xliff:prefix> in size restriction	Yves Savaured	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00030.html	Values for the standard prefixes are called with a "xliff:" prefix (e.g. xliff:sourceids). It may be good to keep the same reserved prefix across conmodules of XLIFF. "xliff:" is used in type in the core. To be consistent I think it should either one, but not both.	Fredrik	Implemented ●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00161.html	-		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00161.html	-	-	-
cpr002	142	sub's value and spaces	Yves Savaured	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00031.html	The definition of sub's says: The sub's MUST only be used to carry attribute name/value comma-delimited pairs for attributes that are valid for the HTML element identified by the accompanying attribute. Example: <fx="img"><xliff:src="imgfile.png"> It is unclear to me if you can have more than one pair of name/value per sub's. I assume you can because a) the definition uses plural here with "the sub's" (see one sub's with many pairs); and b) it wouldn't make sense to restrict attributes to a single one. But it should be a lot clearer. Also the example show that the delimiter comma is used to separate the two parts of a pair, but what is the delimiter between pairs? If I assume it is space, then there is no ways to define a value containing a space since only \and - are escaped. Overall I think it would be a lot simpler to have only one attribute that hold the full element to use. Is there a reason why not?	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED- Per CFD	-		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00114.html	-	-	-
cpr002	143	MUST NOT in spanning description	Yves Savaured	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00032.html	In the description of the inline codes we have: "Codes that MUST NOT overlap, that is they cannot enclose a ..." I think this must not need to be in lower case: this is not a must not applying to the format but just a description of what an overlapping code is.	Davidef	IMPLEMENTED- non-normative reformatting with cannot	N/A		TBA 20131217	-	-	-
cpr002	144	inconsistent PRs for closing/duplicating codes with copyOf	Yves Savaured	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00033.html	We have the following two PRs in different phases: - Modifiers MUST NOT close a code that has its canCopy attribute is set to no. - Modifiers SHOULD NOT replicate inline codes that their attribute canCopy set to no.They are not consistent.	Davidef	IMPLEMENTED- MUST NOT used consistently	N/A		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00012.html	-	-	-
cpr002	145	improve the appearance of schema files	Tom Comerford	2013 05 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310img00034.html	Some suggestions for improving the appearance of the schema files: When a schema attribute is optional and the default value applies, sometimes it's expressed and sometimes it's omitted. We should choose one approach, and be consistent. / Add a descriptive comment to each element definition (as already exist for inline elements). The comment can be taken directly from the documentation, for most elements. / Add organizing comments throughout: e.g. imports, attribute types, elements. / Apply consistent formatting (indentation, blank lines, etc.). / Apply a logical order to elements in choice groups (may be alphabetical or hierarchy order). / Apply a logical order for XLIFF attributes: required (alphabetical) before optional (alphabetical), final last. / None of these affect the syntax or semantics, but they will be useful for implementers who read the schema files.	Tom	IMPLEMENTED-	N/A		TBA 20131217	-	-	-
cpr002	146	TC admin comments	Chet Ensign	2013 24 Sep	●https://www.oasis-open.org/app/wg/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201309/msg00049.html and ●https://www.oasis-open.org/app/wg/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201401/msg00104.html	On the cover page, the link to the schema folder is broken. The link is XML schemas accessible from ●http://docs.oasis-open.org/xliff/xliff-core/2.0/cpr002/cpr0022schemas/, what breaks it is the extra cpr002 in the URL. The link on the citation format on the cover page is also broken for the same reason. The approval date on the cover page should be "03 September" not "3 September" to match the OASIS style. In the Previous version links, the HTML URL is not marked (Authoritative) as it is for the This version and Latest version links.	Davidef	editorial fixes as listed	-		Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310img00042.html)	●https://www.oasis-open.org/app/wg/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201309/msg00050.html	-	-
-	-	Note: the following issues, (below this row and above the green row) are from TC members, logged after the PR closed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
cpr002	147	mkr translate outside the context but in scope	Yves Savaured	2013 28 Oct	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310img00071.html	For the <segment> element we have the following definition for the translate attribute:When used in any other admissible structural element: The value of the translate attribute of its parent element. But annotation can be placed in ignorable elements. And one of the fairly common uses for <ignorable> is to store things such as opening and closing codes that enclose the whole content of the segment, allowing for "cleaner" segments. Annotations may get become treatment. Another way to put such unit is when a segmentator puts breaks as close as possible to the text. The bottom line insuring prevent you to get a unit like this: <unit id="1"><segment id="1"><source>T.Sentence 1.</source></segment><targetable><source><cm id="m1">translate</cm></source></targetable></segment></unit></source>T.Sentence 2.</source></segment><ignorable><source><cm start="m1"></cm></source></ignorable><segment id="3"></source>T.Sentence 3.</source></segment></unit></So in such case a tool would get a default of translate="yes" for the segment <2> while the content is clearly intended (and coded) to be non-translatable. The solution would be to change the definition so the default first takes into account the translate state at the end of the previous segment or ignorable element. Note that this is potentially difficult to implement: you may have to look inside all previous siblings of a <segment> to get its default translate value.	Davidef	IMPLEMENTED- the algorithm has been clarified and simplified by the consensus decision to drop translate from <segments>. Might add examples at a later stage..	N/A	Consensus in teleconf ●http://markmail.org/message/gCfwgwbeadabbbk7h	substantive	-	-	-
