Multidimensional Quality Metrics Terminology

This document presents a comprehensive list of terms pertinent to MQM Translation Quality Metrics. As such, it is more comprehensive than the terminology clauses included in ISO 5060 and ASTM WK 46396. Concepts are organized in logical order, followed by an alphabetical index. Note that this kind of conceptual ordering is designed to encourage the readers to read or at least skim over the list of terms to familiarize themselves with the terms in a meaningful context.

1 Quality management

1.1 **quality**, *n*
degree to which a set of inherent characteristics of an object fulfills requirements
Source—ISO 9000:2015, 3.6.2.

1.2 **quality assurance, (***QA), n*
quality management activities with the objective of auditing processes and procedures to provide confidence that stakeholder requirements can be fulfilled.
Note—Quality assurance is not equivalent to quality control.

1.3 **quality control,** *(QC), n*
quality management activities for monitoring and assessing resources and process performance in real time to verify that stakeholder requirements are being fulfilled.
Note— In quality control, data concerning the work product and process are collected in real time by monitoring the process. They are also analyzed in real time (vs. being stored only for future quality assurance audits).

1.4 **quality planning**, *n*
quality management activities for designing a system of strategies, processes, and procedures capable of producing deliverables that will fulfill stakeholder requirements.

1.5 **quality evaluation, (***QE), n*

quality management activities for determining whether stakeholder requirements have been fulfilled through inspection and measurement of product properties.

1.6 inspection, *n*
determination of conformity to specified requirements.
Source— ISO 9000, 3.11.7.
Note—The result of an inspection can show conformity, nonconformity, or a degree of conformity. Translation quality evaluation can serve as a kind of inspection.

1.7 quality improvement, *n*
forward-looking quality management activities focused on preventing future variation from stakeholder requirements by adjusting a process—including any changes to measurements, resources, methods, tools, and training—to increase the ability of the process to produce deliverables that are fit for purpose.

1.8 quality translation*, n*
translation that is accurate and linguistically correct for its audience and purpose, and that complies with all other specifications negotiated between the requester and provider, taking end-user needs into account.
Note 1—These specifications determine translation project parameters
*Source—S*ee ASTM F2575:2024, parameters.
Note 2—In some contexts, a quality translation is defined as one whose content displays a high level of correspondence between the content of the source and target texts, and which displays a high level of fluency. Although this high standard of quality is demanded by some translation project specifications, this is not always the case.

1.9 translation quality*, n*
degree to which the characteristics of a translation fulfill the agreed-upon appropriate specifications.

1.10 translation quality management, (*TQM), n*
integration and coordination of management activities for ensuring that an organization's translation-related deliverables fulfill stakeholder requirements.
Note—Quality management encompasses quality planning, quality assurance, quality control, quality evaluation, and quality improvement. In broader industrial quality management environments, *TQM* also represents *total quality management*, which conforms closely to the criteria for *translation quality management*. In essence, *translation quality management* comprises *total quality management* for translation products.

2 Translation quality evaluation stage

2.1 **translation quality evaluation,** *(TQE), n*
quality evaluation of a translation product.
Note 1—The terms *translation quality assessment*, *linguistic quality assessment*, *language quality assurance*, and their respective acronyms, *TQA* and *LQA*, used in the sense of *translation quality evaluation*, are deprecated in the context of this standard practice to avoid confusion with *translation quality assurance*, which is also properly abbreviated as *TQA*.
Note 2—TQE should not be confused with so-called *translation quality estimation*, the process of automatically predicting the putative quality of translation output.

2.2 ***translation quality evaluation strategy****, n*
organization-wide policy implemented on the basis of the specific purpose for the evaluation of translation output
Source— ISO 5060, 3.3.3.
Note—The purpose for the evaluation of translation output can vary from project to project. Therefore, it can be necessary to apply various translation evaluation strategies.

2.3 **analytic translation quality evaluation**
analytic evaluation, analytic translation evaluation, analytic TQE, n
quality evaluation that identifies and annotates errors from an analytic metric and calculates quality measures and quality ratings using a suitable scoring model.

2.4 **holistic translation quality evaluation,** *holistic translation evaluation, n*
quality evaluation based on identifying overarching qualities such as readability and correspondence at the macro level.

