

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 **espr01** are now frozen. All items marked **espr02** are now frozen. All items marked **espr03** are now open.

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 (CFD="Call For Dissent")	Type of Change	Reply URI	Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI
espr03	200	invalid resourceData examples	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00000.html	The 3 examples in section "5.5.6 Examples" are invalid: The <resourceData> elements must be before the <segment> element, not after. Each <file> element is also missing its id attribute.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: fixed examples to be valid	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00020.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	201	resourceData occurrences	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00001.html	The specification states that a <file> element can have "Zero, one *or more*" <resourceData> elements" and the <unit> element can have "Zero or one" <resourceData> elements". It is inconsistent. I believe originally <resourceData> was allowed more than once in <unit> as well. And that was changed because <resourceData> doesn't have any attributes and therefore having more than one is pointless. So <file> should probably allow no more than one, like <unit>.	Ryan/Kevan/Uwe/Bryan	IMPLEMENTED in the Constraints section of "4.2.2.2 file"; change "Zero, one or more <resourceData> elements" to "Zero or one <resourceData> element"	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00022.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	202	Core specification overview text	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00002.html	In the section "4 The Core Specification" the 3rd paragraph states: ... Each <file> element contains a set of <unit> elements that contain the text to be translated in the... That's not quite correct anymore: a <file> can contain a single <group> that can be empty. So *each* <file> does not necessarily have <unit> elements. I suggest to change the text to: "Typically, each <file> element..." or "Typically a <file> element..." or something similar that is less absolute than the current text.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as suggested "Typically, each <file> element."	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/02ooi7ah2bdqndu	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	203	Non-capitalized paragraph for XLIFF Document definitio	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00003.html	In section "1.1.3 Key concepts" The paragraph defining XLIFF Document does not start with a capital, while the other definitions do. That is: "any XML document that..." should be "Any XML document that..."	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as suggested "Any ..."	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/5ewbs4vgufegyhx	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	204	Title vs title	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00004.html	In the section "1 Introduction", the text has several reference to "Title" when defining how informative text is labeled. The word is capitalized while there is no reason to capitalize it. For example "Non-Normative" in Title should be "Non-Normative" in title or even better English: "Non-Normative" in the title.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as suggested: "Title" lowercased	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/5op64a5e5c2yfs	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	205	Copyright notices	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00005.html	In the Copyright Notices section it says: Copyright C OASIS Open 2013. All Rights Reserved. The year should be 2014.	DavidF	See master: 216	N/A	See master: 216	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	206	incorrect note in Translate Annotation section	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00008.html	The Translate Annotation section has the note: This annotation overrides the translate attribute set at the <segment> level. This note is now incorrect as there is no translate attribute in <segment> anymore.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Note corrected using <unit>	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/4qfbc5zlid5mkrc	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	207	misspelled namespace fo change tracking	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00006.html	In section "5.6.2 Module Namespace" the specification says: The namespace for the Change Tracking module is: urn:oasis:names:tc:xliff:change:Tracking2.0 But elsewhere the namespace is "urn:oasis:names:tc:xliff:change:tracking2.0" (all lowercase). I believe the all lowercase notation is the correct one.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: corrected case	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00019.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	208	XML namespace vs xml namespace	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00007.html	There are several occurrences of both "XML namespace" and "xml namespace". The document should be consistent and use only one spelling.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: unified as "XML namespace"	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/t4rqmvyjhexu4bd	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	209	incorrect values for appliesTo in change_tracking.xsd	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00009.html	The schema change_tracking.xsd uses the XLIFF core definition for the appliesTo attribute of the <revisions> element. But the specification describes other values: Value description: Any valid XLIFF element which is a sibling, or a child of a sibling element, to the change track module within the scope of the enclosing element. I'm also not quite sure what "valid XLIFF element" is right here. Shouldn't that be: "The name of any XLIFF element...?" Note also that if you keep track of a deleted element, per this definition its appliesTo value can be invalid since it's not a child or a child of a sibling element anymore.	Tom (schema change)/David (spec change)	IMPLEMENTED: NMTOKEN in schema, NMTOKEN name of XLIFF element in space	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00037.html	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/fmveygovx4mish
espr03	210	invalid changeTrack example	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00010.html	The example in section "5.6.6 Example" is invalid: The elements of the Change Tracking module have no namespace. The order is <segment>, <notes>, <changeTrack> is invalid, it must be <changeTrack>, <notes> then <segment>. There are extra > in several <revision> elements. There is an invalid nid attribute in some <revision> element. Etc... [Also, typo in 5.6.4.3 revisions example, missing namespace prefix in item close tag]	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: made examples valid	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00020.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	211	inconsistent currentVersion value definition for change tracking	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00011.html	In section "5.6.5.3 currentVersion" the specification states that the value is an NMTOKEN, while in the schema it is not defined, so I believe it is implicitly an xs:string.	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: Added attribute type xs:NMTOKEN in schema	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	[TC Resolution (CFD="Call For Dissent")]	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	212	inconsistent ref value definition for change tracking [same issue applies also to gls: glossEntry@ref, gls: translation@ref, and mtc: match@ref]	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00012.html	In section "5.6.5.5 ref" the specification states that the value is an NMTOKEN, while in the schema it is defined as xs:anyURI. [same issue applies also to gls: glossEntry@ref, gls: translation@ref, and mtc: match@ref]	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: Verified with Ryan that NMTOKEN is correct, and updated the schema	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00038.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	213	invalid example in Translation Candidates module	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00013.html	The example in section "5.1.4 Translation Candidate Annotation" is invalid: - <mtc:matches> element must be before <segment> not after - the ref attributes values should be "#id" rather than "id" since ref is defined as xs:anyURI.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00020.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
espr03	214	ref attribute in Translation Candidate annotation	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00014.html	In the section "5.1.4 Translation Candidate Annotation" the ref attribute of the annotation is listed as optional and has several issues: a) It has no normative definition (both the note and example are non-normative). This means an agent doesn't know where the reference can point to, nor what behavior it is suppose to have with the referred object. b) The Translation Candidate module has its own reference mechanism and only needs a span marker in the content. The ref attribute is never necessary for the module to work. c) In fact, the ref attribute in the annotation is kind of conflicting with the module way of referencing, as DavidF noted during the discussion leading to the decision to move the Translation Candidate annotation out of the core: "df: I don't feel strongly about having defined an mtc: annotation, it could be used eventually if there were no suitable marked spans in the core and the Enricher should be able to insert its match even if there was no span available. If the annotation had a ref, it would be in conflict with the mtc:ref" (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html) d) the note states: In this annotation type, the XLIFF Core ref attribute is primarily intended to allow for referencing of translation candidate resources or other relevant metadata that are external to the XLIFF Document. The Translation Candidates module uses its own mtc:ref to reference its match spans in source content the other way round. Implementers who are not using the Translation Candidates Module and want to reference translation candidates provided by external systems such as TM or MT services, will be better off with defining their own Custom Annotation than using the mtc:match type. The two paragraphs are contradictory: the second paragraph says that you shouldn't really do what the first paragraph says. I strongly recommend to: - remove completely the note - remove any <mtc:ref> attribute from the example, - and replace the ref value from "The ref attribute is OPTIONAL" to "The ref	DaveO/Yves	IMPLEMENTED: Text updated as per resolution.	N/A	CFD: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00032.html	Editorial	N/A	Yes