cpr002	148	Allow empty group elements	Bryan Schnabel	2013 10 Nov	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00049.html	In XLIFF 1.2 we allowed empty group elements. In XLIFF 2.0 we require group elements to have one or more unit or group elements. When I read the first sentence in the definition of group, "Provides a way to organize units into a structured hierarchy," I thought, okay, not allowing empty group makes sense. But when I read the second sentence, "Note that this is especially useful for mirroring a source format's hierarchical structure," I became less sure. I think you if a writer's goal for group is to mirror a source format's structure, and part of that structure is a non-inline empty element, it would be reasonable to have an empty group element. The rub is we have inline elements meant to mirror empty source elements, but we do not have structural elements to mirror empty source elements. As an example the comes to mind is the CALS table colsep (<http://www.docbook.org/doc/1.0/html/colsep.html>). I think it is implicit in the fact that we are making statements that the group element can preserve structure and hierarchy of source files – that we intend to continue to support the maximalist (storing structure w/o skeletons) method. And I think we should. So I think we should either: 1. Allow empty group elements (change "One or more units" or <group> elements in any order followed by "to Zero, one or more units" or <group> elements in any order followed by "). 2. Edit the sentences about preserving structure and hierarchy away from all elements except for skeletons. I vote for 1.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED- Per CFD	-		Allow group to be empty - no dissent ●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00049.html	-	-	-
cpr002	149	Element names	Yves Savaured	2013 11 Dec	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00062.html	While <xsl:attribute> all lowercase is fine (because it's an actual word), based on our naming convention <xsl:metaDataGroup> should be <xsl:metaDataGroup>, like <xsl:resourceData> for example. In the same vein: <xliff:glossentry> should be <xliff:glossEntry> (or better: <glEntry>).	Davidef	IMPLEMENTED	N/A		duplicate of #133	editorial	-	-
cpr002	150	PR for white spaces	Yves Savaured	2013 30 Dec	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00173.html	In the white spaces section we have this PR: "For the elements <sc>, <cc>, <qph> and <dato>: The white spaces of their content MUST be preserved in all cases, even if the value for whitespace is set or inherited as default." <sc>, <cc> and <qph> are empty elements and therefore cannot have content, so we shouldn't list them here. Only <dato> should be listed here.	Bryan	●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00110.html	-		●https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00110.html	-	-	-

exp002	151	Finald	Yves	Nov 21 2013	http://markmail.org/thread/2qo36m2nuv3g73u	While resolving the id uniqueness related comments [109, 111, 113, 114, 126, 130 and the secondary id uniqueness issues A, B, C, D, and E] it transpired that an explicit fragment identification mechanism is needed for internal and external referencing	DavidF, Yves, Fredrik, DavidKC	IMPLEMENTED	-	resolved by ballot in meeting on January 7, 2014, see http://markmail.org/thread/5fvt4qgq3k8k4	substantive	-	-
exp001	001	Format Style Module Processing Requirements	Bryan Schaubel	2013-4-30	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201304/msg0000.html	new Processing Requirement: The <file> and subfile MUST be configured in such a way that the resulting HTML snippet is valid, such that it can be rendered by a standard HTML browser	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Bryan added the PR with reference to HTML standard object model	TC member	consensus clarified at F2F https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg00009.html following mailing list call for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/kx3uiffCk8emyp	substantive	N/A	YES
exp001	002	XLIFF 2.0 public review comments [TAB] review	Martin Chapman	2013-5-09	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0000.html	A summary of comments and a checklist of TO DO items	dF	IMPLEMENTED: dF to make the changes in spec	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg0012.html	This was extensively discussed in the TC on May 21, 2013. https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg00019.html , the consensus was that dF will make changes as requested by martin in his e-mail	substantive	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201308/msg0001.html	?
exp001	003	XLIFF 2.0 Suggestion: XLIFF example in the spec	Bryan Schaubel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0001.html	The XLIFF specification does not include a full-featured, fully valid example of an XLIFF file. This would be a useful addition.	Tom	Implemented	TC member	TC agreed having a shell is a start, but not robust enough to be completely useful. Agreed to approve with the promise that text and attribute values will be added as an editorial improvement requested by chair at the beginning of PR2 https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg0004.html	editorial	N/A	?