2.5 **validation**, *n*
confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence, that a system or a related product is fit for purpose and meets user needs.
Note 1—System *validation* demonstrates that a system is designed to meet stakeholder specifications on the overall quality assurance scale. Product *validation* demonstrates that a given product is the correct product for a given application.

2.6 **verification***, n*
confirmation, through the provision of objective evidence, that a product fulfills specified requirements.
Source—Based on ISO 9000:2025/6
Note—Verification qualifies whether a quality management system reflects specified requirements.

2.7 **assessment**, *n*
process of collecting data to improve performance, focusing on measuring progress and providing ongoing feedback.
Note—Assessment is formative in that it promotes improvement and feedback, while evaluation is summative, in that it informs decision-making and effectiveness.

2.8 **reliability**, *n*
degree to which a system repeatedly and consistently produces the same result

2.9 **translation intra-rater reliability**, *n*
degree to which a single rater (evaluator) produces the same results in revising or evaluating the same translation output.
Source—Based on ISO 10075:3-2004(en), 3.2.4.

2.10 **translation inter-rater reliability**, *n*
degree to which two or more raters (evaluators) produce the same results in revising or evaluating the same translation output.
Source—Based on ISO 10075:3-2004(en), 3.2.4

3 Translation process

3.1 **translation**, *n*
set of processes to render source language content into one or more target languages in written form .
Source—Adapted from ISO 17100:2015, 2.1.2.
Note—Translation may involve formats other than text-based formats (e.g. an audio file, image, etc.).

3.2 **content**, *n*
written or spoken material and associated non-linguistic material, such as images and video
Source—ASTM 2575:2023, 3.1.7.

3.3 **translation content**, *n*
written or spoken material and associated non-linguistic material, such as images and videos that comprise the substance of source or target language texts.
Note—Translation content can include a variety of content types, such as web pages or application user interfaces, including text and complementary components, such as graphics, video, hyperlinks, and accessibility content.

3.4 locale, *n*

combination of the language variety and geographic region for a given text or audience.

Note—Optionally, a locale tag or identifier can also relate to other items of information, such as time and date formats, legally binding format restrictions, international telephone codes and writing systems

Source—Based on ASTM F2575-14, 3.1.16.

Example 1—Spanish in Colombia: es-CO versus Spanish in Spain: es-ES; Simplified Chinese used in China: zh-Hans-CN versus Traditional Chinese used in Taiwan: zh-Hant-TW (see IETF BCP 47).

Example 2—Spanish in Colombia: es-CO versus Spanish in Spain: es-ES; Simplified Chinese used in China: zh-Hans-CN versus Traditional Chinese used in Taiwan: zh-Hant-TW.

3.5 source language, *n*

language of the source language content.

Source—See ISO 17100:2015, 2.3.6.5.

3.6 source language content, *n*

language content to be translated.

Source—ISO 17100:2015, 2.3.2.

3.7 target language, *n*

language into which source language content is translated.

3.8 target language content, *n*

content translated from a source language.

Source—ISO 11669:2024, 3.1.2.

3.9 translation output, *n*

translated target-language content.

3.10 translation product, *n*

fully processed deliverable translation output.

Note—In some environments output and product can act as near synonyms if output is delivered directly to the end user.

4 Translation modalities

4.1 translation modality, *n*

means by which a translation product is created.

Note—Translation modalities comprise both unedited machine translation and all forms of human translation, including post-edited machine translation and augmented translation.

4.2 human translation, (*HT), n*
translation of text or speech from one natural language to another conducted by a human, including when supported by technology.

4.3 computer-aided translation*, computer-assisted translation,* **(***CAT), n*
part of translation workflow in which a variety of software applications are used to support the task of human translation.
Source—ISO 17100:2015, 2.2.1.
Note—These computer programs are usually referred to as computer-aided translation (CAT) tools, or, sometimes, translation environment tools (TEnTs).

4.4 translation memory, (*TM), n*
database consisting of aligned text segments in two languages.
Note—TM segment pairs are also referred to as *translation units* or *TU*s (3.4.6).

4.5 segment*, n*
text string that functions as a unit within a translation environment, typically resulting from splitting up text according to agreed-upon rules.
Note—A text segment is often a sentence, but segments can also be other text elements, such as individual words, phrases, or even full paragraphs extracted from longer text or used in titles, captions, headers, or bullet-point items. Computer-aided translation (CAT) tools and machine-translation programs typically segment source-text content as the first step in the translation process.