id	number	title	author	date	comment	description	status	action	url	type	reply	comment	
csprd03	215	invalid example for glossary module	Yves Savourel	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00015.html	In section "5.2.6 Example" the example is invalid: - the <glossary entry must be before <segment>, not after. - it should be <g: glossEntry> not <g: glossentry>.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Changed the example to be valid	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00020.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	216	TC Admin comments on XLIFF V2.0 CSRPD03	Chet Ensign	11 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00016.html	- In the PDF footer and at the end of the HTML, the copyright is incorrect. It reads: "Copyright © OASIS 2014. All rights reserved." It should read: "Copyright © OASIS Open 2014. All Rights Reserved." - In the first line of appendix B.1.1, the csprd02 is labelled "Committee Specification Draft" instead of "Draft." - In the Notices section, the copyright year says 2013 instead of 2014. - On the cover page, in the Citation format section, there is extraneous text. The first URL is preceded by the text: "Persistent link to this version." We don't put anything there, just use the link. In the second URL, it starts with: "The latest version is available from:" Our template is just to use "Latest version:" Also, periods are missing in the citation block after the list of Editors names, and after the URI for the current version.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as requested by Admin	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00017.html	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/wclgv64jxokpe	Editorial	http://markmail.org/thread/wclgv64jxokpe	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	217	typo in "3.2 Selectors for Modules and Extensions"	Bryan Schnabel	13 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00023.html	I think in the sentence "A prefix MAY be associated with more than one namespace URI (to allow for example different versions of a given module or extension to use the same prefix)," we should say "to allow" instead of "to allows."	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: typo fixed	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/mymcut4ssvypf	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	218	attributes mapping table corrections	Yves Savourel	13 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00024.html	There are several issues in the table "Table 2. Mapping between attributes": -- 1) The row for 'dir' at the bottom has no entry for <ec/>, but dir is one of the attributes allowed in <ec/> so it should be listed in the table too. -- 2) There should be a row for subType (same for the three elements). -- 3) the cell "startRef/ id" for <ec/> would be better with additional info. I suggest: "startRef (or id when isolated='yes')"	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Table fixed, reference to <ec/> PR added	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/dc5f6waxqm67p	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/dc5f6waxqm67p
csprd03	219	Intent for value and ref in Comment annotation	Yves Savourel	13 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00025.html	In section "4.7.3.1.3 Comment Annotation" there is this usage definition: If the value attribute is present it contains the text of the comment, otherwise the ref attribute MUST be present and contains the id value (in URI format) of a <note> element that holds the comment. The way I read it, ref is required if value is not present. That part is clear. There is also nothing in the text preventing value and ref to be present at the same time. Is that the intent? (I'm not for or against it. If the intent is to allow both at the same time there is nothing to change. If the intent is to have either ref or value, the text is not explicitly stating that). I'd like to know the intent, to be sure Lynx does the validation properly.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: PR disambiguated, only one source of comment text is allowed	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/doc2o4a4k7qtmoo	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/doc2o4a4k7qtmoo
csprd03	220	can add translatable text PR	Yves Savourel	13 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00026.html	In section "4.7.7.1 Without an Existing Target" where the PRs about how to modify the target content are listed, the specification has the following PR: - Modifiers MAY add translatable text. I assume it really means "Modifiers MAY add translation of the source text". Or does it mean one can add text in the <source>? (that would be strange since the PR is in a target-related section.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00039.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	221	Tree Structure diagram is incomplete	David Walters	13 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00027.html	In section "4.2.1 Tree Structure", the following structural elements are missing: <segment>, <ignorable>, <originalData>, <data>, <source>, <target>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: informative treess fixed	N/A	Resolution http://markmail.org/thread/hoas5jpxv62wj72z	Editorial	N/A	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	222	PR on removing annotations	Yves Savourel	14 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00028.html	In section "4.7.3 Annotations" there is the following PR: [When a Modifier removes an <mk> element or a pair of <sm> / elements and the ref attribute is present, it MUST check whether or not the URI referenced by the ref attribute is within the same <unit> as the removed element. If it is and no other element has a reference to the referenced element, the Modifier MUST remove the referenced element.] There were several issues related to it that were brought up (see https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00054.html) most issues were resolved with the definition of the Fragment Identifier mechanism. However, the last issue listed was forgotten and is still present. This PR is too difficult to implement and needs to be removed. It looks like (informally) there was not dissent on that (See https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00117.html) but it was never formally done.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: This PR was found to be too difficult to implement during the FragID discussion, and should have been removed as part of that resolution (editorial omission). Remove it.	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00040.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	223	Acknowledgements	Dr. David Filip	16 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00030.html	suggest that the informative appendix Acknowledgments is brought up to date, not necessarily removing any acknowledged persons' names, but maybe look into adding some more recent contributors 😊	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Acknowledgements up to date	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/tcmiszmkzkwg2	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/tcmiszmkzkwg2
csprd03	224	untranslatable	Yves Savourel	16 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00031.html	There are 5 occurrences of the term "untranslatable" (in section "4.2.2.3 skeleton" and "4.2.2.11 data" and "5.4.4.4 meta"). To me "untranslatable" means "cannot be translated". In all cases I believe the intended meaning is "should not be translated" and the corresponding term would be "non-translatable". I suggest to replace the 5 occurrences of "untranslatable" by "non-translatable".	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: non-translatable as suggested	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/3yo3budur7mgs5	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/3yo3budur7mgs5
csprd03	225	not changing the skeleton content	Yves Savourel	16 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00032.html	In section "4.2.2.3 skeleton" there is the following PR: [[Modifiers and Enrichers processing an XLIFF Document that contains a <skeleton> element MUST NOT change those elements.]] The text is slightly strange as it refers to "a skeleton" then at "those elements". It may also be clearer to explicitly mention the content. I suggest the following re-wording: "Modifiers and Enrichers processing an XLIFF Document that contains a <skeleton> element MUST NOT change that element and its content."	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: "Modifiers and Enrichers processing an XLIFF Document that contains a <skeleton> element MUST NOT change that element, its attributes, or its content."	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/g57cjrj477o6zft	Editorial	http://markmail.org/thread/g57cjrj477o6zft	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/g57cjrj477o6zft
csprd03	226	glossary reference vs candidate reference	Yves Savourel	18 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00035.html	In section "5.2 Glossary Module", the ref attribute on <glossEntry> and <translation> is optional. I assume this is to allow list of terms without associating them explicitly with their occurrence in the content. This is different from the ref attribute in the Translation Candidates module. Is there a reason for it? That is: Couldn't the translation candidates be also just listed rather than directly pointed to their corresponding text? It seems the two modules use the same referencing mechanism but inconsistently. I'm not necessarily asking for a change, but for a clarification.	DavidF/DaveO	NONE	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/drcvnhnu22wfp1	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/thread/drcvnhnu22wfp1