exp001	004	Document the evolution of a proposed feature from Extensibility to XLIFF core or module	Bryan Schaubel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0002.html	The spec should include an indication of how proposed feature features can use extensibility to model the feature, enter the proposed schemas in the catalog, and forward the proposal to the TC	dF	dF to propose deadline for a TC Note describing this process	TC member	consensus reached at F2F https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg00009.html	out of scope	N/A	YES
exp001	005	In "1.1.1 Key words	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0003.html	In my opinion these key words should be capitalized. It makes the reading a lot easier and other OASIS specifications do use this already.	dF	IMPLEMENTED: changed front matter for UPPERCASING // IMPLEMENTED: html and pdf stylesheets adopted	TC member	call for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/tuz5tan42cx3fk	editorial	N/A	YES
exp001	006	In "2.2.2.2 file	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0004.html	It does not really make sense to force a specific order for the elements of modules before the first <cmto>-<group>-in- <file>. Since extension could be listed in any order, it probably makes sense to just allow modules and extensions, then the core elements (skeleton, <cmto>-<group>).	Fredrik	IMPLEMENTED: as per CFD based on dF proposal http://markmail.org/thread/qksh7bn7j23hcxp4query+page:1+mid=agzdv7ar3tycyb2+state=results	TC member	call for dissent: http://markmail.org/thread/qksh7bn7j23hcxp4query+page:1+mid=agzdv7ar3tycyb2+state=results	substantive	-	?
exp001	007	Missing description	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0005.html	"The <file>-element must not have a <skeleton>-child, if and only if the optional skeleton attribute is used". There is no attribute skeleton defined in the description of <file>.	dF	IMPLEMENTED: Depends on 008, see it.	TC member	Calls for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/hz3okvgvbkwaadcl and http://markmail.org/thread/vwpgtqkchbtoroku	substantive	N/A	YES
exp001	008	Duplication in skeleton reference	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0006.html	"skeleton attribute - a pointer to the location of the file that contains untranslatable data for the enclosing <file>-element." The <skeleton>-element has an href attribute that seem to be having the same function as the <file>-skeleton attribute. What is the difference. If there is no difference, the skeleton attribute should probably be removed, or alternatively skeleton=href.	dF	IMPLEMENTED: Skeleton attribute removed from <file>, the internal/external mechanism kept on <skeleton>-only	TC member	Calls for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/hz3okvgvbkwaadcl and http://markmail.org/thread/vwpgtqkchbtoroku	substantive	N/A	YES
exp001	009	translate attribute	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0007.html	"Translate - Indicates whether or not the source text text of a <segment>-element should be translated." There is twice the word 'text' Since translate can be used in <cmto>, <segment>-or <cmto>- this definition citing only segment is incorrect. It should probably be something more general pertaining to the content of the element. There is also no description of the scope of the attribute: e.g does it applies to the children of <cmto>- when on <cmto>-? the children of <segment>- when on <segment>-?	dF	IMPLEMENTED: dF implemented full recursive inheritance on structural elements and markers as per CFD // also made changes in relation to 038, see it	TC member	CFD: http://markmail.org/message/7fwb7pf3d6nuux , based on dF proposed solution http://markmail.org/message/6vnt7uoy3tnejd	substantive	N/A	?
exp001	010	Minimum portion of translatable text	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0008.html	"2.2.2.6 segment: Minimum portion of translatable text" Technically <segment>-contains source and target, so not just translatable text. It also contains more than text. Maybe a reference to the Segmentation section would be nice here.	dF	IMPLEMENTED: dF clarified in spec and added Segmentation reference	TC member	TC consensus in teleconference: http://markmail.org/thread/7d6fagpgq3vuxm	editorial	N/A	?
exp001	011	State vs Approved	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0009.html	There is no description of the relationship between segment=state and segment=approved. One can have contradictory values: e.g. approved="yes" with final="no". Overall I seem approved is redundant.	Tom, dF	Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: "option 3: drop the flag approved=canMerge, no PRs." https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg0004.html IMPLEMENTED: as per CFD. http://markmail.org/thread/bv7hcc5fzck3k4 based on dF proposal. https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg0003.html , that was discussed in non-urgent TC on Aug 6, 2013 and received support.	TC member	Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: "option 3: drop the flag approved=canMerge, no PRs." https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg0004.html CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/bv7hcc5fzck3k4 based on dF proposal. https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg0003.html , that was discussed in non-urgent TC on Aug 6, 2013 and received support.	substantive	-	?