4.6 translation segment pair, *translation unit, (TU), n*
segment of source content matched with its corresponding translated content.
Note 1—A translation segment pair can contain an empty placeholder for the translation content.
Note 2—In CAT-tool interfaces, translation segment pairs (called *translation units* in many interfaces) are presented as either horizontally or vertically paired text chunks and are retained—together with any embedded metadata—as reusable knowledge units in translation-memory serializations.
Source—ISO 18968:2026, 3.8.
Note 3—Translation unit in this context should not be confused with Notes on *segmentation* carried down to the lexical or terminological unit level, where the so-called translation unit represents a single sub-sentence level concept.

4.7 machine translation, (*MT), n*
automated, machine-generated translation of text or speech from one natural language to another using a computer system.
Source—ISO 17100, 2.2.2)
Note—Machine translation (MT) originally referred to rule-based and then later, statistical MT, but has been augmented by neural MT, and more recently by AI-generated approaches, which are stages in the development of machine-generated translation.

4.8 **unedited machine translation**, *(UEMT output), raw machine translation output*, *n*
output of machine translation that has not been post-edited by a professional human translator
Source—ISO 11669:2024, 3.4.3.

4.9 **post-edited machine translation,** *(PEMT), n*
machine translation output that has been edited by a professional human translator as appropriate to comply with translation project specifications.

4.10 **augmented translation***, n*
technology-centric approach to the translation process that employs and generates rich metadata to amplify the capabilities of human translators by integrating interactive, heuristic computer-aided translation memories, machine translation, intelligent terminology and knowledge management, and highly automated project management processes.
Note—Augmented translation, sometimes called "human at the core," is an idealized framework for human-machine interaction that extends the traditional CAT tool framework by linking to external resources and using AI approaches to provide just-in-time assistance and information to assist the translator, while leaving the translator in full charge of the output. It also requires that processes learn in real or near-real time from translator input.

4.11 **professionally verified translation,** *(PVT), n*
translation product that has been examined by a qualified professional human translator to ensure that the product fulfills agreed specifications for translation quality.

4.12 **unverified translation,** *(UVT), n*
translation output or product that has not been examined and approved by a qualified professional human translator.
Note—In this document, *qualified professional translator* implies compliance with the competence and qualification requirements set down in ASTM F2575:2023 or ISO 17100:2015.

5 Translation specification

5.1 **requirement***, n*
statement which expresses a need and its associated constraints and conditions. *Source*—Based on ISO/IEC/IEEE 29148:2018, 3.1.29.

5.2 **translation project specifications***, n*
defined and agreed upon requirements that are related to translation project parameters and that are used for creating translation product.

5.3 **style guide**, *n*
set of rules related to writing and presenting text to ensure consistency and compliance (technical or regulatory) both within a translation product and across multiple translation products.
Note—Style guides provide general linguistic, stylistic, and formatting guidelines for writing, translating, and editing text, as well as prescriptive usage glossaries.

5.4 **translation project parameter,** *translation parameter, n*
attribute of a translation project.

6 Translation error

6.1 **issue**, *n*
<*translation evaluation*> possible error identified manually or using an automated tool.
Note—Issues can be annotated as errors, marked as preferential changes (which can be marked using the neutral error severity), or rejected as a false positive.

6.2 **error,** *translation error, n*
violation of a rule of good writing or good translation based on specifications.

6.3 **error type**, *n*
class of errors identified by error type IDs, error type names, definitions, and positions in a semantic hierarchy.

6.4 **error subtype**, *subtype, n*
one of the child error types associated with a given top-level error type dimension.
Note—The use of the term *error category* is not recommended.

6.5 **error type dimension,** *dimension, n*
one of the seven top-level error types in the MQM error typology.

6.6 **error typology,** *n*
taxonomy of error types that can be assigned to errors in quality evaluations to characterize the nature of problems encountered.

6.7 **DQF-MQM error typology**, *n*
subset of the MQM error typology developed by the Translation Automation User Society (TAUS) to support software localization as the quality metrics component of its Dynamic Quality Framework (DQF), now superseded by MQM-Core.

