

| Comment URL | Date received | Name of commenter | Comment | TC's public answer | TC's decision |
|---|---------------|---|--|---|---|
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-presentation-in-two-separate-documents | 9/27/24 | Christian Lieske | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>While I can understand the rationale behind the decision to present XLIFF 2.2 in two separate documents, I sense that the separation creates difficulties to compare XLIFF 2.1 and XLIFF 2.2. on a textual level.</p> <p>I wonder if the TC could facilitate the review of textual differences between the two versions (e.g., by providing a kind of alignment of sections, paragraphs etc.).</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Christian</p> | <p>Hi Christian</p> <p>The specification for XLIFF 2.2 is published in two versions to provide a simplified view (XLIFF Version 2.2. Part 1: Core) that is easier to read than the complete one (XLIFF Version 2.2. Part 2: Extended).</p> <p>The version that could be compared with XLIFT Version 2.1 (https://docs.oasis-open.org/xmliff/xmliff-core/v2.1/xmliff-core-v2.1.html) is XLIFF Version 2.2. Part 2: Extended (https://docs.oasis-open.org/xmliff/xmliff-core/v2.2/csd01/xmliff-extended-v2.2-csd01-part2.html). This version includes everything from the Core part plus current modules. You can open the provided links side by side in a browser (Microsoft Edge supports split view) to compare them.</p> <p>The latest specification draft was written following the new template provided by OASIS for Standards documents. This required reordering chapters and appendices and changing text formatting. There are too many differences in style to provide a useful unified document for tracking the changes between versions.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> <p>Rodolfo M. Raya</p> | <p>Explain publicly how the two versions could be textually compared.</p> |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-machine-readable-allowed-selector-keywords-for-plural-gender-and-select-module | 9/27/24 | Christian Lieske | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>In the context of the new Plural, Gender, and Select Module several allowed selector keywords are mentioned in the document:</p> <p>„Plural: the predefined keywords in this order: zero, one, two, few, many, other“</p> <p>„Gender: followed by the predefined keywords in this order: feminine, masculine, neuter, other“</p> <p>For automated processing (e.g., by validation tools such as validating parsers), it would advantageous if these keywords (and the order-related constraints) could also be provided in a machine-readable way.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Christian</p> | <p>Hi Christian,</p> <p>The keywords you mention for the "switch" attribute are just prefixes, not a list of allowed values. It would not be easy (if at all possible) to define constraints in the corresponding XML Schema for the module.</p> <p>For the "case" attribute, the situation is more complex because the attribute values must also be constructed taking into account the associated "switch" attribute, keeping in mind that the possible values for "gender" are an open list.</p> <p>XLIFF validation cannot be done with just a validating XML parser. You need code that checks for compliance with the constraints described in the specification document.</p> <p>While I agree with you that it would be nice to have the keywords in a machine-readable format, we simply have to accept that validating attributes related to gender, plural, and selection requires code that applies some logic to verify compliance with the constraints defined in the corresponding module.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> | <p>Acknowledge the comment and explain why providing keywords in a machine-readable way is not possible</p> |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-rationale-for-removal-of-the-change-tracking-extension | 9/27/24 | Christian Lieske | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>It would be great if the rationale for removal of the Change Tracking Extension could be made explicit in the document. The rationale could for example be valuable knowledge for commenting on other extensions.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Christian</p> | <p>Dear Cristian,</p> <p>Thank you for your message.</p> <p>The CTR module was demoted after the comments received during the second public review of XLIFF 2.1, here is a summary of the issues found: https://issues.oasis-open.org/browse/XLIFF-44.</p> <p>During the development of 2.2 we did not work on it and it was decided to remove it from the spec to make it shorter (as the informative module can still be found in the previous version). We had a ballot to remove the Change Tracking module from the spec: https://groups.oasis-open.org/higherlogic/wg/groups/5d071f56-8477-4653-8b14-0186c70Decdf/ballots/ballot?id=3731</p> <p>We might work on this module and the issues that were raised in the past to have it back in the next version.</p> <p>Best, Lucia</p> | <p>Follow the comment's advice and include the rationale for removal that module in the new version of the specification.