

Challenges of Setting up a Legal Translation Quality Assessment System

Denisa UNGUREAN*, Loredana PUNGĂ**

Abstract: This article explores the challenges of setting up a coherent legal translation quality assessment system at a national – Romanian, and international – European level. It begins by providing an overview of the importance of accurate legal translation and its impact on legal procedures. It then delves into the current state of legal translation quality assessment in Romania and Europe and suggests the establishment of a legal translation control body, insisting on a number of responsibilities that it may have and challenges that it may face.

Keywords: legal translation quality assessment, legal translation control body, legal translation

1. Introduction

When it comes to effective communication and to ensuring fair access to justice in multilingual legal systems, legal translation plays a vital role. In an increasingly interconnected world, legal proceedings and the drawing up of various official documents often involve parties from different language backgrounds or cross-border jurisdictions. In such cases, accurate and reliable translation becomes essential for the proper functioning of legal systems, as errors or inaccuracies in both translated documents and oral exchanges in legal contexts can have significant consequences on people/ parties and the trials or legal procedures they are involved in, jeopardizing the integrity and fairness of the whole justice system. Translating in the legal environment requires a deep understanding of legal terminology, concepts, and cultural nuances. When errors or inaccuracies occur in this environment, they can

* PhD student in Philology, West University of Timisoara, Romania. E-mail: denisa.ungurean@e-uvt.ro

** Professor of Linguistics and Translation Studies, West University of Timisoara, Romania. E-mail: loredana.punga@e-uvt.ro

lead to misinterpretations of the law, misunderstandings, lack of clarity and, ultimately, to the improper functioning of the system of law as a whole.

In civil and criminal cases, accurate translation of evidence, witness statements, contracts, and other legal documents is essential. Even a minor mistranslation can alter the meaning or intention behind the original text, potentially resulting in unjust, wrong or wrongly-informed outcomes. Inaccurate legal translations can lead to procedural errors, incorrect application of laws, and even wrongful convictions or acquittals.

Rapport International, for example, mentions the case of business contracts written in Chinese and translated into English resulting into about 5% of all contract disputes being due to improper legal translation. “Contract disputes often involve disagreements over which party is responsible for what duties, and how profits are dispersed, [...] for example, the 2011 dispute due to the English word “drydocking” being translated as “tank washing”. In the same contract, “except fuel used for domestic service” was translated as “except fuel used for domestic flights”, two very different meanings. These differences in wording not only delay transactions, but they cost both sides money while trying to renegotiate terms to be consistent in both languages.” (Rapport International, 2017: online)

The American Psychological Association, in its Legal Notebook (a publication based on a project focusing on faulty translation in courts of justice), quotes Peter Uiberall, one of the main interpreters at the Nuremberg trials, who noticed the very frequent translation of the German word “ja” by the English “yes” even where “ja” had only a filler function and should have been equated to the English “um” “ah”, “well”, thus redefining, by the translation of a single word, the meaning of witnesses’ testimonies (Winter 2012). Beitsch (2016) quotes Michelsen-King who, in her turn, reports on a situation in court when the interpreter informed a man who was accused of running the red light in traffic that he was accused of “violación”, which in Spanish does not mean “violation”, but “rape”. Confusion was obviously created by the incorrect portrayal of the facts (which could have affected the outcome of the judge’s final decision), until things went back on the right track.

Access to justice is a fundamental principle of the rule of law, and it entails the right of every individual to understand and be understood in legal proceedings. Legal translation acts as a bridge between different languages, enabling individuals to comprehend legal processes, exercise their rights, and fully participate in the legal system. It ensures equal treatment and protects the rights of all parties involved, regardless of their mother tongue or nationality and is, therefore, of paramount importance.

Furthermore, legal translation plays a vital role not only at the level of individuals, but also in cross-border cases in which institutions are involved, in international arbitration, and in cooperation between legal systems. Inaccurate translations in these contexts can hinder effective communication, compromise the enforcement of judgments, and impede the resolution of legal disputes. Therefore, ensuring the accuracy and reliability of legal translations is of paramount importance

for maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of not only domestic, but international legal proceedings and official agreements as well.