6.8 MQM error typology, *n*
analytic writing and translation error typology underlying the MQM quality evaluation model, organized under seven top-level error type dimensions.

6.9 MQM-Core, *n*
set of error types that contains the seven top-level error type dimensions, plus a selection of error subtypes commonly used in commercial production.
Note—-MQM-Core provides a structural framework for the MQM error typology upon which users can build their own metrics in response to their own context and requirements.

6.10 MQM-Full, *n*
complete MQM error typology, consisting of the seven top-level dimensions and their complete hierarchical sets of error subtypes.
Note—Designers and implementers of translation evaluation strategies can select a subset of error types that best reflects their specifications, and they use this subset to create a metric and design a *scorecard* (7.3).

6.11 translation error root cause, *error root cause, root cause, n*
proximate cause that initiated the causal chain that leads to and is responsible for an error in the text being evaluated.
Note—The proximate cause is the immediate, most obvious cause for an error.

6.12 root cause analysis, *(RCA), n*
identification of the root cause that leads to an error, with the goal of systematic quality improvement.

6.13 root cause translation error analysis, *n*
logical systematic examination of an identified translation error, its attributes, application, and documentation, in order to identify the error type and severity and to determine the error mechanism and its basic cause.
Source—Based in part on ISO 6781-1:2023, 3.1.19.
Note—Root cause translation error analysis is often used to provide a solution to chronic problems.

6.14 repeated error, *n*
specific error that recurs two or more times throughout an evaluated sample.
Note—Implementers are called upon to determine whether each instance of a repeated error is assigned penalty points or whether the set of recurring instances is treated as a single composite error
Source—See ASTM WK 46396, 8.3.1.3.

7 Translation quality scoring

MQM 2.0 Linear Calibrated Model: Evaluation Scorecard

Client	Project Name		Translator		Evaluator		
	MQM 2.0 Analysis						
Sample Client LLC	Source Language	Target Language		Total Word Count	Evaluation Word Count (EWC)	Content Type	
	Eng	Ara		3000	1500	General, legal, business, media	
Score Calculation Parameters	Maximum Score Value (MSV)	Passing Threshold Raw QS	Passing Threshold Calibrated QS		Reference Word Count (RWC)	Acceptable Penalty Points/RWC	
	100	99	90		1000	10	
Evaluation Results	Quality Rating (QR)	Raw Quality Score (RQS)	Absolute Penalty Total (APT)	Per-Word Penalty Total (PWPT)	Normed Penalty Total (NPT)	Calibrated Quality Score (CQS)	Calibrated Quality Rating (CQR)
	Pass	99.40	9	0.006	6.00	94.00	Pass

General Comment

Please provide a detailed comment on quality of the evaluated sample.

Severity Penalty Multiplier	0	1	5	25				
Error Type	Neutral Errors Count	Minor Errors Count	Major Errors Count	Critical Errors Count	Error Type Penalty Total (ETPT)	Weighted ET Penalty Points	Normed ET Penalty Points	Error Type Weight
Terminology	0	0	0	0	0	5	3.33	1
Accuracy	0	0	0	0	0	4	2.67	1
Linguistic Conventions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	1
Style	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	1
Locale Conventions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	1
Audience appropriateness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	1
Design and markup	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	1
Grand Total	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	

Figure 1: Sample MQM Translation Quality Scorecard: Top-level error typology with four severity levels

Note: https://themqm.org/error-types-2/the-mqm-scoring-models/

7.1 **metric**, *n*

standard of measurement that defines the conditions and the rules for performing a measurement and for understanding the results of a measurement.

Source—ISO/IEC 19086-1:2016, 3.10.

Note 1—In this context, a metric consists of an error typology based on MQM-Core or MQM-Full and a scoring model.

Note 2—Scorecards can be configured as simple tables or spreadsheets, as stand-alone programmed tools, or as widgets or other built-in features associated with computer aids for translators.

Example—See Figure 1.

7.2 **score**, *n*

<*translation evaluation*> numerical value (or set of values) that quantifies performance by measuring observed errors against a specified error tolerance level.

Note 1—In some scoring models, higher raw scores represent a desirable outcome and in others, lower scores do.

Note 2—The numerical scores calculated according to a scoring model (see below, 3.4.6, ff) result from the comparison of the sum of the calculated error severity values against an ideal quality measure such as 100% or 0, depending on score directionality.

