XLIFF Promotion and Liaison SC INFOCALL Minutes

Interoperability Now! Presentation of Results and Discussion of Next Steps

Attendees

XLIFF TC: Bryan Schnabel, **David Filip**, David Walters, **Peter Reynolds**, **Lucía Morado**, Andrezj Zydroń, Christian Lieske, Helena Shih Chapman, Andrew Pimlott,

IN!: Peter Reynolds, Micah Bly, Sven Andrä, Andrezj Zydroń, Andrew Pimlott, Chase Tingley,.

General Public: Kevin O'Donnell

Minutes

[Intro]

David: The meeting will run as this: 20 minutes presentation, 20 discussion, 20 next steps. Micah Bly is giving a presentation: [Presentation will be linked or attached once Micah provides it.]

"Who we are", "Who initiated"," What we do", "Approach (agile implementations, practical, pragmatic, open)", "Aims".

XLIFF:doc is a reference guide to representing documents in XLIFF files. They couldn't wait for XLIFF 2.0. Tailored for some source formats (Office, FrameMaker, InDesign, XML). Restricts the use of some XLIFF features to simplify and defines some extensions for added features. Has processing expectations, separately for tools that create XLIFF:doc and those that process it.

Some restrictions and simplifications: segmentation, join/split handled through <group>. One target language. One field for trans-unit status.

Some added features: simple terminology embedded. HTML preview. QA information. Target revisions.

TIPP: [ZIPped]Container that allows the seamless exchange of information between different TMSs. Share content (translations and resources), metadata, and some process information. (...)

[Presentation end, XLIFF:doc]

Micah presents the XLIFF:doc Representation Guide.

[The version that Micah is walking through on screen is this: http://interoperability-now.googlecode.com/files/XLIFFdoc%20Representation%20Guide_v0.95.pdf]

These documents [their current versions] are available publicly through the Interoperability Now webpages:

http://code.google.com/p/interoperability-now/

http://www.interoperability-now.org

[Intro end, Discussion start]

David: Questions from the audience?
Bryan: Any issues that the XLIFF TC can help you with?

Micah: I would like to know to what the XLIFF TC thinks of it. We use it as glue for different systems in our company, for us it is a real thing.

Bryan: We are very interested in your work and we'd like to take it as industry input for XLIFF 2.0?

Sven: To me it would be nice to see what you are doing and know what the relation is between both efforts?

David: I think we should ask the question the other way round.. I have a question from Kevin, he asks you, Interoperability Now! guys, how you see the relationship between XLIFF 2.0 and XLIFF:doc.

David: I think XLIFF 2.0 is having a really good momentum. I think you say that you are not a standardisation body but you are behaving like one. What about your exit strategy?

Bryan: Perhaps, OAXAL would be a venue for some of your ideas..

Micah: I think that is a good question: relation between XLIFF 2.0 and XLIFF:doc. I think XLIFF:doc can be implemented by any tool now, it is a short term solution. By summer we will have five tools implementing it. When would this happen with XLIFF 2.0?

Bryan: I would say that XLIFF 2.0 failed if it is not approved as standard a year from now.

Micah: are you saying that people are doing this now? I think it would take two or three years before people implements it.

Sven: One of the things we did in XLIFF:doc we decrease [implementation] freedom to increase interoperability... I think XLIFF 2.0 should provide the long term solution. XLIFF:doc will be good for up to 5 years.

David: I feel like it would be good if XLIFF:doc business critical features would be pushed into XLIFF 2.0, it would be good. I believe at least a couple of members of your group should join the TC, and push your extensions into the standard proper.

Micah: Is there time to do that?

David: There is a lot of work to be done, and features are being developed in parallel.

Micah: I wish we were faster than we are.

Chase: We need to push the features of XLIFF:doc into XLIFF 2.0.

David: I think the view is to push features into XLIFF 2.0, use your spec as industry input for XLIFF 2.0, we just need to see if they are warranted and constitute improvement compared to status quo. It makes total sense to do that.