csprd03	227	Enhanced conformance clause/statement related to "Backward Compatibility"	Lieske, Christian	20 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00036.html	In section "2. Conformance" Comment Annotation" there is passage:3. Backwards Compatibility - Conformant applications are NOT REQUIRED to support XLIFF 1.2 or previous Versions. To me, additional information related to backward compatibility would seem valuable: Information that clarifies whether XLIFF 2.0 documents are (or under certain circumstances can be) backward compatible with XLIFF 1.2 or not.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: added Note as per CFD	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00037.html	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/w32fjb6koqtpb7	Editorial	http://markmail.org/thread/w32fjb6koqtpb7	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	228	invalid example in isolated example	Schnabel, Bryan S	24 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00038.html	The example in 4.3.1.22 isolate has three problems. 1. It has a stray </match> end tag. 2. It has no </m:cmatches> end tag. 3. The <m:cmatch> element follows <segment>. It needs to precede <segment> to be valid.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00041.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	229	redundant, incomplete example in Metadata module	Schnabel, Bryan S	24 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00039.html	The second metadata module example in 5.4.6 Example is incomplete, and not needed. The first example is sufficient. Suggest removing the 5.4.6 example.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: redundant example removed	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/message/omjkbun6jinkcda2	Editorial	N/A	YES, http://markmail.org/message/omjkbun6jinkcda2
csprd03	230	invalid examples in Resource Data Module	Schnabel, Bryan S	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00041.html	The first example has the <resourceData> element following the <segment> element. To be valid the <resourceData> needs to come first. And <file> needs an @id. Same issues in the second example, plus the namespace abc is not declared. Suggest fixing the examples. Same fixes for third example.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00041.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
						pt. 1: The constraints in 5.5.4.3 resourceItemRef and 5.5.4.4 resourceItem say "The value of the OPTIONAL id attribute MUST be unique among all <resourceItem> and <resourceItemRef> elements of the immediate enclosing <file>							

csprd03	231	Constraints in 5.5.4.3 resourcelemRef and 5.5.4.4 resourcelem	Schnabel Bryan S	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00043.html	<p>or <unit> element." Since we agreed to make <resourceData> Zero or One for <file> and <unit>, there will never be a case where sibling <resourceData> elements have potentially conflicting @id values for <resourcelemRef> or <resourcelem>. So the only conflict that could be impacted (and this seems like a nearly non-existent use case) is if for some reason FragID needed to discern between them. Seems like a lot of baggage to support such a corner case. I suggest we either (1) remove the constraint all together, or (2) edit the constraint to say "The value of the OPTIONAL id attribute MUST be unique among all <resourcelem> and <resourcelemRef> elements of the enclosing <resourceData> element." pt. 2: After a closer look, I think it is more likely that we would need to keep <resourcelem> id attributes unique. I'm not so sure the case for <resourcelemRef> is as strong. But it still holds true that with only zero or one <resourceData> now allowed in <file> or <unit> we no longer need to keep them unique among their containing <file> or <unit> elements. So I now propose just option 2. Edit the constraint to say "The value of the OPTIONAL id attribute MUST be unique among all <resourcelem> and <resourcelemRef> elements of the enclosing <resourceData> element."</p>	Ryan/Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00044.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	232	term annotation and refnote	Yves Savourel	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00044.html	<p>In section "4.7.3.1.2 Term Annotation" we have a note that states: In this annotation type, the XLIFF Core refattribute is primarily intended to allow for referencing of terminology resources that are external to the XLIFF Document. I think this text is not appropriate. This is a continuation of the discussion started during the second review cycle: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00038.html I didn't pursue it then to avoid delaying the 3rd draft, but I'll resume it now. The text expresses only one opinion on how the references can be used. We have real-life examples of different use cases (I've pointed to TWAS previously). So the text, while non-normative, is misleading because not only it offers only one view, it suggests that it is the recommended one. As for the argument of avoiding reference outside the unit: XLIFF is an exchange format, not a processing one. There can be perfectly valid reasons to use references outside the unit. The core is (relatively) optimized for streaming, but at some point one has to give priority to features and flexibility. So, instead of trying to express two contrary views in a note, I recommend to remove that paragraph completely and let users use ref as they see fit.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Note deleted	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/voojdmjv4wtwskn	Editorial	N/A	<p>YES, http://markmail.org/thread/voojdmjv4wtwskn</p>
csprd03	233	term annotation and Glossary	Yves Savourel	Tue, 25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00045.html	<p>The example in 4.3.1.2.2 isolate has three problems. 1. It has a stray <match> end tag. 2. It has no <micmatches> end tag. 3. The <micmatch> element follows <segment>. It needs to precede <segment> to be valid. In section "4.7.3.1.2 Term Annotation" we have an example and a note that are, IMO, confusing. They mix the glossary module usage and the Term annotation. The note state The Glossary module uses its own gsr:ref to reference its corresponding spans in source content the other way round. The XLIFF Core refattribute can be also used in case of multiple occurrences of a term in the same unit for pointing from these different occurrences to the same glossary entry in the same unit. a) There are two typos: "occurrences" and "occurrences" should be "occurrences" b) The example should be without glossary. This annotation is not necessarily used for the glossary and text and example of its use with the glossary should be in the glossary module section. I recommend to: - remove the note (or move the text to the glossary module) - change the example to the following (simpler and not involving the Glossary module): <unit id="1"><segment><source>He is my <mrk id="m1" type="term" ref="http://dbpedia.org/page/Doppelgänger">doppelgänger</mrk>.</source></segment></unit></p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00041.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	234	xml:lang	Yves Savourel	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00046.html	<p>In section "4.3.2 XML namespace" the specification has a provision to forbid xml:lang in <file>, <group> and <unit>. xml:lang MUST NOT be set on either the <file>, <group>, or <unit> element. My understanding is that adding those prohibition was done to prevent <source> and <target> to end-up with an xml:lang implicit value different than the expected one on <source> and <target>. First xml:lang is not prohibited in <xliff> which makes the other prohibitions moot. Second, this PR is really necessary. The only thing needed is to ensure that the xml:lang implicit or explicit value on <source> is the same as the one of srcLang, and on <target> is the same as trgLang. Those two elements already have constraints pertaining to xml:lang for explicit values, they just need to be re-worded to add implicit values as well. This would allow the tools to use xml:lang in the rest of the document as they see fit. I recommend to do the following: 1) Remove the provision of section 4.3.2 "xml:lang MUST NOT be set on either the <file>, <group>, or <unit> element." 2) Remove the warning text in that same section "4.3.2.1 xml:lang". 2) Change the constraint in section "4.2.2.12 source" from "When a <source> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable> and the OPTIONAL xml:lang attribute is present, its value MUST be equal to the value of the srcLang attribute of the enclosing <xliff> element. To [[When a <source> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable> the explicit or inherited value of the OPTIONAL xml:lang attribute MUST be equal to the value of the srcLang attribute of the enclosing <xliff> element.]] 3) Change the constraint in section "4.2.2.13 target" from "When a <target> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable> and the OPTIONAL xml:lang attribute is present, its value MUST be equal to the value of the trgLang attribute of the enclosing <xliff> element. To: When a <target> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable> the explicit or inherited value of the OPTIONAL xml:lang attribute MUST be equal to the value of the trgLang attribute of the enclosing <xliff> element. I have also a separate issue with "When a <target>/<source> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable>" but I'll post a separate comment for that.</p>	DavidF->Yves	IMPLEMENTED: Change as suggested	N/A	<p>TC Resolution https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00018.html</p>	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]
csprd03	235	xml:lang-related text and Translation Candidate module	Yves Savourel	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00047.html	<p>In sections "4.2.2.12 source" and section "4.2.2.13 target" there are constraints starting with "When a <source> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable>..." and "When a <target> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable>..." In the core <source> and <target> are always child of <segment> or <ignorable>. That part should be remove: we don't specify the parents of any other elements elsewhere. I'm guessing this was added because <source> and <target> are also used in the Translation Candidates module, but: a) The definition in the core should not make special provision for modules. b) In the Translation candidate module the behavior xml:lang for <source> is no different, so there is no point making a distinction. c) The module has a constraint for xml:lang in <target> that overrides the core definition, so there is no reason to have the text in the constraint of the core. Actually technically since the constraint of the core explicitly address only the child of <segment>/<ignorable> one can even argue that the constraint in the module is irrelevant. c) In addition, there is no need for preventing <match> to have xml:lang (same reasons as in the general comment for xml:lang). I recommend the following: 1) Remove the text "When a <source> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable>..." and "When a <target> element is a child of <segment> or <ignorable>..." from the</p>	Ryan/Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00021.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]	[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]

						<source> and <target> sections.2) Remove the constraint: "xml:lang MUST NOT be set on the match element." As well as the warning.									