7.3 **scorecard**, *n*
table containing all relevant *error types* (6.3) with their assigned *penalty points* (8.3), for the purpose of producing an error *score* (7.2) and the *pass-fail rating* (8.15) for the *evaluated translation output* (3.9), and for documenting the *translation quality evaluation* (2.1).
Note—Based in part on ISO 5060:2024(en), 3.3.8

7.4 **calibration**, *n*
<*translation evaluation*>, the process of adjusting translation score values based on the translation scoring model to ensure that the output data matches a scoring range within the framework of anticipated human evaluation parameters.
Note—If, for instance, the acceptability for the interval between the perfect score (100%) and the acceptance threshold is very small, and interpreting the scores is difficult, calibration procedures can be introduced to display the desired acceptability range on a larger scale that is easier to interpret and understand.

8 Score calculation

8.1 **evaluation word count, (***EWC), n*
actual number of words evaluated for the source language content, usually counted by a CAT tool.

8.2 **error severity level**, *n*
rating of the impact of an error on the target language content's suitability for its intended purpose.
Example—In Figure 1, the error severity levels range from neutral to critical, reflecting the effect of the error on the usability of the text.

8.3 **penalty point**, *n*
negative single numerical unit value levied against an error instance during translation quality evaluation.
Note—The number of penalty points assigned to an error is said to reflect its *error severity level* (8.2).

8.4 **severity penalty multiplier**, *n*
aggregate number of *penalty points* (8.3) assigned to an error instance during translation quality evaluation reflecting the criticality of the individual error.

Note 1— Depending on the *error severity level* (8.2) associated with an error, a number of *penalty points* (8.3) is selected to function as a severity penalty multiplier in a *scorecard* (7.3).

8.5 neutral severity level, *n*
error severity level assigned to an issue that differs from a quality evaluator's preferred translation or that is flagged for further attention, but that is an otherwise acceptable translation.

8.6 minor severity level, *n*
error severity level assigned to an error that does not seriously impede the usability, understandability, or reliability of the content for its intended purpose, but has a limited impact on, for example, accuracy, stylistic quality, consistency, clarity, or general appeal of the content.

8.7 major severity level, *n*
error severity level assigned to an error that seriously affects the usability, understandability, or reliability of the content for its intended purpose, or hinders the proper use of the product or service due to a significant loss or change in meaning or because the error appears in a highly visible or important part of the content.

8.8 critical severity level, *n*
error severity level assigned to an error that renders the entire content unfit for purpose or poses the risk of serious physical, financial, or reputational harm.

8.9 error count, *n*
number of instances of an individual error type or subtype assigned to a given error severity level.
Example—Any one of the values under Error Counts in Figure 1.

8.10 severity error count, *n*
number of instances of an individual error type or subtype assigned to a given error severity level.
Example—Any one of the values under Error Counts in Figure 1.

8.11 error type weight, *(ET weight), n*
numerical value used to modify the unweighted error type penalty point total.
Source—Based on ISO 5060, 3.5.6.

8.12 error type penalty total, *(ETPT), n*
sum of the products of individual error counts associated with a given error type multiplied by their respective severity penalty multipliers.
Example—Any one of the values in the ETPT column in Figure 1.

8.13 absolute penalty total, *(APT), n*
sum of all error type penalty totals for a given translation evaluation project.

8.14 passing threshold, *Threshold Value, (TV), acceptance threshold, n*
greatest quantity of penalty points allowed for a given sample, above which the translation product receives a fail rating as the ultimate quality rating.

8.15 pass/fail rating, *rating, ultimate quality rating, n*
<*translation evaluation*> final evaluation decision indicating the absolute acceptability or rejection of a translation, typically based on the comparison of the quality score to the threshold value stated in the translation quality specifications for a given project.

8.16 fit-for-purpose, *fitness for intended purpose*, *adj/n*
in line with pre-agreed requirements for an intended use.
Note–Fitness for purpose is closely dependent on operationalizing requirements in the form of translation project specifications. The so-called "good enough" level of translation quality fails to account for true fitness, unless it is specified for what purpose it is "good enough.
Source: Based on ISO 2033:2021(en), 3.22

8.17 anchoring, *n*
<*translation evaluation*> aligning the scoring model explicitly with a stakeholder-defined acceptance threshold, typically expressed as acceptable penalty points per Reference Word Count (usually 1000 words).