exp001	012	tgt vs trg	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0010.html	Some attributes use tgt for target, other trg (tgtLang, trgDir). A consistent naming would be better for users. Personally 'tgt' look simpler to me as it's the three first consonant of TarGet.	Fredrik	IMPLEMENTED: Fredrik to unify on trg in spec, duplicate of 020 (master)	TC member	TC consensus in teleconference: http://markmail.org/thread/7d6fagpgq3vuxm	substantive	N/A	YES
exp001	013	PR for PI	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0011.html	There is a section about comments and one about CDATA sections. But there is nothing about how to deal with Processing Instructions in an XLIFF document. My personal view would be a Processing Requirement that states "When MAY preserve XML processing instructions on output."	dF	IMPLEMENTED: as per ballot results, also reflecting ballot comments in a note.	TC member	resolved by ballot https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/ballot.php?d=2432	substantive	N/A	No (https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00006.html)
exp001	014	Metadata Module lacks processing requirements	Bryan Schaubel	2013-5-24	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0014.html	To enable the capture of attributes for an XML rendering, using the maximalist method (i.e., to not use a skeleton) (1) make the processing requirement should be that agents may ignore the candidates, but the MUST NOT remove. (2) Change 2.1 from "Should" to "Must". "A tool processing a valid XLIFF document that contains custom elements that it cannot handle MUST preserve those elements." (3) Change 2.7.2 from "must" to "SHOULD"; and limit the clause to just extensibility: change "Tools must not rely on user extensions (either in the Metadata module or custom [type] namespace based) other than the ones possibly defined in <skeleton>" to "Tools should not rely on custom namespace based extensions other than the ones possibly defined in <skeleton> to create the translated version of the original document."	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Based on a CFD to improve the language in Extension section to NOT prohibit using the maximalist method. https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg0011.html , and refined here: https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg0016.html Removed the restriction from using Metadata module for roundtripping, and fixed the type.	TC member	CFD: https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg0016.html	substantive	-	?
exp001	015	Processing Requirements for XML PIs	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	It should be mentioned that possible XML processing instructions (PI) must be preserved by tools that process XLIFF 2.0, and that cannot handles these PIs.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per TC ballot (was in conflict with 013 // Bryan to follow up with Jörg on comment list)	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	resolved by ballot https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/ballot.php?d=2432	substantive	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201307/msg0005.html	?
exp001	016	Structure and Structural Elements comparison with the previous 1.2	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	A comparison with the previous 1.2 version would support the general understanding of the new design and its overall rationale. This comparison should also include the relationship between the core elements and the module elements, and the general approach that is chosen to distribute data and metadata (in the broad sense) between these elements including possible best or good practices.	dF	This will be described in TC Note, dF to propose deadline	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	consensus reached in teleconference June 4, 2013, http://markmail.org/thread/kx3uiffCk8emyp	out of scope	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201308/msg0006.html	?
exp001	017	Structure and Structural Elements: custom-cmto-junction	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	The annotation elements <cmto> and <cmto> are just specialized cases of the <cmto>-element. Since they don't add any additional value to the inline annotation markup, they could be subsumed under <cmto>. Therefore, a justification of their existence would be most valuable.	Yves	Yves to conclude discussion with Jörg, eventually propose editorial changes (clarifications)	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	approved by ballot: https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	noneditorial	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201306/msg0008.html	?
exp001	018	Structure and Structural Elements: Glossary module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	It is unclear if for the 'term' type the 'ref' attribute could be used to establish a relationship with entries in the Glossary module. The Glossary module does not have a mechanism, e.g. an attribute such as 'href', or even an element, that allows for referencing.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to 2/3 consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Related to 024 // Ryan to follow up with Jörg	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	F2F consensus (https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201305/msg00009.html) + ballot https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/ballot.php?d=2438 + call for dissent https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00046.html	substantive	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201307/msg0015.html	?
exp001	019	Structure and Structural Elements: reduce inlines to just 2	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	All other defined inline elements add structural complexity to the format, and they could be easily replaced by only 2 inline code types, one standalone – which includes the <cxp>-case of Unicode characters that are invalid XML – and one with a start and end marker. The need for the introduced different types is unclear, and the overcomplication through RFE code is not very helpful because it represents a very specific application case. Inline codes should simply help to process (either by human or machine) the content, and trigger appropriate translations including possible markup within the content. The existing attributes would certainly apply to these 2 inline code types. In addition, the content of the elements <originalData>-and <data>-would be simplified too if they are actually needed – remember that their content might be used differently by tools, and might therefore lead to incompatibilities. Therefore, these elements might be candidates for the Resource Data module to actually guarantee interoperability	Yves	REJECTED: Yves to conclude discussion with Jörg, eventually propose editorial changes (clarifications)	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	approved by ballot: https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	none	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201308/msg0015.html	?
exp001	020	Attributes: consistency between abbreviations	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	It might be more appropriate to maintain consistency between abbreviations used for target (language and directionality), i.e. tgt vs. trg. In the case of directionality we might even abandon the source/target distinction, and just use the attribute 'dir'.	Fredrik	IMPLEMENTED: duplicate of 012 (dave), Fredrik to follow up with Jörg	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	TC consensus in teleconference: http://markmail.org/thread/7d6fagpgq3vuxm	substantive	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201308/msg0015.html	?
exp001	021	Attributes: collapse state and substate	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0023.html	The attributes 'state' (no customization) and 'substate' (for customization) could be collapsed into one state attribute with pre-defined 'xlf:' namespace and customized values.	dF	REJECTED: comment 021, IMPLEMENTED: the general subproperties solution consensus as per CFD	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	CFD: https://www.oxis-open.org/apps/app/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg0014.html	substantive	https://lists.oxis-open.org/archives/biff-comment/201308/msg0015.html	?