</p> |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-minor-improvements | 10/10/24 | Jano Husarick on behalf of Tomáš Betušský | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>I'm submitting this feedback on behalf of Tomáš Betušský, who's waiting for his account to be approved:</p> <p>4.9.1 (typo) Actual (missing "s" in the 2nd occurrence of "day"): When the two English forms "[count] day" / "[count] day")... Correct: When the two English forms ("[count] day" / "[count] days")...</p> <p>Chapter 4.9.2 Link https://docs.oasis-open.org/xmliff/xmliff-core/v2.2/wd/schemas/plural_gender_select.xsd doesn't work.</p> <p>Chapter 4.9.8.1 (inconsistent example) XLIFF example: You deleted no file. A compact form example: You deleted no files.</p> <p>Best regards, Jano</p> | <p>Thanks for reporting. These issues will be fixed in next public review.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> | <p>Fix the typos in the new version of the specification.</p> |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-compact-form-non-xmliff | 9/30/24 | Christian Lieske, Jano Husarek | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>In several places (e.g., "4.9.6.1 Plural") the document mentions a "compact form (non-XLIFF)": Example:</p> <p>unit @switch(plural:file_count)</p> <p>segment "You deleted no files." @case{0}</p> <p>segment "You deleted one file." @case{1}</p> <p>segment "You deleted <ph disp="file_count"> files." @case{other}</p> <p>Two questions pop up in this context:</p> <p>Is this form known sufficiently well to serve its purpose (i.e., assist in understanding)? Assuming that the form is something not created for the document: Should a reference to the format be provided? Aside: Is it from Mozilla's "Fluent" project?</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Christian</p> | <p>Hi Christian,</p> <p>The format used in the examples was "made up" for this special case. It is not well known and there is nothing to document.</p> <p>The only goal was to have a compact form, much less verbose than XML, so that the reader could see the overall structure. And the hope was that it would be readable enough without explanations.</p> <p>If you feel that reading the examples in this format has helped you understand the specification better, then we can assume that it has served its purpose. Let us know if not.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> <p>---</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm replying on behalf of Mihai Niță, who wrote the Plural, Gender and Select module.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>There is no origin, it was created "on the spot" the same way most programmers use some kind of pseudo-code, with no formal standard or definition, with variations between people, but widely</p> | <p>Remove the compact form from the new version of the spec.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---|--|---|
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-457-preventing-segmentation-modification-for-pgs | 10/10/24 | Jano Husarick | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>is the spec implicitly relying on General Processing Requirements to prevent modifiers from changing segmentation within a unit with a PGS module, or would it still be possible to split and join the segments?</p> <p>Would it be "safer" to add canReSegment="no" on units with PGS module?</p> <p>Thanks, Jano</p> | <p>Hi,</p> <p>Mihai Niță, who wrote the Plural, Gender and Select module, says that adding canReSegment="no" would be a good idea.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> | Answer affirmatively the question |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/latest-comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-design-decisions-related-to-representation-of-related-strings-in-plural-gender-and-select-module-group-as-alternative-to-unit | 10/22/24 | Christian Lieske | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>The design decision with respect to "related strings" in the Plural, Gender, and Select Module is to represent their "relatedness" via inclusion in a single "unit" element.</p> <pre><unit id="lul1" pgsw:switch="plural:file_count"> </notes> <note appliesTo="target" ref="lul1_file_count_1" category="plural_examples">1</note> <note appliesTo="target" ref="lul1_file_count_few" category="plural_examples">0, 2-16, 102, 1002</note> <note appliesTo="target" ref="lul1_file_count_other" category="plural_examples">20-35, 100, 1000, 10000, 100000</note> </notes></pre> | <p>Hi Christian,</p> <p>In the old XLIFF 1.2, the only option was to use <group>. Now with XLIFF 2.x, we have the option of using <unit> instead.</p> <p>We discussed whether to use <group> with nested <unit> elements or just <unit> with each case in its own <segment>. There were many pros and cons to each option, but in the end we decided to skip the extra layer that <group> requires.