8.18 quality score, *(QS), n*
representation of the quality evaluation results in a form suitable for decision making, such as on a 0 to 100 scale.

8.19 score directionality*, n*
relationship that exists between the quality score and the ideal quality score that reflects no detected errors, whether higher or lower numbers represent superior performance.
Note 1—In this standard practice, score directionality indicates whether a higher score is more or less desirable than a lower score. On the one hand, a score can resemble a percentage. In this type of system, the higher the QS, the higher the ultimate quality rating. On the other hand, In contrast, ISO 5060 calculates its so-called Error Score (ES), which is comparable to the per-word penalty total in this standard practice. In the ISO 5060 case, lower error scores are desirable, with the result that the higher the ES, the lower the ultimate quality rating.

9 Translation quality evaluation stage

9.1 **quality evaluation stage**, *n*
separate stage in the sequence of processes included in an analytic translation quality evaluation.
Note—Quality evaluation proceeds through three stages: preliminary planning, error annotation, and automatic score value and rating calculations.

9.2 **planning**, *n*
initial stage phase of the evaluation process, during which the text sampling approach, the scoring model, and the scorecard are selected, and translation samples are prepared, and, if necessary, loaded into the evaluation software.

9.3 **sampling**, *n*
selection of a subset of texts or text segments used to represent the full text or the full set of texts for evaluation purposes.

9.4 **simple random sampling,** *random sampling, n*
sampling method in which a set of evaluation segments or chunks of sufficient size is chosen from the entire content without any particular defined selection criteria.

9.5 **stratified sampling**, *n*
sampling method in which the total content is divided into different strata based on their characteristics and a simple random sample is selected from each stratum.
Note—To be representative, the results are weighted with respect to the overall evaluation sample in relation to the proportion of each stratum with respect to the total evaluation content.

9.6 **targeted sampling**, *n*
sampling method in which certain characteristics of the entire volume of the evaluated translation content (overall statistical population) are overrepresented in the sample selection.
Note—Targeted sampling is useful for closer examination of specific aspects of the translation content, for example content deemed to pose a high risk with respect to the content's fitness for purpose.

10 translation role

10.1 **stakeholder**, *n*
person or organization that can affect or be affected by a translation product or translation activity.
Note—Stakeholders typically include management, requesters, translation service providers, end users, interested third parties, etc.

10.2 **requester**, *n*
person or entity commissioning translation services.
Note—The requester usually receives the translation product for their own use or on behalf of the end users. In situations where the requester proceeds to commission a translation service provider, they can also be considered as a client or customer from the perspective of the translation service provider that will provide the translation service.

10.3 **client**, *n*
entity that contracts with the translation service provider and is responsible for paying for the translation product.
Note 1—A client may or may not be a requester or an end user.
Source—Based on ASTM F3130, ??

10.4 **translation service provider,** *(TSP), provider, n*
person or organization that delivers a translation service.
Source—ISO 20539:2023, 3.3.5.

10.5 **translator**, *n*
person who performs the translation of the source content into content written in another language

10.6 **reviser**, *n*
person who revises target language content against source language content
Source— ISO 17100:2015, 2.4.5.
Note—According to ISO 17100, the reviser shall be a person other than the translator.

10.7 **reviewer**, *n*
person who reviews target language content.
Source—ISO 17100:2015.
Note—In contrast to the reviser and the evaluator, the reviewer focuses solely on target language content.

10.8 **evaluator**, *n*
person who conducts a quality evaluation of a translation product.
Note—According to ISO 17100, the evaluator shall be a person other than the translator.

10.9 **audience,** *target audience, n*
person or group of persons for whom a translation is intended.

10.10 **end user***, n*
person or group of persons that ultimately uses a service
Source—Based on ISO 20539:2019, 3.2.6, modified – 'the service delivered' changed into 'a service'.