csprd03	236	unnecessary references to core	Tom Comerford	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00048.html	The schemas for metadata and for size and length restriction each reference the xliff namespace unnecessarily. The core namespace must be referenced when the module includes any elements, attributes, or attribute types from the core. These modules do not reference anything from the core. Thus xmlns:xliff and xs:import of xliff can be deleted.	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: removed references to core from mda and slr	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	[TC Resolution (CFD="Call For Dissent")]	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	237	mtc:match default value in schema	Tom Comerford	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00049.html	For mtc:match, the schema doesn't reflect the specified default value 'no'	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: added the missing default value.	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	[TC Resolution (CFD="Call For Dissent")]	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	238	validation: mustLoc and noLoc attributes	Tom Comerford	Tue, 25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00050.html	Section 5.8.5.7 defines the attribute 'mustLoc', and 5.8.5.8 defines 'noLoc'. Both are included in the list of attributes for the validation module (5.8.5) and they're mentioned in the description of endsWith (5.8.5.5). Neither of these attributes is referenced in the content model for the validation or rule elements, and they're not in the schema.	Tom/Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: commented out the references to mustLoc and noLoc.	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00102.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	239	error in example for 4.7.2.4.2 Creating a brand-new code	Yves Savourel	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00051.html	In section "4.7.2.4.2 Creating a brand-new code" the example is wrong: dataRefStart="x2" should be dataRefStart="n1"	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201402/msg00042.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	240	warning in "1.1.2 Definitions" -> Modifier, Modifier Agent	Yves Savourel	25 Feb 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201402/msg00052.html	In section "1.1.2 Definitions" -> Modifier, Modifier Agent: The warning talks about merger and extractor. The warning has nothing to do with Modifier and should be removed.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: redundant Warning removed	N/A	CFD http://markmail.org/thread/tjksuzqtbkchil	Editorial	N/A	http://markmail.org/thread/tjksuzqtbkchil	YES.	
csprd03	241	Fix editorial inconsistencies in the specification]	Bryan Schnabel	14 Mar 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00110.html	Tom has cataloged a list of inconsistent language used in various spots in the spec	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: edited some text for consistency; checked spelling; made minor punctuation fixes.	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00110.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	242	core attribute 'type' shows nothing for group or unit	Tom Comerford	14 Mar 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00068.html	In the description for the core attribute 'type' (section 4.3.1.40), there's no value description and no default value for <group> or <unit>. Also the 'used in' section doesn't include these elements. However, they are referenced by those elements (section 4.2.2.4 group, section 4.2.2.5 unit).	Yves	IMPLEMENTED per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00094.html	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	243	no initial paragraph for meta	Tom Comerford	14 Mar 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00070.html	In section 5.4.4.4 meta, there is no initial paragraph (short description) for the element. All other elements include this information. I believe that this is an editorial issue, and as a resolution I propose to add the following: "Container for a single metadata component." Please provide any comments or dissent before Monday, March 17.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as per CFD	[Receipt Acknowledged: URI]	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00070.html	Editorial	N/A		YES	
csprd03	244	metadata list of attributes omits id	Tom Comerford	14 Mar 2014	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00069.html	I believe that this is an editorial issue, and as a resolution I propose to add 'id' to the list of attributes and to add this subsection: ##.## id - Identifier - a character string used to identify a <metadata> or <metaGroup> element. Value description: NMTOKEN.Default value: undefined Used in: <metadata> and <metaGroup>. Constraints: The id value MUST be unique within the enclosing <metadata> and <metaGroup> elements. Please provide any comments or dissent before Monday, March 17	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: as per CFD	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201403/msg00069.html	Editorial	N/A		YES	
csprd03	245	Fragment identifier examples	Yves Savourel	17 Mar 2014	There is no examples in the Fragment Identifiers section. Several people commented internally that it is needed.	This can be resolved by a simple example.	Yves	IMPLEMENTED: Example added.	N/A	[TC Resolution (CFD="Call For Dissent")]	Editorial	[Reply URI]		[Commenter satisfied (y/n): URI]	
csprd03	[No more csprd03 comments]														
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
csprd02	100	Suggest fleshing out samples	Bryan Schnabel	2013 20 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00003.html	-	-		yes	
csprd02	101	fs attributes	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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 csprd02, I'm not required to preserve any of the Format Style attributes. It is 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 fs/subFs attributes. This leads to another issue: The fs/subFs 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 fs/subFs attributes of a <cp> element. The <cp> element is an escape mechanism, there is no realistic way to preserve fs/subFs on something that will be converted to character in the parsed document. - if the PR is to protect only elements: nothing to change. - if it is to protect elements and attributes: -- it needs to be update (and the PR for custom namespaces too) -- fs/subFs should be removed from <cp>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00060.html	-	-			
csprd02	102	description for <note>	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	editorial	https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/ema/201311/msg00168.html	yes		
csprd02	103	splitting of modules and extended elements	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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 <mda:metadata> elements followed by; - Zero, one or more <res:resourceData> elements followed by; - Zero or one <slr:profiles> elements followed by; - Zero or one <slr:data> elements followed by; - Zero or one <val:validation> elements followed by; - One or more <unit> 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-is. In <file>, outputting the modules 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	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00068.html	-	-			
csprd02	104	location of "inf" elements (<notes>, modules, etc.)	Yves Savourel	2013 23 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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 lot 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	NA	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00068.html	-	-			
csprd02	105	Namespace in Validation Module	Yves Savourel	2013 24 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00018.html	None of the 13 snippets of code used as example in the Appendix I (Validation Module) is valid. They are all missing namespace information.	Ryan/dF	IMPLEMENTED: namespace prefix added as required	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-			
						We have: "Please note that Agents using Processing Instruction to implement XLIFF Core or Module features are not									

csprd02	106	typos in PI warning	Yves Savourel	2013 26 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00020.html	compliant XLIFF applications disregarding whether they are otherwise conformant." It should be (correction between >> <<): "Please note that Agents using reprocessing instruction to >>implement<< XLIFF Core or Module >>features<< are not compliant XLIFF applications >>disregarding<< >>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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00043.html (2013-10-18) + https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00066.html (2013-10-23)).		Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)			
csprd02	107	subState and state="initial"	Yves Savourel	2013 27 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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, is it 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-worded. But event re-wording 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	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html			
csprd02	108	Format Style attributes again	Yves Savourel	2013 28 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00022.html	It seems to me that the widespread presence of the fs:fs and fs:subFs 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 fs:fs and fs:subFs 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 tools data model.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD		https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00071.html			
csprd02	109	id values for unit and group	Yves Savourel	2013 28 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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 so <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 ids 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.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201311/msg00039.html	N/A	CFD: https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201311/msg00039.html			
csprd02	110	xmlspace	Yves Savourel	2013 30 Sep	https://lists.oasis-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 "whitespace/white spaces/white-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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html			
csprd02	111	Proposed changes to matches module	David O'Carroll	2013 30 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201309/msg00026.html	The current implementation of the matches module (i.e. where the source references the match using mrks) does not seem adequate. The only solution at the moment to handle multiple matches for a single source is to have nested mrk 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: segRef and mRef. segRef is a URI pointing to the segment id that contains the source for the match. mRef is a URI pointing to some inline marker (mrk for a single segment and matching sm em tags for cross segment matching). It is required to have one and only one of segRef or mRef 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 mrks in the source when multiple matches are available for a single source. >> I would suggest changing the scope of the id 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 id's uniqueness to unit level while preserving the statement "elements and inline elements with the same id in both source and target MUST be corresponding elements." (From the XLIFF 2.0 editors draft on mrk's id attribute). >> I would suggest changing the id attribute on the segment element from OPTIONAL to REQUIRED. This way it would be possible to reference the segment id 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.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: A ref attribute on <match> has been introduced, analogously also in gts module. Final solution depends on resolving the fragment identification issue	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00028.html			