cpo001	022	Attributes: <code><canCopy></code> , <code><canDelete></code> , <code><canOverlap></code> , and <code><canRender></code>	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The attributes <code><canCopy></code> , <code><canDelete></code> , <code><canOverlap></code> , and <code><canRender></code> used in conjunction with inline code are helpful because they add value to the processing (human and machine), and therefore should be retained if the previous suggestion of using just 2 inline codes would be adopted.	Yes	NOT RELEVANT: depends on 019, see it if Yes to follow up with Jörg	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	This becomes irrelevant in the TC is not going to change the general design of the inline codes.	none	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00015.html	?
cpo001	023	Translation Candidates Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Translation Candidates module is a replacement of the <code><alt-strs></code> element in XLIFF 1.2, and provides a means to maintain alternative translations (in particular translation automation) for the translatable content. The module is not very restrictive in the attribute selection, and might therefore be hijacked for arbitrary customization purposes. An exception, however, is the attribute <code>type</code> for which standard values are provided. Because of the stated processing requirements, these standard values should be further explained and justified. This module particularly lacks a contextual reference (before/after; previous/subsequent) which certainly would be very helpful for human and machine processing (even in fully automated cases). The Resource Data module might be a place for such contextual information but only the Metadata module is a permitted element in this module.	Yes	IMPLEMENTED: clarifications proposed by Yves.	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	approved by ballot: https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	editorial	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00035.html	?
cpo001	024	Glossary Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Glossary module is a very simple incarnation of a bi-lingual terminology resource (source and target language of the <code><xliff></code> element) that does not offer either a mechanism to relate the <code><source></code> entries with <code><source></code> and <code><target></code> content or any other means to accomplish such a relationship by, for example, a term or even a concept identifier. Variations or synonyms are also not foreseen, and always require a new entry. The only attribute that is required is <code>source</code> for the <code><definition></code> element which is certainly very bizarre in this context. The module has it defined in the specification is useless because it only provides an isolated data bag.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to CZ consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Ryan to follow up with Jörg if A) make Glossary Module more expressive: 1) make <code><glossentry></code> extensible by both elements and attributes; 2) make children extensible by attributes; 3) Introduce id to be able to reference back from <code><mk type="term"></code> ; B) Remove <code><glossary></code> from <code><file></code> // duplicate of 36 and 50 (master)	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	F2F consensus: https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00009.html + ballot https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/ballot.php?id=2438 + call for dissent https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00046.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00012.html	?
cpo001	025	Format Style Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Format Style Module offers a mechanism to support the generation of a simple HTML preview. Although limited, e.g. the embedding of images is not allowed, it might add value to the human translation process. A more sophisticated example should be provided anyway.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: related to 001 // Bryan to follow up with Jörg	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	consensus clarified at F2F: https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00009.html following mailing list call for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/kxa3ml5c3kernip	editorial	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00011.html	?
cpo001	026	Metadata Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Metadata module is a very simple container format for contextualized data that should support the processing of the content data. An example should be provided to illustrate the relationship with the content data.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Bryan provide example for <code>mda</code> and follow up with Jörg // duplicate of 048 (master)	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	approved by ballot: https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	editorial	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00010.html	?
cpo001	027	Resource Data Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Resource Data module is yet another data container that specifically can refer to external data, and might also present certain contextual information (see Section 3.1). However, for employing this module to provide guidance to the translator or the processing tool it might be misplaced under the <code><file></code> element, and could certainly also useful on the <code><unit></code> and <code><segment></code> level to provide preceding and subsequent contextual content information. In addition, further examples should be provided to clarify the purpose and intent of this module.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: the design of the resource data module as outlined in the call for dissent // df proposed option for internal file analogous to skeleton	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	call for dissent: https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00051.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00010.html	?
cpo001	028	Change Tracking Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Change Tracking module permits the adding of processing information to the content elements <code><segment></code> and <code><unit></code> , and provides a useful means for maintaining and curating lifecycle information including provenance. This module is a very simple container format to establish references between different information elements which are missing in other modules such as the Glossary Module in particular.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to CZ consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Improve data referencing in modules	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	call for dissent: https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00046.html + https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00052.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00013.html	?
