# Session 2:
# Summary of the discussion

Commenting on Paul Burton's paper, Catriona Picken emphasised the importance to all translators of knowing the basic techniques for good personal information retrieval and enquired whether there was such a thing as a simple guide to cataloguing rules which might be of use to translators. Paul Burton advised translators to contact their national library association and Aslib for advice on that question.

John Alvey of World Bank then asked Peter Arthern whether the terminology bank of the Council of the European Communities (CEC) would be available to the public on Euronet, and Peter Arthern answered that this was unfortunately not possible as it would require the use of complete standardised character sets. Eurodicautom used a multilingual approach whereas the CEC's approach was bilingual.

Mr Daniel Pageon, of Actors World Production, London, enquired whether the CEC used the same procedures of access as Eurodicautom. Peter Arthern stressed that the main criterion of the CEC terminology system was user-friendliness and that for this reason it had been decided that the procedures of access and the commands would be different from those of Eurodicautom. Furthermore, because it was to be primarily a service to translators, its approach was entirely pragmatic and it did not use academic terminology such as gender.

To Tom Evenson's question on whether it took American English into account, Peter Arthern replied that it was on the whole limited to British English, and added that every effort was made to retain a high quality of language.

Commenting on the fact that the CEC were setting up their own terminology base separately from Eurodicautom, Barbara Wilson wondered whether other organisations had felt the need to do the same. Mr Gabor

Sandi of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in Geneva expressed regret at not having access to a free online terminology base such as Eurodicautom, stressing that the lack of such a facility was greatly felt at ILO.

Another comment from the floor underlined the importance of having an ad hoc team working on terminology as well as permanent bureaux, so that the terminology service should retain a function within the translation service, as there was only too often a lack of understanding between the two.

Mr Luis Marques, from UNESCO, commented that in order to be useful a terminology service must meet the needs of translators and not do terminology for terminology's sake. He added that management felt that terminology support services were not economic.

Christopher Percival of Flambard (Europe) in Durham asked whether the Confidence Code (CC) assigned to each term indicated the quality of the term in question, to which Peter Arthern replied that it was merely an indication of its acceptability. He added that the Council was considering 'subjectivising' Confidence Codes by inviting translators to add their CC to that given by a previous translator, and thereby confirming it. Zero CC meant that nobody had confirmed a particular term.

Finally, Peter Arthern was asked whether one should not be working towards a standard quality of glossary and whether the Eurodicautom Confidence Code could not be used for that purpose. He replied that attempts had indeed been made to standardise the quality of glossaries but that the existing variety in the translation services themselves presented the greatest problem, as terminology requirements varied so widely. However, MATER was such a terminology system.

## RAPPORTEUR

Guyonne Proudlock, freelance translator and research student, 73 Wavendon Avenue, London W4 4NT, UK.