csprd02	112	Problems validating XLIFF files with 2.0 schemas	Yves Savourel	2013 26 Sep	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00051.html	I can't validate XLIFF 2.0 with Oxygen without getting errors in the schemas files. I have xliff_core_2.0.xsd and in a modules folder I have: change_tracking.xsd, glossary.xsd, matches.xsd, metadata.xsd, resource_data.xsd, size_restriction.xsd, and validation.xsd. All files comes from the links found in the csprd02 specification.	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		
csprd02	113	Improve sub-flows	Bryan Schnabel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00066.html	Our example does not mention anything about the uniqueness of <unit> IDs that are involved in a sub-flow. Therefore if IDs are not unique we could get unexpected results	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Subflows explicitly prevented to be formed across files	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	substantive		
csprd02	114	id values constraint specified in two places	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00000.html	In a few places we have the requirement about the uniqueness of the id value defined in the definition of the id attribute and in the definition of the element using the id. It may be better to have it defined in a single place: the attribute definition.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: All id value constraints are now on the id attribute and commented out from element descriptions. The final id constraints depend on the final fragment identification solution	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html			
csprd02	115	Typos	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00001.html	--- " 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"	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)			
csprd02	116	undefined in metadata	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00002.html	Several of the attributes of the metadata module have their default defined like this: Default value: undefined Where "undefined" is styled with <code> instead of being in normal text, making the word look like a real value rather than the term 'undefined'.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed		Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)			
csprd02	117	typos	Yves Savourel	2013 01 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00003.html	"content of the metagroup applies." Should be "content of the metagroup applies." (and should be styled with <code>)	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)			
csprd02	118	no link between type and subType values for inline codes	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00004.html	The specification provides a list of values for the type attributes when in inline codes: firt, ui, quot, link, img, other - It also provides a list of reserved values for subType: Xliff, xlifpb, xlifb, xli, xliu, xliivar - 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: xliib, xli, xliu, xliib, xlifpb -> firt xliivar -> ui	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: mapping Constraint added to subType, mapping as requested	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html			
csprd02	119	definition and spelling of 'quot' type	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00005.html	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'?	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: value changed to "quote", example and clarification added	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	substantive		
						The specification has the following PR for the type attribute:							

csprd02	120	wrong agent?	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00006.html	"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 in subState: "Writers updating the attribute state MUST also update or delete subState." Shouldn't this be a PR for Modifiers rather than Writers?	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: fixed the agent as requested	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	
csprd02	121	Typos	Lucía Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00007.html	PAGE SPELLING MISTAKE /9 processing / 10 W3C Note, 15th Setember 1997. / 11 process /14 cotained / 14 conent / 14 terms of of documents / 15 procesing / 27 Deirectionality / 35 lckey / 38, 122 elment, / 39 adhers / 40 are ti be treated. / 41 Please note that Agents using Processing Instruction to implemet XLIFF Core or Module leatures are not complant XLIFF applications disreagring wheteher they are otherwise conformant. / 41 dsicouraged / 47 formatng / 46, 48, 57, 58 a content, / 49 equivalent / 58 funtionalty / 58 extensin / 59 Constrains / 59 Intergrty / 59 (twice) prerserved. / 60 Note that when splting 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 resgmentation. If the linguistically correct alghmet cannot be guaranteed, discarding the target content and retranslating the resulting source segments is worth considering. / 61 fulfill / 61 apeared / 61 Trasformations / 74 because / 59 Intergrty / 76 language. / 77 translaton candidates / 79, 88 attributes / 82 presche / 82 Requremenets / 88 matagroup / 91 attribute / 100 element / 104 attributes / 106, 107 preform / 107 storage / 108 (twice) elmnt / 59 (twice) prerserved. / 60 linguistic expertise and hence manual resgmentation. / 108 (inverted commas) "xliffcodepoints" / 108, 109 (inverted commas) "maximum" or "minimum and maximum" / 109 (inverted commas) size ("minsize, maxsize") / 109 (inverted commas) H.1.5.2 Storage restriction profiles "xliffut8", "xliffut16" and "xliffut32" / 110 this module can be used is / 119 The allowed values are are listed in / 122 symplified. / 122 elments / 122 extensions / 122 Markres / 122 refernces / 123 Recommendation / 122 (twice) specification / 123 definitions / 123 reponse	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)	-	-	-	
csprd02	123	empty skeleton and no href	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00008.html	withdrawn (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00009.html)	WITHDRAWN	WITHDRAWN	N/A	WITHDRAWN	none	N/A	yes	
csprd02	124	Alphabetical order - Attributes	Lucía Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00010.html	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 "d4". - 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. dataRef, dataRefEnd and dataRefStart 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.]	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	
csprd02	125	typo	Lucía Morado	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00011.html	Small typo in page 73: subType, it should be subType.	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)	-	-	-	
csprd02	126	ref in mrk	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00012.html	There is the following PR: "When used in a term annotation, the value is referring to a <glossentry> element or another URI providing information about the term." - the link on <glossentry> is broken - <glossentry> should probably be <glossentry> - the value of ref 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 <glossentry> element."	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: the issue largely gone due to other related changes	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html	-	-	-	
csprd02	127	xml:lang and xml:space	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00013.html	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 a <target> without declaring the attribute on that element: <unit id="1" xml:space="preserve"><segment><source>preformatted text</source></unit> <!-- implicit xml:space="preserve" --></segment></unit> 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's not specified the value should be the same as the value for the parent element.	Bryan (change to DavidF?)				https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00130.html	-	-	-
csprd02	128	extended attributes	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00014.html	The specification says: "The following XLIFF Core elements accept custom attributes: '- <file> - <group> - <unit> - <mrk> - <sm>' " The <xliff> element is missing in that list: it also accept custom attributes.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	
csprd02	129	ignorable and fs	Yves Savourel	2013 02 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00015.html	The section describing the fs attribute says: "Used in: <file>, <unit>, <ignorable>, <notes>, <note>, <originalData>, <data>, <cp>, <se>, <ec>, <pl>, <pc>, <mrk>, <sm> and ." It's incorrect: <ignorable>, do not have fs attributes.	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00072.html	-	-	-	
csprd02	130	Translation Candidate Annotation	Yves Savourel	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00016.html	The section "2.7.3.1.3 Translation Candidate Annotation" defines a way to associate a give span of content with a <ntc:match> element. It uses the type 'match' for this. / While trying to implement validation with a tool supporting the core, I run 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 <ntc: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 <mrk>'s type. I also think the whole "Translation Candidate Annotation" section should be in the section defining the Translation Candidate module.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: Translation Candidates annotation is a core device for pointing to translation candidates analogical to the term annotation. It can be used by the module but realz 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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html	-	-	-	
csprd02	131	sections in the specification	Yves Savourel	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00017.html	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	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: As voted by TC, c) use sub-sections	-	Roll call vote (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-	
csprd02	132	attribute without value description/type	Yves Savourel	2013 03 Oct	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00018.html	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."	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00066.html	-	-	-	
						-Naming issues in the following attributes (they might be like that for a reason, I don't know): glossentry or								

csprd02	133	Editorial changes	Lucia Morado	2013 03 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00019.html 	<p>glossEntry? metagroup or metaGroup? datetime or dateTime? -</p> <p>The table in page 83 has some overlapping issues with its title. - Code outside the purple box, pages 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 63, 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 B1, page 75. / Attributes in page 88 (section E.1.3), "appliesTo" 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 H1, page 106. / Values in table H2, page 107. / Values in table I1, page 119 / state (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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-