Numerous real-life examples illustrate the importance of precise legal translation. In a cross-border contract dispute, an inaccurate translation of a contractual clause can lead to conflicting interpretations and legal disputes between parties from different language backgrounds. Mistakes have always been made in this context. International Rapport (2017: online) offers one example to prove this, too: “In 1840 the Maori tribe in New Zealand signed a treaty, the Treaty of Waitangi, with the British government, but the treaty signed by each party was not the same due to a bad translation. The treaty, as written by the British government, stated that the Maori were to “cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty.” The English treaty was translated by a British missionary, but the translation did not correctly convey the intent of the treaty. The treaty the Maori signed stated that the British would provide governance, or a legal system, to the Maori but that the Maori would continue to rule themselves, and would not be giving up sovereignty to Britain. This error in translation has resulted in continued disagreement and negotiations many years and generations later.”

A single example like the one above suffices to understand that accurate legal translation is crucial to ensuring the proper application of international treaties and conventions. The European Union, for instance, heavily relies on legal translation to ensure the consistent interpretation and implementation of EU laws across member states. Any errors or inconsistencies in these translations can create confusion and legal uncertainty and hinder the harmonization of the legal systems across the Union.

The few examples of inappropriate translation provided so far underscore the need for precise legal translation and highlight the potential consequences of inadequate translation choices and practices in the field of law. Therefore, it is imperative to have robust quality assessment tools to evaluate the performance of legal translators, minimize errors, and maximize the reliability and effectiveness of translations, be they of written documents or of pieces of oral discourse.

To uphold the professional performance of appointed legal translators and the quality of their work, we consider it imperatively necessary to establish a control body within justice systems (of which the EU system is of concern to us here, Romania being an EU member state) which would serve as an independent authority responsible for overseeing and maintaining legal translation in high standards.

What we see as the main duties of this body and the challenges that it may face (at a national – Romanian and international – European level) will be discussed in sections to follow.

2. Legal translation quality assessment tools in Europe

Despite the lack of a standardized approach, several EU member states have established and have been using their own legal translation quality assessment tools and practices. For instance, some countries rely on certification exams conducted by

professional translation associations or language institutions to evaluate the competence and skills of legal translators. In the United States, translators can earn credentials through the American Translators Association (ATA), testifying for their proficiency in specific language pairs. Canada places its trust in the Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council (CTTIC), which collaborates with regional bodies like the Association of Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters of Ontario (ATIO) to manage these certifications. In contrast, European member states, like Germany, for instance, while not having a centralised certification system, rely on the affiliations of translators with major bodies like the Federal Association of Interpreters (BDU). In Spain, while the Spanish Association of Translators, Copy-editors and Interpreters (ASETRAD) is a notable entity, official authorization involves being titled as “Sworn Translator” through the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, just like in Romania’s case. The exams taken by translators often include translation tests and assessments of legal terminology knowledge. Latin American countries have their own systems of evaluating translators’ proficiency: for example, Argentina’s primary standard comes from the Argentine Association of Translators and Interpreters (AATI), while Brazil requires translators to navigate exams from public institutions to be designated “Public Translators and Commercial Interpreters” (Schaeffer, 2020).

Peer-review systems are preferred by large companies which present the need for accurate translation in multiple languages. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) stands as a very good example in this context mainly because of its responsibility for the scientific evaluation, supervision, and safety monitoring of medicines in the EU. Given the critical nature of their work and the diverse languages within the EU member states, there is an immense need for accurate translations. When a new medicine is approved for the market, the product information (which includes details like usage instructions, side effects, dosage, etc.) needs to be translated into all the official languages of the EU. This ensures that doctors, pharmacists, and patients in all member states can access this crucial information in their native language. Given the high stakes — where an inaccurate translation could result in medical errors — the EMA adopts a rigorous translation process. Once the product information is translated, it does not immediately get published. Instead:

- The translated document undergoes a review by a second, independent translator or reviser. This translator checks the initial translation against the source text for accuracy, consistency, and clarity.
- The initial translator receives feedback from the reviser and makes necessary changes. This collaboration ensures that any potential issues or ambiguities in the translation are addressed.
- Before the translations are finalized, member states have the opportunity to review and validate the translations in their respective languages. This ensures it that the content aligns with local linguistic and cultural nuances and that it is technically correct from a medical perspective.

Through this rigorous peer-review and validation system, the EMA ensures that medical product information is accurately and effectively communicated across all EU languages. This example underscores the importance of the peer-review system in sectors where precision and clarity can directly impact public health and safety. (Yang, 2021), the legal sector following track.