References

ASTM F2575:2023, *Standard Guide for Quality Assurance in Translation*

ASTM F3130-18, *Standard Practice for Language Service Companies*

ISO Standards:

ISO 5060:2024, *Translation services — Evaluation of translation output — General guidance*

ISO 6781-1:2023*, Performance of buildings — Detection of heat, air and moisture irregularities in buildings by infrared methods — Part 1: General procedures*

ISO/IEC 19086-2:2018, *Cloud computing — Service level agreement (SLA) framework — Part 2: Metric model*

ISO 11669:2024, *Translation projects — General guidance*

ISO 17100:2015, *Translation services — Requirements for translation services*

ISO 18968:2026, *Post-editing of non-human translation output — Requirements*

ISO 21720:2024, *XLIFF (XML Localization Interchange File Format)*

ISO/IEC/IEEE 29148:2018*, Systems and software engineering — Life cycle processes — Requirements engineering*

ISO 9000:2015, *Quality management systems — Fundamentals and vocabulary*

ISO 9001:2015, *Quality management systems — Requirements*

Terminology Index

This alphabetical index references terms in Section 3, which are organized in logical order to facilitate understanding of term usage in this complex field.

Term	Number
absolute penalty total	8.12
acceptance threshold	8.13
analytic evaluation	2.3
analytic TQE	2.3
analytic translation evaluation	2.3
analytic translation quality evaluation	2.3
anchoring	8.16
APT	8.12
assessment	2.7
audience	10.9
augmented translation	4.12
calibration	7.4
CAT	4.3
client	6.3
computer-aided translation	4.3
computer-assisted translation	4.3
content	3.2
critical severity level	8.7
customer	6.3
dimension	6.5
DQF-MQM error typology	6.7
end user	10.10
error	6.2
error count	8.8
error root cause	6.11
error severity level	8.2
error subtype	6.4
error type	6.3
error type dimension	6.5
error type penalty total	8.11
error type weight	8.10
error typology	6.6
ET weight	8.10
ETPT	8.11
evaluation word count	8.1
evaluator	10.8
EWC	8.1
fit-for-purpose	8.15
full post editing	4.10
holistic translation evaluation	2.4
holistic translation quality evaluation	2.4
HT	4.2
human translation	4.2
inspection	1.6
issue	6.1
light post editing	4.11
locale	1.4
machine translation	4.7
major severity level	8.6
metric	7.1
minor severity level	8.5
MQM error typology	6.8
MQM-Core	6.9
MQM-Full	6.10
MT	4.7
neutral severity level	8.4
pass/fail rating	8.14
PEMT	4.9
penalty point	8.3
planning	9.2
post-edited machine translation	4.9
professionally verified translation	4.13
provider	6.4
PVTQ	4.13
QA	1.2
QC	1.3
QE	1.5
QS	8.17
quality	1.1
quality assurance	1.2
quality control	1.3
quality evaluation	1.5

quality evaluation stage 9.1
quality improvement 1.7
quality planning 1.4
quality score 8.17
quality translation 1.8
random sampling 9.4
rating 8.14
raw machine translation output 4.8
RCA 6.12
reliability 2.8
requester 6.2
requirement 5.1
reviewer 10.7
reviser 10.6
root cause 6.11
root cause analysis 6.12
root cause translation error analysis 6.13
sampling 9.3
score 7.2
score directionality 8.18
scorecard 7.3
scoring model 7.2
segment 4.5
severity error count 8.9
severity penalty multiplier 8.3
simple random sampling 9.4
source language 3.5
source language content 3.7
stakeholder 6.1
stratified sampling 9.5
style guide 5.3
subtype 6.4
target audience 10.9
target language 3.6
target language content 3.8
targeted sampling 9.6
Threshold Value 8.13
TM 4.4
TQE 2.2
TQM 10
translation 1.1
translation content 3.3
translation error 6.2
translation error root cause 6.11
translation interrater reliability 2.9
translation memory 4.4
translation modality 4.1
translation parameter 5.4
translation project parameter 5.4
translation project specifications 5.2
translation quality 1.9
translation quality evaluation 2.1
translation quality evaluation strategy 2.2
translation quality management 10
translation quality scorecard 7.3
translation segment pair 4.6
translation service provider 6.4
translation unit 4.6
translator 10.5
TSP 6.4
TU 4.6
TV 8.13
UEMT output 4.8
ultimate quality rating 8.14
unedited machine translation 4.8
unverified translation 4.14
UVT 4.14
validation 2.6
verification 2.5