csprd02	134	Example in Format Style uses an XLIFF element that does not exist	Bryan Schnabel	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00020.html 	<p>The Format Style example uses the old XLIFF 1.2 <x> element. It should use the <ph> element. <f:fs="img" f:subFs="src,smileface.png" /> should be / <ph id="ph1" fs="img" f:subFs="src,smileface.png" /></p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: editorial fixes as listed	-	Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-
csprd02	135	extensibility wording	Yves Savourel	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00022.html 	<p>I had to read the following sentences quite a few times before understanding what they meant: "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 sentence by something like: "To see 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html 	editorial	-	-
csprd02	136	extended attributes	Yves Savourel	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00023.html 	<p><note> 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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)	-	-	-
csprd02	137	XLIFF as a processing format for CAT tools	Bryan Schnabel	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00013.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 formats, even in cases when they are processing XLIFF Documents created by another Extractor." 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 it {XLIFF} as 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." (Ad a second note to clarify that XLIFF is not forbidden from being a processing format (but is primarily an exchange format))	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00158.html 	editorial	-	-
csprd02	138	schema ambiguity in core and matches	Tom Comerford	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00025.html 	<p>Element references in the following three element definitions are syntactically ambiguous within the XML schema language: / element definition for elf:group references: / mda:metadata / slr:data / val:validation element definition for elf:unit references: / mtc:matches / gls:glossary / mad:metadata / res:resourceData / slr:data / val:validation element definition for mtc:match references: / elf:originalData / mad:metadata / Each element reference is optional in the given context. In all three element definitions these references are followed by <xs:any>, which allows any element from any namespace, including any of the referenced elements. This redundancy is explicable; 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 <xs:any> token. Thus, strict validation of the schema fails.</p>	DavidF/Tom	IMPLEMENTED: as per resolution Dec 3, 2013	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00077.html 	substantive	-	-
csprd02	139	ChangeTrack	Bryan Schnabel	2013 04 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00026.html 	<p>I am trying to put <ctrchangeTrack> in an example file. I could not find any element in the spec that says it contains <ctrchangeTrack>. Do we allow change track anywhere in core? Tom explained: "CtrchangeTrack is allowed only by wild-card, so it can be used in any of these contexts: / xliff / xlfskeleton / xlffgroup / xlffunit / gls:glossentry / mtc:match / res:resource / res:target / slr:profiles / slr:data</p>	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: per CFD	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00084.html 	-	-	-
csprd02	140	type attribute for group	Yves Savourel	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00029.html 	<p>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 layout a table, with groups of rows and cells. Addendum from Yves: "We don't have a type attribute in unit either."</p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00063.html 	-	-	-
csprd02	141	xliff prefix in size restriction	Yves Savourel	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00030.html 	<p>Values for the standard profiles are called with a "xliff" prefix (e.g. xliffcodepoints) It may be good to keep the same reserved prefix across core/modules of XLIFF. "xliff" is used in type in the core. To be consistent I think it should either one, but not both.</p>	Fredrik	Implemented https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00161.html	-	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00161.html	-	-	-
csprd02	142	subFs value and spaces	Yves Savourel	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00031.html 	<p>The definition of subFs says: The subFs MUST only be used to carry attribute name/value comma-delimited pairs for attributes that are valid for the HTML element identified by the accompanied fs attribute. Example: fs:fs="img" f:subFs="src,smileface.png" It is unclear to me if you can have more than one pair of name/value per subFs. I assume you can because a) the definition uses plural here with "the subFs" (so: one subFs 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 fs attribute that hold the full element to use. Is there a reason why not?</p>	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: Per CFD	-	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00114.html	-	-	-
csprd02	143	MUST NOT in spanning description	Yves Savourel	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00032.html 	<p>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 needs 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.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: non-normative reformulation with cannot	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201401/msg00171.html	-	-	-
csprd02	144	inconsistent PRs for cloning/replicating codes with copyOf	Yves Savourel	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00033.html 	<p>We have the following two PRs in different places: - Modifiers MUST NOT clone a code that has its canCopy attribute is set to no. - Modifiers SHOULD NOT replicate inline codes that have their attribute canCopy set to no. They are not consistent.</p>	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: MUST NOT used consistently	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201311/msg00012.html	-	-	-
csprd02	145	improve the appearance of schema files	Tom Comerford	2013 05 Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201310/msg00034.html 	<p>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), #any last. / None of these affect the syntax or semantics, but they will be useful for implementers who read the schema files.</p>	Tom	IMPLEMENTED:	N/A	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00068.html	-	-	-

csprd02	146	TC admin comments	Chet Ensign	2013 24 Sep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201309/msg00049.html and ● https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201401/msg00104.html 	On the cover page, the link to the schemas folder is broken. The link is XML schemas accessible from http://docs.oasis-open.org/xliff/xliff-core/v2.0/csprd02/csprd02/schemas/ - what breaks it is the extra /csprd02/ 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.	DavidF	editorial fixes as listed		Roll call ballot: approve editorial fixes as listed (● https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00042.html)		● https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
csprd02	147	mrk translate outside the content but in scope	Yves Savourel	2013 28 Oct	● https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201310/msg00071.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 the same treatment. Another way to get such unit is when a segmenter puts breaks as close as possible to the text. The bottom line snoothing prevent you to get a unit like this: <unit id="1"><segment id="s1"><source>T-Sentence 1.</source></segment><ignorable><source><sm id="m1" translate="no"></source></ignorable><segment id="s2"><source>NT-Sentence 2.</source></segment><ignorable><source><em start="m1"></source></ignorable><segment id="s3"><source>T-Sentence 3.</source></segment></unit></So in such case a tool would get a default of translate="yes" for the segment s2 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.	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED: the algorithm has been clarified and simplified by the consensus decision to drop translate from <segment>. Might add examples at a later stage.	N/A	Consensus in teleconf ● http://markmail.org/message/6cfwgwbbudobk7h	substantive	-	-	
csprd02	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 groups 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. An example comes to mind is the CALS table co-spec (● http://www.docbook.org/tdg/en/html/co-spec.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 skeleton) method. And I think we should. So I think we should either: 1. Allow empty group elements (change "One or more <unit> or <group> elements in any order followed by" to "Zero, one or more <unit> or <group> elements in any order followed by"). 2. Edit the sentences about preserving structure and hierarchy away from all elements except for skeleton. 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		-	-	
csprd02	149	Element names	Yves Savourel	2013 11 Dec	● https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201312/msg00062.html	While <metadata> all lowercase is fine (because it's an actual word), based on our naming convention <mda:metagroup> should be <mda:metaGroup>, like <res:resourceData> for example. In the same vein: <gls:glossentry> should be <gls:glossEntry> (or better: <gls:entry>).	DavidF	IMPLEMENTED	N/A	duplicate of #133	editorial	-	-	
csprd02	150	PR for white spaces	Yves Savourel	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>, <ec>, <ph> and <data>: The white spaces of their content MUST be preserved in all cases, even if the value for xml:space is set or inherited as default." <sc>, <ec> and <ph> are empty elements and therefore cannot have content, so we shouldn't list them here. Only <data> 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		-	-	
csprd02	151	fragid	Yves	Nov 21 2013	● http://markmail.org/thread/2q36m2rusv3g73a	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, DavidOC	IMPLEMENTED		resolved by ballot in meeting on January 7, 2014, see ● http://markmail.org/thread/5p6v4ggz8bkbj4	substantive	-	-	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
csprd01	001	Format Style Module Processing Requirements	Bryan Schnabel	2013-4-30	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201304/msg00000.html	new Processing Requirement: The & and subFs 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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00009.html following mailing list call for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/kxa3ml5r3kemyp	substantive	N/A	YES	
csprd01	002	XLIFF 2.0 public review comments [TAB] review	Martin Chapman	2013-5-09	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00000.html	A summary of comments and a checklist of TO DO items	dF	IMPLEMENTED: dF to make the changes in spec	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00012.html	This was extensively discussed in the TC on May 21, 2013 https://lists.oasis-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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00001.html	?	