Specialized translators employ specialized software tools for quality assurance, such as translation memory systems and terminology databases, which facilitate consistency and efficiency in legal translations. In Europe, a diverse range of software tools have been incorporated into the translation process to ensure precision, especially in the realm of legal translation. Among these, there is SDL Trados, globally recognized for its capabilities in managing repetitive terminologies. Similarly, MemoQ is favored for its collaborative features, essential for expansive legal projects with stringent deadlines. Wordfast, with its budget-friendly appeal, has found favor among freelancers and small translation agencies, while Déjà Vu is known for its advanced translation memory functions. Prioritizing an uninterrupted translation workflow combined with quality checks leads us to Across, while Terminotix, another important actor on the market of translation softwares, focuses on the pivotal realm of terminology management, aiding in consistent term translation. In French-speaking regions, Antidote, an advanced linguistic corrector, is commonly deployed for linguistic accuracy. Tools like Verifika, QA Distiller, and Xbench have carved niches for themselves in spotting and rectifying localization issues and ensuring uniformity, especially crucial for large-scale projects. Additionally, Linguee serves as a valuable web-based resource, offering translators contextual translation insights from authentic documents. While these tools play a pivotal role in streamlining the translation process, the indispensable value of human expertise in grasping the nuances of legal language remains paramount.

The EN-15038 European Quality Standard for Translation Services entered into effect in August 2006 and was developed in a bottom-up manner by the translation industry (involving all its most important representatives: translators, translation companies, professional translators associations, the academia, translation quality standardization bodies and clients) with a specific goal in mind - to reference the translation process and to assign separate roles to translators and revisers on account of the fact that a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach would yield the highest quality results. Recognizing the complexities and nuances inherent in translation, the standard underscores the importance of collaboration and defined roles. By separating the tasks of translators and revisers, the EN-15038 aimed to ensure that each translated document undergoes meticulous scrutiny by different professionals. This strategy was rooted in the belief that, while a translator focuses on conveying the message from one language to another, a reviser acts as a safeguard, verifying accuracy, consistency, and cultural appropriateness. Such division of roles facilitates a thorough vetting process, reducing the potential for errors or oversights. Moreover, by involving all stakeholders in its development, the standard benefited from diverse perspectives, ensuring a holistic, industry-wide approach to upholding

translation quality and professionalism. This indicates that the standard, which sets objective criteria to benchmark the overall execution of translation tasks and translation quality, actually anticipates a rise in the demand for translation revision.

Introduced in 2015 as a successor to the EN-15038, ISO 17100 presents the overarching guidelines for ensuring translation quality, applicable across various types of translations such as literary, legal, and technical. ISO 17100's section 5.3.1 emphasizes a process-driven approach, detailing requirements for the translator to adhere to consistency in terminology, semantic precision, syntactic and orthographic correctness in the target language, adherence to style guides, local standards, proper formatting, and catering to the intended audience's needs.

“Throughout this process, the translator shall provide a service conforming to this International Standard as regards: a) compliance with specific domain and client terminology and/or any other reference material provided and ensuring terminological consistency during translation; b) the semantic accuracy of the target language content; c) the appropriate syntax, spelling, punctuation, diacritical marks and other 144 orthographic conventions of the target language; d) lexical cohesion and phraseology; e) compliance with any proprietary and/or client style guide (including register and language variants); f) locale and any applicable standards; g) formatting; h) the target audience and purpose of the target language content.”

This standard underscores a commitment to fulfilling client specifications and language conventions, potentially at the sacrifice of the translator's personal flair and innovative solutions to translation challenges. (Vilceanu, 2017)

The lack of common evaluation criteria makes it difficult to compare the translation quality across member states. This results in different countries having varying levels of quality and reliability in the legal translations made, this bearing a negative effect on the consistency and compatibility of legal systems within the EU. In response to the challenges and divergences in legal translation quality assessment, the need to adjust evaluation methods and to set up common standards across EU member states is has been ever growing recently.

