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This paper will discuss a particular project of Eiger Translations which has been performed using Trados Translator's Workbench. This project comprises weekly batches of Community Trade Mark applications, from four source languages into English, received in pre-processed form. The turnaround time for each batch is two weeks and the charges levied are in a tiered form depending on the level of fuzzy match established during pre-processing.

A number of defined problems were encountered during the initial stages of the project. These were due to a number of factors: the translators were in most cases new to the principle of translation memory; a method had to be found of avoiding working on the 100% match segments, which generate no revenue; our revision methods had to be re-evaluated for work with translation memory; the different versions of Workbench were not strictly compatible; and most importantly, because we were not networked to our client's memory and our translators were not networked to ours, different versions or generations of the memory were generated almost immediately, giving rise to discrepancies in matches and between saved translation units. The solutions found, and in some cases the difficulties created by the fact that we could not find solutions, will be described.

Because the nature of the project made it eminently suitable for application to translation memory methods, this has been a fascinating and challenging experience.
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The Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union issued a call for tenders for the project in late 1997, and contracts were awarded and implemented in May 1998.

All language permutations of the EU are covered by the project: Eiger Translations provides German/French/Italian/Spanish into English. Training and data (including extensive memories) were provided by the Translation Centre.
Eiger had some but not much experience of Workbench before beginning work on this particular project. These experiences differed in terms of how successfully we had used Workbench.
Some files are very short indeed, as evidenced by this example. Others may run to 30,000 characters, but this is rare. The average size is around 1,500 characters (equivalent to one page).
This is a screen shot of the same file, shown in the context of Word 6 and processing using Translators' Workbench.
The five headings indicated will be discussed individually below.

- 100% match = zero revenue
- Revision methods
- Diverging versions of the TM
- Analysing batches with a constantly changing TM
- Different versions of Workbench
There are various ways of avoiding spending time on the ever-increasing proportion of 100% match segments, which do not generate any revenue at all.
Revision methods

- All work done on stand-alone PCs
- Best way to revise is to open the segments (revision on screen)
- No printing required
- But: several memories exist in parallel

We decided at the time of tendering to carry out full revision of all translators' work, and considered how best to do this in the context of Workbench.
The main problem thrown up by the project was the fact that, as translators work in parallel on the same project, their memories start to diverge from one another. When we revise, yet another version of the memory is created. The difficulties caused by this and the solutions found will be discussed.
This divergence also has an effect on the analysis figures obtained for individual batches, and hence on the fees charged. In addition, a new batch adds to the memory each week, and this affects the analysis of the following week's batch.
Some translators were already working with Workbench before they joined us on the project, and of these some had version 2. This discrepancy caused some problems at the revision stage.

- Files are in rtf
- Files are left uncleaned
- Some version 1 dongles were supplied
- Different versions behave differently
- Changeover to version 2 is imminent
At first there was a lot to learn and we found the Concordance non-intuitive. Workbench has undergone some changes since we began work on the project in May 1998. Consequently, some of the problems described here have been solved since then.
Some translators had difficulty adjusting to the new style of working with Workbench, for reasons which will be explained.
Finally, a summary of the pros and cons of our particular project.

- New methods
- Problems of diverging memories
- Suitability of project
- An ongoing process