Micah: I don't disagree. We use extensions because the features we wanted were not there and they were all business critical to us. In an ideal world instead of putting that information into extension it should be included into the standard itself. Time wisely, we are not in a good place.

Chase: It is what it is. I think we all agree that we want a format that we can all understand. The problem is how to get there. The question I would have is: "How is the TC is going to avoid the inconsistencies in implementations that are notorious for 1.2", my concern is that within the one year timeline that Bryan mentioned, interoperability won't be improved.

Bryan: In the TC, we asked if we should be calendar driven or milestone driven, and the answer was milestone driven. I apologize if that give the impression that we don't have tome for accommodating your contribution to the standard's development...

David: I agree with Bryan. And there is a specific ballot approving that approach for the time being. But I think it is time to change that and put a calendar date on it. We are having a good momentum and should take advantage of it, we cannot afford to let that momentum dissolve before finalizing the spec…

Micah: How the XLIFF TC sees the importance of interoperability.

Bryan: We recognise that extensibility has been a double-edge sword. We feel that there were features that were in the standard, but some implementers decided to use their own extensions to cover them. So I think the mood in the TC is to try to avoid this risk.

David: it is not just the mood. We also have specific ballots mandating processing requirements all over the spec. But, as we want the new spec to be tighter, we also must have strong industry representation. OASIS now enforces compliances clauses and we see this as an opportunity, our clause will say that all processing requirements must be honoured in order to pass as compliant.

Christian: For XLIFF:doc you edited some capabilities that are not available in XLIFF 1.2, like doing some xsl rendering of html previews, is that right?

Micah: yes.

Christian: What about IPRs of your stuff, can it be taken used, and developed elsewehere?

Micah: That will be totally fine.

Chase: that is right. You are very welcome to use it? We would be only glad if you "stole" it and made it XLIFF 2.0 ☺

Christian: the other question is the wiki page says that you are working with the Linport project. What is the status of this relation?

Chase: we started talking to them in TM Europe because we have some points in common. And we talk regularly.

Micah: that also relates that we do not want to be a standard body.

Peter: I think Linport is moving into a standardization body, is that right?

Chase: not sure, there will be a Linport call soon. But they will most probably end up in OASIS.

David: Did the Linport guys did something else than the zip file? You both say that zip is just one of possible forms..

Chase: We are trying to coordinate with them. But there is stuff like instructions to [human] translators that has not automation impact but we can represent it.

David: I do not think that their current work is related to XLIFF 2.0.

Christian: I think it is worth exploring XLIFF:doc and study in depth how this can help the current work on XLIFF 2.0.

David: I think the practical thing would be ask Interoperability people to tell the TC which business critical features should be transfer to XLIFF 2.0. Andrew is in both groups, so if you [Andrew] could, it would be great if you could expand the features wiki [section 2] with business critical XLIFF:doc features.

Andrew: I am not an official core member of Interoperability Now.

Bryan: it would be nice to have a direct liaison between the groups (more than one person maybe).

Chase: we need talk about this more. Is the xliff 2.0 wiki up to date?

David: some of the features there are so rich that they will constitute a whole module. The feature tracking wiki is divided into three sections. Section 2 – proposed, Section 1 – Approved (can go into core or module later), Section 3 – Discarded.

David: We are running out of time.. Any other opinions what the next steps should be?

Micah: what about one of the TC members working with Interoperability Now! and report the other way around?

David: We need somebody who understands very well both formats and can push features from yours to the standard.

Micah: We do not have a person who understands XLIFF 2.0 very well. The other way round would be easier. XLIFF:doc is straightforward.

David: It is more important to understand XLIFF:doc than XLIFF 2.0. XLIFF 2.0 is in flux and feature approval process will sort it out.

Micah: I am interested but before my company did not allow me to join AOSIS bacuase of IPR issues.

David: Strange, OASIS IPR policies are just as any other's open standards body, is your company Medtronic not involved in any standardization efforts whatsoever?

David: Proposed action: Micah will try and propose what features of XLIFF:doc can be transfer to XLIFF 2.0. David to help Micah explore options for joining TC.

David: Thanks everybody.

[Meeting adjourns.]