cpo001	029	Size Restriction Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Size Restriction module provides means to encode size restrictions based on so called restriction profiles (<code><profiles></code>). A <code><normalization></code> element specifies with 2 attributes (<code>general</code> and <code>storage</code>) how to normalize the content that should be processed. In both cases only the normalization forms C and D as specified by the Unicode Consortium are supported (values being <code>"none"</code> , <code>"rfc"</code> , and <code>"utf"</code>). This module is yet another good example of a well-defined and extensible module (through the provision of additional profiles).	Fredrik	NONE	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	no resolution required, just a positive comment/endorsement	none	N/A	YES
cpo001	061	Validation Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Validation module defines a container format for a couple of validation rules that should be applied to the translated content (<code><target></code> elements) of an XLIFF file. Rules are simple test cases that should be applied to the associated content, and sometimes relate <code><source></code> and <code><target></code> content as well as normalization (see section 3.7). The execution of the tests should be automated. The defined processing requirements or better rule definition requirements, however, demand the entire flexibility of the module, and therefore the module description should provide additional clarification and justification.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to call for dissent. Depends on 033 // Ryan to follow up with Jörg	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	Call for dissent: https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00099.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00015.html	?
cpo001	030	Basic structure	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[1] The <code><file></code> element (2.2.2.2) is described as a "container for localization material extracted from a single document/source." This language is actually less restrictive than the language in XLIFF 1.2 ("...single extracted original document.") Unfortunately, even in XLIFF 1.2 this was not implemented consistently. Some tools adopt the concept of a sub-file "page" unit (eg. a single worksheet from an Excel document, a single PowerPoint slide, or a single page from a multi-page document in Word, InDesign, etc.) and some implementations mapped these pages to the <code><file></code> element, while others would map it to the entire file. This practice will continue with XLIFF 2.0. [2] The intended use of the <code><ignorable></code> element is not clear from its definition in section 2.2.2.7. [3] The <code><notes></code> element (2.2.2.9) allows formatting style information (<code>@fcls</code> , <code>@fcsmbv</code>). Why? My understanding of the purpose of <code><notes></code> was to allow for comment data that was made during the localization lifecycle (ie. after text had been extracted from the native source, and before the translated target document was created), but the <code>fs</code> markup implies that it may also carry notes from the underlying content as well. It's also possible that the <code>fs</code> attributes are intended to allow richer text in <code><notes></code> content, but this seems like a strange way to go about it.	df	IMPLEMENTED: clarified <code><file></code> and <code><group></code> granularity. // REJECTED: to remove <code>fs</code> from annotations (notes and markers) as <code>fs</code> is for preview and review purposes it seems logical to generate preview of both data and relevant metadata	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	df proposed CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/7cyc7565qphbz3m	editorial	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
cpo001	031	SLR Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[1] Why aren't <code>sizeInfo</code> (H.1.4.9) and <code>eqnStorage</code> (H.1.4.8) named consistently? They perform a similar function along different axes (size vs storage). Possibly consider renaming <code>sizeInfo</code> to <code>eqnSize</code> , or alternately renaming <code>eqnStorage</code> to <code>storageInfo</code> . [2] Can <code>sizeInfoRef</code> (H.1.4.10) point to data outside the XLIFF document itself? It seems that the intention for it is always point to content within a local <code><data></code> element, but it is unclear. [3] SLR data is schematically valid in places where its meaning is not obvious. For example, it could be attached to a <code><group></code> element that contained a mix of segment content and <code><ignorable></code> elements. In the size/storage requirements of <code><ignorable></code> content counted towards the overall totals for the <code><group></code> ?	Fredrik	Implemented. Demonstrated and approved at TC meeting https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00004.html design of <code>slr</code> module	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	approved by ballot: https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
cpo001	032	Metadata Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	No use case is provided for this, and there are no processing expectations. Is this data to be maintained during processing?	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: design of <code>mda</code> module	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	approved by ballot: https://www.ossis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	substantive	https://lists.ossis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00032.html	?
						[1] Examples are needed. [2] The processing requirements for validation (1.1.2.2) include, "When <code><validation></code> occurs at the <code><group></code> level, rules may be applied to all <code><target></code> elements within the scope of <code><group></code> , except where overrides are specified at the <code><unit></code> level." What about in the case where <code><group></code> elements are nested? Can a nested <code><group></code> override the validation rules of a parent <code><group></code> ? [3] The operation of the rule override mechanism is not obvious. In particular, I'm not sure how the disabled attribute (1.1.3.6) meant to be used. For example, suppose there are multiple "mustLoc" rules that are defined in a given group's validation data. How would a nested group or unit disable use of those rules? Is the intention that the entirety of the rule should be reproduced, with the addition of the disabled attribute? I think this is the only							

cpw001	033	Validation module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	Ryan	<p>possible way, since "disabled" offers no other way to reference a specific rule. [4]Reference the occurrences attribute (1.1.3.3); [4a] The use of double quotes as an escaping mechanism is an unusual choice given that " is a problematic character in XML attribute values. [4b]The value space is sufficiently complex that it may be better to just use an explicit XML schema. This would be more verbose, but would simplify implementations because it would remove the need for a one-off occurrence parser. Additionally, the use of this attribute both as a way to both require occurrences (eg "foo{1}") and also to require that things not occur (eg "foo{0}") seems like a semantically tricky overloading of this arbitrary syntax. A real schema would make the desired behaviors more explicit. [5]Regarding the mustLoc attribute (1.1.3.4); [5a] Similar to comments about occurrences, the overloading of this attribute to mean both "must contain" and "must not contain" seems unnecessarily complicated. Why not just split this into #mustLoc and #mustNotLoc, or similar? This would also simplify implementations that would no longer need to special-case the parsing of these attribute values.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: simplified val rules, no special escaping needed, see the call for dissent for details. Design of validation module / Ryan to follow up with Chase</p>	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	Call for dissent: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00099.html	substantive	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg0016.html	?