csprd01	003	XLIFF 2.0 Suggestion: XLIFF example in the spec	Bryan Schnabel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00001.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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00004.html	editorial	N/A	?	
csprd01	004	Document the evolution of a proposed feature from Extensibility to XLIFF core or module	Bryan Schnabel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00002.html	The spec should include an indication of how proposed future features can use extensibility to model the feature, enter the proposed schema 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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201306/msg00009.html	out of scope	N/A	YES	
csprd01	005	In "1.1.1 Key words	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00003.html	In my opinion those 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 adapted	TC member	call for dissent http://markmail.org/thread/tuz5ln42cs3fjk	editorial	N/A	YES	
csprd01	006	In "2.2.2.2 file	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00004.html	It does not really make sense to force a specific order for the elements of modules before the first <unit> </group> in <file>. Since extension could be listed in any order, it probably make sense to just allow modules and extensions, then the core elements (skeleton, <unit> </group>).	Fredrik	IMPLEMENTED: as per CFD based on dF proposal http://markmail.org/thread/qbb78u7j23hcxp	TC member	call for dissent: http://markmail.org/thread/qbb78u7j23hcxp#query=+page:1+mid:gqzrekv7ar3hxyyb2+state:results	substantive	-	?	
csprd01	007	Missing description	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00005.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/tz3okyegwkaadcl and http://markmail.org/thread/wpotgkxhcbrotku	substantive	N/A	YES	
csprd01	008	Duplication in skeleton reference	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00006.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/tz3okyegwkaadcl and http://markmail.org/thread/wpotgkxhcbrotku	substantive	N/A	YES	
csprd01	009	translate attribute	Yves Savourel	2013-5-19	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00007.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 <unit>, <segment> or <mrk>, this definition citing only segment is incorrect. It should probably be something more general pertaining to the content of	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/7rfwb7p3d6mumxt , based on dF proposed solution http://markmail.org/message/oir7u0jio3hezjd	substantive	N/A	?	

csprd01	027	Resource Data Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oasis-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 <file> element, and could certainly also be useful on the <unit> and <segment> level to provide preceding and subsequent contextual content information. In addition, further examples should be provided to clarify the purpose and rationale 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 analogical to skeleton	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	call for dissent https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00051.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00010.html	?
csprd01	028	Change Tracking Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Change Tracking module permits the adding of processing information to the content elements <segment> and <unit>, and provides a useful means for maintaining and curating lifecycle information including provenance. This module is a good example of how to establish references between different information elements which are missing in other modules such as the Glossary Module in particular	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to I2 consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Improve data referencing in modules	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	call for dissent https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00046.html + https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00052.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00013.html	?
csprd01	029	Size Restriction Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00023.html	The Size Restriction module provides means to encode size restrictions based on so-called restriction profiles (<profiles>). A <normalization> element specifies with 2 attributes (<general> and <storage>) 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 "none", "nlc", and "nld"). This module is yet another good example of a well-defined and extensible module (through the provision of additional profiles).	Fredrik	NONE	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	no resolution required, just a positive comment/endorsement	none	N/A	YES
csprd01	061	Validation Module	Jörg Schütz	2013-5-28	https://lists.oasis-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 (<target> elements) of an XLIFF file. Rules are simple test cases that should be applied to the associated content, and sometimes relate <source> and <target> content as well as normalization (see section 3.7). The execution of the tests should or can be automated. The defined processing requirements or better rule definition requirements, however, delimit 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.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00062.html	Call for dissent: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00099.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00015.html	?
csprd01	030	Basic structure	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[1] The <file> 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 <file> element, while others would map it to the entire file. This practice will continue with XLIFF 2.0. [2]The intended use of the <ignorable> element is not clear from its definition in section 2.2.2.7. [3]The notes element (2.2.2.9) allow formatting style information (@f:fs, @f:subFs). Why? My understanding of the purpose of <note> 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 f: markup implies that it may also carry notes from the underlying content as well. It's also possible that the f: attributes are intended to allow richer text in <note> content, but this seems like a strange way to go about it.	dF	IMPLEMENTED: clarified <file> and <group> granularity. // REJECTED: to remove f: from annotations (notes and markers) as f: is for preview and review purposes it seems logical to generate preview of both data and relevant metadata	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	dF proposed CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/7eyc7565qhv3mu	editorial	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
csprd01	031	SLR Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[1] Why aren't sizeInfo (H.1.4.9) and equivStorage (H.1.4.8) named consistently? They perform a similar function along different axes (size vs storage). Possibly consider renaming sizeInfo to equivSize, or alternately renaming equivStorage to storageInfo. [2]Can sizeInfoRef (H.1.4.10) point to data outside the XLIFF document itself? It seems that the intention is for it to always point to content within a local <data> 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 <group> element that contained a mix of segment content and <ignorable> elements. Is the size/storage requirements of <ignorable> content counted towards the overall totals for the <group>?	Fredrik	Implemented. Demonstrated and approved at TC meeting https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201309/msg00004.html design of slr module	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	approved by ballot: https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
csprd01	032	Metadata Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-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 mda module	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	approved by ballot: https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xliff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201307/msg00032.html	?
csprd01	033	Validation module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[1] Examples are needed. [2]The processing requirements for validation (1.1.2.2) include. "When <validation> occurs at the <group> level, rules must be applied to all <target> elements within the scope of <group>, except where overrides are specified at the <unit> level." What about in the case where <group> elements are nested? Can a nested <group> override the validation rules of a parent <group>? [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 "mastLoc" rules that are defined in a given group's validation data. How would a nested group or unit disable one 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 possible way, since "disabled" offers no other way to reference a specific rule. [4]Regarding 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 mastLoc 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 @mastLoc and @mastNotLoc, or similar? This would also simplify implementations that would no longer need to special-case the parsing of these attribute values.	Ryan	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	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	Call for dissent: https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff/201307/msg00099.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
csprd01	034	Matches module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	[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.	dF	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	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	dF proposed CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/2mqjks4n6aflofdjm	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xliff-comment/201308/msg00016.html	?