</p> <p>Regards, Rodolfo</p> | Explain that the new module was written taking advantage of new XLIFF elements |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-4974-additional-recommendations | 10/10/24 | Jano Husarick on behalf of Tomáš Betušky | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>I'm submitting this feedback on behalf of Tomáš Betušky, who's waiting for his account to be approved:</p> <p>I understand that these are just recommendations, but how about adding a recommendation on what to do in case the source language contains a case which does not exist in the target language? Should it be simply omitted, or put into notes for more context?</p> <p>Also adding a missing form to a target language might be difficult if the other case is missing. Just a real life example: We in Phrase (formerly Memsource) have improved the support of ICU forms in several file formats and do the following for plural in case languages support different cases:</p> <p>Keyword forms: If a target case is missing in the source, we will create it and copy text from other form as it is a default form. The other case is required so we can always do this. If a source segment contains a case which is not supported in the target, it will be ignored and thrown away. This also includes unknown forms. Number forms: Generate the same forms as the ones in source.</p> <p>Best regards, Jano</p> <p>---> And I was planning to create a separate document.</p> <p>Yes, that would be great!</p> | <p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm replying on behalf of Mihai Niță, who wrote the Plural, Gender and Select module.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>> I understand that these are just recommendations, but how about adding a recommendation on what to do in case the source language contains a case which does not exist in the target language? Should it be simply omitted, or put into notes for more context?</p> <p>Yes, omitting it is the correct action.</p> <p>> Also adding a missing form to a target language might be difficult if the other case is missing.</p> <p>The "other" case must be present, at least in ICU.</p> <p>> We in Phrase (formerly Memsource) have improved the support ...</p> <p>100% agree. We do something similar. And I also know about a few other companies doing the same.</p> <p>My thinking is that the spec is often too formal / short / technical / dry to go into details.</p> <p>And I was planning to create a separate document. Similar with what XLIFF 1.2 provided Java Properties (https://docs.oasis-open.org/xmliff/v1.2/xmliff-</p> | Explain how to handle especial cases |
| https://groups.oasis-open.org/discussion/comment-on-xmliff-v22-csd01-general-impression | 10/10/24 | Jano Husarick on behalf of Tomáš Betušky | <p>Dear TC,</p> <p>I'm submitting this feedback on behalf of Tomáš Betušky, who's waiting for his account to be approved:</p> <p>Translators might need to translate the same thing over and over because some parts are repeated in all cases. Of course, the tools themselves can make translators' lives easier by adding some help. But because of this it might be impossible to merge. You want to generate the same format but since cases can be translated freely it is nearly impossible for tools to do that. Simple example of ICU message: Anna has invited {g, plural, one {one guest} other {a lot of guests}} to her party. Translated XLIFF for Slovak language (for simplicity "few" and "many" cases are omitted):</p> <pre><unit id="seg1" pgsw:switch="plural:g"> <segment id="seg1" pgsw:case="one"> <source>Anna has invited one guest to her party.</source> <target>Anna pozvala jedného hosťa na svoju párty.</target> </segment> <segment id="seg1" pgsw:case="other"> <source>Anna has invited a lot of guests to her party.</source> <target>Anna pozvala mnoho hostí na svoju párty.</target> </segment> </unit></pre> <p>A tool should merge translations into the following: Anna pozvala {g, plural, one {jedného hosťa} other {mnoho hostí}} na svoju párty. I hope you can see the problem. The way how we overcame this problem is that we would create the following segments for a given example:</p> <pre>Anna has invited {1} to her party. (one) one guest (other) a lot of guests</pre> | <p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm replying on behalf of Mihai Niță, who wrote the Plural, Gender and Select module.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>> Simple example of ICU message: Anna has invited {g, plural, one {one guest} other {a lot of guests}} to her party.</p> <p>Those kinds of messages are in general considered bad 18n. Because in many languages the sections "outside the decision" must in fact change (to agree in gender / number / case).</p> <p>So there is no intention to support ICU messages where the decision is inside the main flow. In fact the MessageFormat v2 spec (very close to release) does not provide any way to do that anymore.</p> <p>The translator would have to translate more, indeed, but they are free to change order, account for agreement, etc. In general the 18n tools would use some kind of fuzzy match and alleviate a bit the burden of translating more. With the advantage of less complexity and higher quality.</p> <p>> I hope you can see the problem. The way how we overcame this problem is that we would create the following segments for a given example: > Anna has invited {1} to her party.</p> | Comment the examples provided and explain how the new Plural Gender and Select module could be used |