Furthermore, the diversity of legal systems and languages in Europe is challenging as far as the terminology and the concepts used in official settings are concerned. Legal translation requires thorough knowledge of both the source and the target legal systems, as well as of the cultural differences often implied by the translation process. The absence of standardized terminology and definitions of terms can bring about hesitation in accurately translating legal concepts, thereby increasing the risk of translation errors and misunderstandings to occur. (Morris, 1995)

EU definitely has the capacity to promote the development of mutually agreed assessment tools and standards for legal translations and it may act as a strong facilitator of collaborative efforts among its member states, legal professionals, translation associations, and other relevant stakeholders in the translation industry that can ultimately lead to the rounding off of guidelines and best practices for legal

translation quality assessment at an international, European level. Common assessment tools, such as standardized translation tests or peer-review processes, can be developed to evaluate the competence and skills of legal translators consistently.

Harmonization efforts should also consider the ongoing advancements in translation technology. The even integration of specialized software tools and resources, such as translation memory systems and terminology databases, can improve the efficiency and consistency of legal translations while maintaining high quality standards.

Last but not least, bringing legal provisions concerning the assessment of translation in the domain of law to a common denominator should also be a short-term goal for the EU member states.

3. Legal translation quality assessment in Romania: the legal framework

In Romania, legal translation is governed by a single official document - Law No. 178/1997 regarding the status of translators and interpreters authorized by the Ministry of Justice. It mainly provides the legal framework for the authorization of legal translators and interpreters in the country. It establishes the requirements and responsibilities of authorized translators and interpreters, aiming to ensure the quality and accuracy of their work.

According to this law, legal translators in Romania must hold a bachelor's degree in philology, foreign languages, or law or possess equivalent qualifications recognized by the Ministry of Education. Additionally, they must successfully pass an examination administered by the Ministry of Justice to obtain authorization in order to provide professional translation services in the legal domain. This examination mainly assesses translators' language proficiency, translation skills, and knowledge of legal terminology.

There are laws which emphasize the importance of professional development for authorized translators, encouraging their participation in specialized training programs and lifelong learning education to enhance their language skills, stay updated with legal developments, and improve their translation competence.

Law No. 178/1997 puts forth specific requirements and provisions, insisting mainly on the fact that authorized translators and interpreters are required to maintain the confidentiality and impartiality of their work by adhering to professional ethics and standards. They are entrusted with the responsibility of accurately translating legal documents, contracts, court decisions, and other legal materials, thus playing a crucial role in the administration of justice. The translation of legal texts involves being at ease with complex legal terminology and concepts that require expertise and precision, which is exactly what the law mentioned emphasizes.

As Law No. 178/1997 sets the legal framework for legal translation in Romania, it definitely lacks explicit provisions regarding quality assessment tools for authorized translators. The absence of explicit quality assessment strategies and tools leads to inconsistencies in the quality of the final translations. Without a standardized methodology, it is challenging to measure and compare the translation competence

and proficiency of authorized translators. This, in turn, can affect the reliability and consistency of legal translations, potentially impacting the administration of justice, and may be regarded as a significant gap in the legal framework under discussion.

It is essential for Romania to consider the establishment of legal translation quality assessment tools and practices in order to address this gap. The introduction of standardized evaluation methods and frameworks can contribute to the overall improvement of translation quality and consistency and, more importantly, can set the ground for promoting accountability and ensuring the delivery of accurate and reliable translations.

4. Steps towards standardizing legal translation quality assessment in Romania. Setting up a control body

In order to ensure the high quality of legal translation and the appropriate professional performance of appointed legal translators in Romania, we consider it imperative to establish a control body as an independent authority within the justice system.

As we see it, this control body may be responsible for:

a) setting up a set of criteria for the assessment of legal translations;

It is important for assessors to be able to refer to a set of such criteria.

Consensus on what makes a legal translation appropriate for its purpose and readerships should be reached so that the evaluation process can run smoothly and evenly. In deciding upon legal translation evaluation criteria, one should not disregard the fact that the principles underlying this particular type of instrumental translation cannot be taken over unaltered from translation in other domains (like the literary, for example, which is, perhaps, the farthest away from it). As Pietro Ramos (2015: online) observes, unlike translation in other fields, “legal translation leaves little margin to creativity and subjectivity. It rather depends on legal conditions, comparative law and legal interpretation rules to achieve accuracy and adequacy. In a major proportion of legal translation work, this is a matter of legal consistency and legal certainty, and hence of conformity to legal sources and discourses, rather than a matter of individual preferences”.

However, elements of translation assessment grids that are applicable to domains other than the legal may contribute to an evaluation framework that should be consistently applied to the field of concern here. A good starting point in developing such a framework may be, for example, the ATA assessment grid that we discussed and applied in a case study in a previous work (Pungă, Ungurean, 2022).