						[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 id attribute. It is strange that for example appliesTo could							

csprd01	035	Change Tracking Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	specify "note", but mid could be absent. In this case, it would not be clear what 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.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to call for dissent. Design of change tracking module	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	call for dissent https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201307/msg00044.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201307/msg00014.html	?
csprd01	036	Glossary Module	Chase Tingley	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00061.html	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 per-term metadata is very limited, in particular term variations are not supported. [glossary]	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: according to 2f consensus, ballot, and call for dissent. Ryan to follow up with Chase // duplicate of 024 (slave), see it	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00069.html	F2F consensus (https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201306/msg00009.html) + ballot https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xdiff/ballot.php?id=2438 + call for dissent https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201307/msg00046.html	substantive	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201307/msg00012.html	?
csprd01	037	CRC32 in Change Tracking Module	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00024.html	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.	Ryan	IMPLEMENTED: removed checksum from module as per call for dissent. Adding CRC reference and pseudocode is no longer relevant	TC member	call for dissent https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201307/msg00044.html	substantive	-	YES
csprd01	038	Inline elements and attributes PRs on re-segmentation	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00025.html	in the core specification of inline elements, PRs for re-segmentation are missing. PRs should be discussed on mailing list and stabilized on the F2F in London, June 10, 2013.	Fredrik // affected module and feature owners (Ryan, Bryan, Yves)	IMPLEMENTED: added re-segmentation PRs // IMPLEMENTED: made module and feature changes, so that module and features still work while not on <segment>, <source>, or <target> // IMPLEMENTED: df added re-segmentation flag and did required consistency fixes	TC member	TC resolved by an unanimous ballot on July 2 that module and notes elements will be moved out of the segment level https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xdiff/email/archives/201307/msg00055.html // Affected module and feature owners need to handle the technical details resulting from that decision	substantive	-	?
csprd01	039	classification of processes and agents to improve precision of conformance statements	David Filip	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00026.html	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 that 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	df	IMPLEMENTED: df did normative language rehaul based on: 1) classification of processes and agents (generator/merger, modifier, enricher), 2) PR vs constraints review made in F2F	TC member	consensus reached at F2F https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201306/msg00009.html	substantive	-	?
csprd01	040	Proper namespace value for validation module	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00027.html	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 <validation> elements followed by - Not - Zero or one <validationvalidation> elements followed by	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested	TC member	TC delegated resolution of editorial actions to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	YES
csprd01	041	Approved attribute	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00028.html	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 I have <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.	Tom, df	IMPLEMENTED: Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: "option 3: drop the flag approved/canMerge, no PRs" https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201309/msg00004.html [as per CFD: @approved is required and has priority, PRs added see the proposed solution https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xdiff/email/archives/201308/msg00003.html , depends on 011, see 1]	TC member	Robustly debated on the list and on the call. Ballot winner: "option 3: drop the flag approved/canMerge, no PRs" https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201309/msg00004.html [CFD: http://markmail.org/thread/6f87ccc74e5zjk based on df proposal https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xdiff/email/archives/201308/msg00003.html , that was discussed in non-quorum TC on Aug 6, 2013 and received support.]	substantive	N/A	?
csprd01	042	2.3.1.23 dataRefStart	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00033.html	In the example in section 2.3.1.23 dataRefStart - The <pc> tags need to be closed by </pc>.	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested	TC member	TC delegated resolution of editorial actions to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	YES
csprd01	043	note priority	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00034.html	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 no context here to what ITS is, what it means, and how it relates to XLIFF. And there are a few typos in there as well: "interpeted", "parctice", and "annoted". And overall, it should be noted that this is just an example usage of priority, otherwise, I believe it is too implementation specific.	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed typos, added non-normative reference to ITS	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	?
csprd01	044	inline code examples and context	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00035.html	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 <mrk> 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.	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	?
csprd01	045	attributes from xml namespace	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00036.html	In section 2.3.2, both xml:lang and xmlns:namespace are defined. They are also listed as optional attributes for <source> and <target>. Shouldn't we also define xmlns in that section and list it as an optional attribute for <xdiff> since this is the main mechanism for declaring a module's namespace? For example: <xdiff xmlns:xdiff="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:document:2.0" xmlns:val="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:validation:2.0" xmlns:ctr="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:changeTracking:2.0" xmlns:mdata="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:metadata:2.0" xmlns:mrc="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:resourceData:2.0" xmlns:res="urn:oasis:names:tc:diff:resourceData:2.0" version="2.0" srcLang="en-US" tgtLang="de-DE">	Tom	IMPLEMENTED: approved by ballot and checked in to SVN	TC member	approved by ballot: https://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/xdiff/email/archives/201308/msg00090.html	substantive	-	?
csprd01	046	2.6 Inline Content	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00037.html	Just a minor suggestion, but I think it would be clearer if the last paragraph in this section had "in an <originalData> element" appended to it, like this: In some cases, data directly associated with inline elements may also be stored at the <unit> level in an <originalData> element.	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	?
csprd01	047	2.6.3 Annotations	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00038.html	In the following Processing Requirements: When a user agent removes a <mrk> element or a pair of <sm> / elements and the ref attribute is present, it must check whether or not the URI pointed by the ref attribute is within the same <unit> as the removed element. If it is and no other element has a reference to the pointed element, the user agent must remove the pointed element. Minor linguistic suggestion: changed "pointed" to "referenced". Using the word "pointed" sounds strange in this context.	df	IMPLEMENTED: fixed as suggested	TC member	TC delegated resolution of minor editorial actions such as this one to df: http://markmail.org/thread/7dhfpgqajj5vuxm	editorial	N/A	YES
csprd01	048	2.7 Extension examples	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00039.html	It may be helpful in this section to give an example of how metadata might be defined in a <metadata> element contrasted with the same metadata defined as attribute extensions and element extensions using a namespace. (see example)	Bryan	IMPLEMENTED: duplicate of 026 (slave), see it	TC member	APPROVED: duplicate of 026 (slave), see it	editorial	-	YES
csprd01	049	2.7.1 Extension Points	Ryan King	2013-5-29	https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff-comment/201305/msg00040.html	Is there a concrete reason why <file>, <group>, and <unit> can contain element-based extensions, but <segment> and <ignorable> can't, especially when those elements already contain modules? Not allowing extensions here means that no one could create an extension that could potentially become another module at <segment> or <ignorable> level like those already defined. Additionally, is there a concrete reason why <mdata:metadata> is allowed only in <mtc:matches> and no other modules in the spec? (BTW, there's a typo in the list, it currently says <mtc:match> and not <mtc:matches>)	Fredrik	IMPLEMENTED: (heavily influenced by the resegmentation solution as per comment #038) depends on resegmentation solution, extensibility and modules will be most probably moved out of <segment> // IMPLEMENTED: allow mdata on all extension points and vice versa	TC member	consensus reached at F2F https://lists.oasis-open.org/archives/xdiff/201306/msg00009.html	substantive	N/A	?