cpw001	034	Matches module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	dF	<p>[1] The value of an optional id attribute in <match> is dubious. A required id might provide value, but an optional id provides roughly as much value as none at all to a consumer. [2] I'm not sure I disagree, but the bifurcation between similarity and matchQuality attributes strikes me as odd. I understand the different cases in which they might be used, but what on earth is a tool meant to do with both of them? This is exacerbated because matchQuality has no prescribed meaning. It might be an MT confidence score (which would be useful), or it might not. In practice, I feel like 99% of the time these two values will be the same, and the other 1% of the time, they will be different -- in which case the meaning is ambiguous.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: make id on matches compulsory, clarified on suitability attributes, introduced pointing from inline annotations, removed mentions of <segment>, as result of the resegmentation changes</p>	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0069.html	dF proposed CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/2mqkks4etafahojm	substantive	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg0016.html	?
cpw001	035	Change Tracking Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	Ryan	<p>[1] This is mostly a matter of preference, but I don't like the ad-hoc referencing mechanism used to attach revision data. I would prefer to see a more robust system based on RDF or something similar. [2] No processing restrictions are given for the rid attribute. It is strange that for example appliesTo could specify "note", but rid could be absent. In this case, it's unclear whether the note the revision refers to. [3] The stated purpose of the #checksum attribute is to detect changes in the revision data from non-compliant parsers. In that case, why not have checksums on the source content itself (or match proposals, etc)? It seems strange to only place this protection here.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: according to call for dissent. Design of change tracking module</p>	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0069.html	call for dissent: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00044.html	substantive	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg0014.html	?
cpw001	036	Glossary Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	Ryan	<p>I am not a term expert, but I am concerned that this schema is overly simplistic. There is no way to identify correlate term entries with segment content. The term metadata is very limited; in particular term variations are not supported. [glossary]</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: according to 7/21 consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Ryan to follow up with Chase // duplicate of 014 (slaved), see it</p>	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0069.html	F2F consensus: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00099.html + ballot: https://www.osis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/ballot.php?del=2438 + call for dissent: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00046.html	substantive	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg0012.html	?
cpw001	037	CRC32 in Change Tracking Module	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00034.html	Ryan	<p>In Change Tracking Module, a normative reference for CRC32 is missing. Also Joachim's pseudocode should be added as informative example to make sure that the intention is clear.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: removed checksum from module as per call for dissent. Adding CRC reference and pseudocode is no longer relevant</p>	TC member	call for dissent: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00044.html	substantive	-	YES
cpw001	038	Inline elements and attributes PRs on re-segmentation	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00025.html	Freddie // affected module owners (Ryan, Bryan, Yves)	<p>in the core specification of inline elements. PRs for re-segmentation are missing. PRs should be discussed mailing list and stabilised on the F2F in London, June 10, 2013.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: added re-segmentation PRs // IMPLEMENTED: made module and feature changes, but that module and features still work with not on segments, <source>, or <target> //IMPLEMENTED: dF added re-segmentation flag and did required consistency fixes</p>	TC member	TC resolved by a unanimous ballot on July 2 that module and notes elements will be moved out of the segment level: https://www.osis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201307/msg00055.html // Affected module and feature owners need to handle the technical details resulting from that decision	substantive	-	?
cpw001	039	classification of processes and agents to improve precision of conformance statements	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00036.html	dF	<p>our specification is still too document centric. Compared to XLIFF 1.2, we have many Processing Requirements and it is very well so. However the only explicit statement we are making towards the application conformance target is isolated and does not have much backing throughout the spec (see evaluation by TAB member Martin Chapman in last TC minutes) I attach and include in the e-mail body proposed definitions that should be included in the spec and used throughout PRs to refine the intended application conformance targets. It is vital for the spec contains normative language that will allow for unambiguous construction of application conformance profiles and to specify admissible document states before and after a specific processes are performed by agents of specific types. This proposal will be presented on the 4th XLIFF Symposium. It should also be preliminary discussed in the F2F on June 10, 2013</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: dF did normative language rehaul based on: 1) classification of processes and agents (generate/merge, modifier, enricher), 2) PRs v constraints review made in F2F</p>	TC member	consensus reached at F2F: https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00099.html	substantive	-	?
