

## Localization

Better, faster, easier through sharing resources

In 2001, a 30+ team of programmers was to develop a large application (it still is under development) that would replace more than 20 legacy applications.

Phase 1 deliverables had a fixed mandatory date, and time was running fast.

Translation Bureau could really not deliver in only one official language and the translation later. Official Languages Act makes it mandatory to deliver documentation and software simultaneously in English and French. So it really had to be delivered simultaneously in both official languages.

Back in 2001, some people were proud to say that they could take "only" one month to translate rather than six or nine as soon as the development would stop. In our case, the solution was to translate **during the development**, and to maintain terminology and definitions from day 1. Developers could consult language specialists to maintain a better terminology, translators could consult programmers to do a better translation, and the process was seamless.

From the moment where programmers stopped to work on phase 1, **12 hours later** the application was delivered in both official languages. This was the result of a collaborative effort involving programmers and translators and using a terminology management tool as a common ground.

Developers would all textual resources (button, menus, error messages, etc.) in the terminology management software and indicate what linguistic process should be done (translate, revise or translate and revise). A few lines of programming allowed one to generate the interface whenever required.

Since start, there were conventions to respect the rules of internationalization that applied (leave enough space for French that is longer than English, never merge messages, use specific rather than generic messages, etc.) In addition, they could provide the translators items of info that are lacking in most localization jobs.

Programmers could also search for existing items rather than reinventing the wheel. Various search methods allowed to find rapidly. This would avoid the translators to call programmers so that they can tell what is the difference between two almost identical texts (when there was none).

The phone numbers of authors were automatically logged, so that they could be reached if any clarifications were still needed. But translators really did not have to call often.

Sometimes, the programmer was bilingual, he would then write directly a name for the button or his message in both languages, but would then check the option Revise. Otherwise, he would check Revise and translate. Some programmers know it is a good idea to have their text revised, even in their mother tongue.

The translators could easily find the records that needed to be translated or revised, and indicate what had been done (revision, translation or revision and translation).

There was a full-time writer for the use cases and other documentation. He could also search in the terminology database and make sure his terminology was consistent, and write new terms.

Translation of those documents was done also on a continuous basis, using a translation memory to speed-up things.

The translation effort required was a bit bigger than on a normal project, but there was almost no delay due to translation.

We can safely say that the additional costs of translation certainly did not exceed the savings on idle time on the programmer's side.

The fact that the application was translated in a continuous basis also allowed for bilingual parallel quality testing (the translators could see the application in English and French in test environment).

Now I will be looking at Wikis to see how they could also help us especially for multilingual documentation and terminology in the future.

Some screen captures follow.

André Guyon

Translation Bureau / Bureau de la traduction

Public Works and Government Services Canada/ Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada



Project Authc

z\_Ja

- PDF reports
- Supplementary Specification
- UC - Administration
- UC - Availability table
- UC - Billing
- UC - Business tables
- UC - Calendar template
- UC - Client Account
- UC - Contact
- UC - Direct billing
- UC - Email
- UC - External Interface - Client Account
- UC - External Interface - Client agreements
- UC - External Interface - MGTC
- UC - Impromptu Report
- UC - Internal Organization
- UC - Interpretation
- UC - News
- UC - Order
- UC - Task
- UC - Timesheet
- UC - User registration
- UC - User Regsist - Sc REgister online
- UC - Virus Scan

Instead of an Abbreviation, we have the ID of the string

**Abbreviations**

GUI\_000065

Context +

This list element is displayed on form data exceptions for the alternate province field.

TR - To be done	TR - Work done	Extract for	Date created	Date modified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Verified
Revise and Translate	Translated	Resource Bundle	2001-11-08	2001-11-09	

Do not modify

Revise and Translate

Revise only

Translate only

Revised and Translated

Revised

Translated

Applets - Up/Down

CodeTable - Billing Activities

CodeTable - Classification

CodeTable - Client Account Types

CodeTable - Communication Modes

CodeTable - Contact Role Types

CodeTable - Countries

CodeTable - Degree of specialization

CodeTable - End Uses

CodeTable - Interpretation Order

CodeTable - Language Categories

CodeTable - Order Statuses

CodeTable - Province / State

CodeTable - Resource Types

CodeTable - Routing Language

CodeTable - Service Categories

CodeTable - Service items

CodeTable - Task statuses

CodeTable - Tmsmss Method

CodeTable - Unit of measure (UOM)

CodeTable - Unit Type

Do not extract