No matter how complex the assessment framework, evaluation criteria should be clear for the translators themselves and easy to apply by the assessors.

b) setting up a set of criteria for the certification and assessment of legal translators;

The control body would establish objective criteria and standards for assessing the translation skills, language proficiency, and legal knowledge of translators. Through a rigorous evaluation process, it can ensure that authorized translators meet

the required standards and possess the necessary competences to handle legal translation assignments in an appropriate manner.

c) legal translators' performance monitorization and evaluation;

The control body would conduct regular monitoring and performance evaluations of authorized legal translators. This would involve assessing the quality and accuracy of translated documents, reviewing translation samples, and conducting proficiency tests. By monitoring the translators' performance, the control body can identify areas that require improvement and provide feedback and guidance to enhance their translation skills.

d) offering professional development and training opportunities to legal translators;

As "no taxonomy of evaluation criteria can be effective unless accompanied by the specialized competence to detect inaccuracies and deal with translation problems" (Pietro Ramos, 2015: online), the control body would also play a vital role in promoting professional development and continuous training for authorized legal translators. It would organize training programs, workshops, and seminars to enhance translators' domain-specific language skills, legal knowledge, and translation competence. By providing opportunities for ongoing learning, the control body ensures that authorized translators stay updated with changes in legal terminology, legislation, and best practices in legal translation.

e) handling complaints and taking disciplinary measures;

The control body would serve as that to which complaints related to translation quality should be filed, it taking on the task to deal with them in a highly professional manner. If individuals or institutions raise concerns about the accuracy or reliability of a legal translation, they can report it to the control body. The control body would investigate such complaints and take appropriate disciplinary measures if necessary, including warnings, suspensions, or revocations of authorization, depending on the severity of the issue.

The establishment of a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Romania offers several benefits:

a) enhanced translation quality and accuracy;

By setting clear standards, conducting regular evaluations, and monitoring the performance of authorized legal translators, the control body ensures a higher level of quality and accuracy in legal translations. This contributes to the reliability and effectiveness of legal procedures by reducing the risk of errors, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations in translated documents or discourse.

b) increased accountability and professionalism of legal translators;

As the control body establishes a system of accountability for authorized legal translators, they know that their work is subject to evaluation and scrutiny, which promotes professionalism and a commitment to delivering high-quality translations.

When authorized translators are aware that an unbiased authority closely monitors their professional performance, they are more likely to comply with ethical standards and professional guidelines.

c) translation consistency and harmonization;

A control body would ensure consistency and harmonization in legal translation practices across Romania. By establishing standardized evaluation methods and criteria, it fosters uniformity in translation quality assessment. This facilitates the mutual recognition of legal translations and promotes consistency in the interpretation and application of legal texts throughout the country.

d) public confidence and access to justice;

The existence of a control body for legal translation quality assessment may increase public confidence in the justice system. Individuals and enterprises involved in legal procedures can trust it that the translation of legal documents is accurate, reliable, and impartial. This, in turn, enhances access to justice by ensuring that language barriers do not hinder individuals' understanding of their rights, obligations, and legal processes.

By certifying and evaluating legal translators, monitoring their performance, handling complaints, and promoting professional development, the control body contributes to enhancing the overall quality of legal translations and strengthens the integrity of the justice system in Romania.

5. Challenges of implementing a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Romania

However useful and necessary the implementation of a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Romania may be, this may not be a very smooth process, as certain challenges may have to be overcome. One of them is establishing the necessary institutional framework and allocating resources to the creation of the body suggested. This includes setting up a dedicated authority or department within the justice system responsible for overseeing the control body's functions and operations. Adequate funding, staff, and infrastructure must be allocated to ensure the effective functioning of the control body.

Clear guidelines and regulations must be developed to define the control body's mandate, responsibilities, and procedures to follow and apply. These guidelines should regard the certification process, evaluation criteria, complaint-handling mechanisms, and disciplinary measures that may be taken if needed. Careful consideration and collaboration with relevant stakeholders such as legal professionals, translation associations, and language institutions are crucial in designing an effective institutional framework, as we have mentioned previously.

Ensuring the availability of qualified and experienced assessors as members of the control body is another potential challenge as assessors should possess a deep understanding of the domestic and international legal systems and, at the same time,

be competent enough to professionally deal with the translation tasks set – this latter thing could be accomplished only by further specialisation based on targeted training. The assessors should be proficient in the source and target languages, and have expertise in legal terminology in both systems of law.