cpw001	040	Proper namespace value for validation module	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00027.html	dF	<p>In the following sections: 2.2.2.2 file, 2.2.2.4 group, 2.2.2.5 unit, 2.2.2.6 segment, it should read: Zero or one <val-validation> elements followed by - Not - Zero or one <validation-validation> elements followed by</p> <p>In section 2.2.2.5 unit, the last PR listed states: "A <unit> element is considered to be translated when all its <segment>-children with translate attribute not set to no have the approved attribute set to yes." And in section 2.3.1.1 approved, it states: "Approved - Indicates whether the holding <segment>-element contains a translation suitable to be used when converting the XLIFF file to original format." Both of these statements seem very implementation specific. Also, I think approved may be redundant, or potentially confusing, now that state has a value of reviewed. If having <segment state="reviewed"> then that arguably could be considered translated and suitable to be used in generating my localized document. Even then, there shouldn't be anything to stop me from considering <segment state="translated"> as translated and ready for generation as well. The logic for when it is suitable to perform the merge should not be baked into the specification.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested</p>	TC member	TC delegated resolution of editorial actions to dF: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfdgpggj5vxxm	editorial	N/A	YES
cpw001	041	Approved attribute	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00026.html	Tom, dF	<p>Confusing, now that state has a value of reviewed. If having <segment state="reviewed"> then that arguably could be considered translated and suitable to be used in generating my localized document. Even then, there shouldn't be anything to stop me from considering <segment state="translated"> as translated and ready for generation as well. The logic for when it is suitable to perform the merge should not be baked into the specification.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: 'option 3: drop the flag approved<canMerge, no PRs.' https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00044.html [as per CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/fw7hcccc744e5gk based on dF proposal] https://www.osis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00003.html, that was discussed in non-querium TC on Aug 6, 2013 and received support.]</p>	TC member	Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: 'option 3: drop the flag approved<canMerge, no PRs.' https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00044.html [CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/fw7hcccc744e5gk based on dF proposal]	substantive	N/A	?
cpw001	042	2.3.1.23 dataRefStart	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00031.html	dF	<p>In the example in section 2.3.1.23 dataRefStart - The <src> tag need to be closed by </src>.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested</p>	TC member	TC delegated resolution of editorial actions to dF: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfdgpggj5vxxm	editorial	N/A	YES
cpw001	043	note priority	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00034.html	dF	<p>Section 2.3.1.25 states: "Note Please note that 1 is the highest priority that can be interpreted as an alert, e.g. an ITS Localization Note of the type alert. The best practice is to use only one alert per an annotated element, and the full scale of 2-10 can be used for prioritizing notes of lesser importance than the alert." This is the only place in the entire specification, as far as I can tell, that ITS is mentioned. There is not just one here to what ITS is, what it means, and how it relates to XLIFF. And there are a few typos in there as well: "interpreted", "practice", and "notated". And overall, it should be noted that this is just an example usage of priority, otherwise, I believe it is a too implementation specific.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: fixed typos, added non-normative reference to ITS</p>	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to dF: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfdgpggj5vxxm	editorial	N/A	?
cpw001	044	inline code examples and context	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00035.html	dF	<p>2.6.2 Inline Codes, 2.6.3 Annotations, 2.6.4 Sub-Flows Are well constructed with good explanations and examples. Annotation and Sub-Flow elements and attributes have links to these sections e.g. "See the example in the Sub-Flows section." and "See the Annotations section for more details and examples on how to use the <unit>-element." The reader can jump there, read, and come back with the proper context. Many sections on inline codes and attributes do show examples, however, the whole context of the example may not always clear until the reader goes through section 2.6.2 Inline Codes, which comes later in the specification. As a suggestion, it may make it easier for readers to understand the examples if there is a link such as "See the Inline Codes section for more details," that they can follow, read, and return with the proper context.</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested</p>	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to dF: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfdgpggj5vxxm	editorial	N/A	?
cpw001	045	attributes from xml namespace	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.osis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00036.html	Tom	<p>In section 2.3.2, both xml:lang and xml:namespace are defined. They are also listed as optional attributes for <source> and <target>. Shouldn't we also define xml:ns in that section and list it as an optional attribute for <xliif> since this is the main mechanism for declaring a module's namespace? For example: <xliif xmlns:xliif="urn:osis:namespaces:xliff:document.2.0" xmlns:val="urn:osis:namespaces:xliff:validation.2.0" xmlns:src="urn:osis:namespaces:xliff:changeTracking.2.0" xmlns:mda="urn:osis:namespaces:xliff:metadata.2.0" xmlns:mcc="urn:osis:namespaces:xliff:matches.2.0"</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTED: approved by ballot and checked in to SVN</p>	TC member	approved by ballot: https://www.osis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00000.html	substantive	-	?

[illegible]