Continuous professional development of assessors is also essential to keep them updated with changes in legal systems, terminology, and translation techniques. Collaboration with academic institutions and professional associations can contribute to the ongoing training and development of assessors, ensuring their competence and expertise in evaluating legal translation quality (Király, 2016).

Incorporating technology and digital tools into the control body's processes is crucial for efficient and effective assessment of legal translation quality. The control body should leverage translation technology, such as translation memory systems, terminology databases, and quality assurance tools to enhance consistency, accuracy, and productivity in translation evaluation. This integration requires investment in appropriate software, infrastructure, and training to ensure the seamless utilisation of these tools and resources.

In conclusion, implementing a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Romania involves various challenges and considerations. Establishing the institutional framework, recruiting qualified assessors, integrating technology, engaging stakeholders, and ensuring transparency are key aspects that need to be carefully addressed. By overcoming these challenges, Romania can establish an effective control body that enhances the quality and reliability of legal translations, ultimately strengthening the justice system and promoting access to justice for all. The existence of a control body for legal translation quality assessment positively impacts access to justice in Romania as long as it heavily relies on effective communication and the thorough understanding of legal rights and obligations. By ensuring the accuracy and reliability of legal translations, the control body helps overcome language barriers that may hinder individuals' and businesses' ability to comprehend legal documents and participate fully in legal proceedings.

Improved access to justice also fosters inclusivity and equal treatment under the law. Individuals who are non-native speakers of the official language of the country can fully understand their legal rights, obligations, and options, regardless of their linguistic background. This reduces the risk of misinterpretation, unequal treatment, and potential injustice that may arise from inadequate translations.

The establishment of a control body elevates the professional status of legal translators' and translation in Romania. By implementing standardized evaluation methods and qualifications, it reinforces the importance of specialized knowledge, skills, and ethical conduct in legal translation. This contributes to the professionalization of the field and promotes a higher level of competence and, consequently, increased self-esteem among authorized legal translators.

6. Challenges of implementing a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Europe

The implementation of a control body at a European level – having responsibilities on an international scale similar to those suggested for a potential Romanian control body in section 4 – would certainly be useful, but it would pose challenges too. Some of these challenges are shared with those at a national level, as stated in the previous section. Others are specific to the implementation of a pan-European legal translation control system.

One of the primary such challenges in the latter category is the uneven legal and linguistic landscape across the EU member states. Europe is home to numerous legal systems and languages, each with its own unique characteristics and complexities. Harmonizing legal translation quality assessment practices while respecting linguistic and, often, legal diversity may be a serious matter to address.

The control body should carefully consider the linguistic competencies required for legal translation in different language pairs and legal domains. This includes determining the level of proficiency needed in both the source and target language. Establishing guidelines and criteria that encompass this linguistic diversity is crucial to ensuring fair evaluation and recognition of legal translations across the EU member states.

One important aspect to consider is also the mutual recognition of the competence of authorized legal translators across various countries. While the establishment of a control body in each country strengthens quality assurance within their respective jurisdictions, it is important to establish mechanisms for recognizing the results of the assessments conducted by control bodies in different countries and, consequently, the translators' level of competence.

Efforts towards harmonization should be made to align evaluation criteria, procedures, and standards to facilitate the mutual recognition of legal translations. This involves engaging in dialogue and collaboration among control bodies in different member states, sharing best practices, and promoting a common understanding of quality assessment in legal translation. Mutual recognition not only streamlines processes but also enhances cooperation and trust among member states.

The control body should carefully consider the role of technology and its integration into the assessment process. While technology can improve translation efficiency and consistency, there should be balance between the ever-increasing tendency to resort to machine translation and to work remotely and the need for accurate and contextually appropriate translations. The control body should establish guidelines and procedures for the use of translation technology, ensuring that it complements the skills and expertise of authorized legal translators rather than replace them. It may also contribute to the assessment of the usefulness and appropriateness of the existing digital translation tools in the legal domain and, depending on the conclusions drawn, to developing the digital instruments further where this is required. Close collaborative work is presupposed by this kind of endeavor too.

Continuous professional development is essential for authorized legal translators to stay updated with the evolving legal landscape, language developments, and translation techniques. The control body should prioritize the establishment of professional development programs for authorized legal translators beyond the national level. These programs may include workshops, seminars, webinars, and conferences that focus on emerging legal trends, changes in legislation, linguistic updates, and advancements in translation technology. Collaboration with universities, translation associations, and professional organizations is always to be taken into consideration in order to ensure the provision of relevant and high-quality professional development opportunities. By investing in continuous professional development, the control body supports the growth and expertise of authorized legal translators, fostering excellence in legal translation across Europe.

Like at a national level, financial and administrative support from relevant authorities is vital to ensure the effective functioning of the control body for the whole Europe. Adequate funding, staff, and infrastructure must be allocated to support the control body's operations, including evaluation processes, complaint handling mechanisms, and ongoing professional development activities.

As legal translation plays a vital role in the administration of justice, ethical considerations are of utmost importance. The control body should address ethical aspects related to legal translation quality assessment, including confidentiality, impartiality, and conflicts of interest so as to obey European legislation concerning these.

Strict ethical guidelines should be established for authorized legal translators, making sure that they adhere to principles of professional conduct and maintain confidentiality when handling sensitive legal information. The control body should incorporate ethical evaluations as part of the assessment process, ensuring that authorized legal translators demonstrate ethical integrity in their work.

Moreover, the control body should regularly review and update its own ethical guidelines to address emerging ethical challenges posed by technological advancements, digitalization, and remote working. This includes considerations such as data privacy, security, and the responsible use of translation technology. By upholding ethical standards, the control body contributes to the integrity and trustworthiness of legal translation in Europe.

7. Conclusion

To sum up, the implementation of a control body for legal translation quality assessment both in Romania and at a larger, European level, addresses not only current challenges but also future developments and implications. Advancements in translation technology, digitalization and remote working, continuous professional development, ethical considerations, and global collaboration are key areas that the control body should focus on. By anticipating and adapting to these future developments, the control body can effectively ensure the quality and reliability of

legal translations, promote professional growth, and enhance the recognition of legal translators as professionals both nationally and internationally.

The establishment of a control body for legal translation quality assessment in Europe can serve as a catalyst for global collaboration and wide recognition of legal translation professionals. Europe, with its rich linguistic diversity and legal system, can position itself as a leader in setting standards for legal translation quality assessment worldwide, thus contributing to the development of global standards and promotion of harmonization in legal translation practices on a broader scale.

References

1. Beitsch, Rebecca. 2016. "How Bad Translation by Court Interpreters Can Turn Misunderstanding into Injustice". PBS News Hour. Available: <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/bad-translation-by-court-interpreters-injustice>.
2. Kiraly, Don. 2016. "Towards a 'Translation Quality Label' for Europe?", *Multilingua*, vol. 35, pp. 511-539.
3. Morris, Marshall. (ed.) 1995. *Translation and the Law*. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.
4. Pietro Ramos, Fernando. 2015. "Quality Assurance in Legal Translation: Evaluating Process, Competence and Product in the Pursuit of Adequacy", *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, vol. 28, pp. 11-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-014-9390-9>.
5. Pungă, Loredana and Denisa Ungurean. 2022. "Quality Assessment in Legal Translation. A Case Study", *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, vol. 19, pp. 22-29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/rjes-2022-0004>.
6. Rapport International (na). 2017. "Legal Translation and Interpretation - Mistakes can be Costly". Available: <https://www.rapporttranslations.com/blog/legal-translation-interpretation-mistakes-can-be-costly>.
7. Yang, Emma. 2021. "The Linguistic Review Process in the Centralized Procedure in the EU. Regulatory Focus." Available: <https://www.raps.org/news-and-articles/news-articles/2021/10/>
8. Vilceanu, Titela. 2017. "Quality Assurance in Translation. A Process-Oriented Approach", *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, vol. 14, pp.141-146. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/rjes-2017-0017>.
9. Winter, Ryan. 2012. "What did he Say? Mistranslations in the Court", *Judicial Notebook*, vol. 43 (3), p. 33. Available: <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2012/03/jn>.
10. Schaeffer, Moritz, David Huepe, Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Sascha Hofmann, Edinson Muñoz, Boris Kogan, Eduar Herrera, Agustín Ibáñez, and Adolfo M. García. 2020. "The Translation and Interpreting Competence Questionnaire: An Online Tool for Research on Translators and Interpreters", *Perspectives*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 90-108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1629468>