

Fifth Annual JAT Contest for New and Aspiring Translators (Japanese to English)

Source Text

Please translate the following text for inclusion in an international organization's Internet presentation on efforts to reduce marine pollution. The US-based translation agency requires that you resolve all language problems and incorporate explanatory notes if you feel any are necessary. The agency also insists that you do not contact the author or the issuing agency. The original context is available at the following address.

<http://www.kaiho.mlit.go.jp/11kanku/02tyraumi/chura/04maga/45migoro.htm>

SOURCE TEXT STARTS HERE

「ゴミのポイ捨て」対策

第十一管区海上保安本部では、海に係わる人達が海のゴミ状況をどのように思われているのか調査を実施し、今後のゴミ対策の参考にするため、沖縄本島の釣具店95店舗にアンケート調査を行いました。

この調査の第2弾として、に本島の漁業協同組合に対してアンケート調査を行いました。調査結果は↓のとおりです。

海における「ゴミのポイ捨て」対策に関するアンケート調査（漁協編）

1 組合の総会は毎年何月ごろ開催しておりますか。

① 5月期 9 漁協 (43%) ②6月期 11 漁協 (52%) ③12月期 1 漁協 (5%)

2 現在の組合員数は何名おりますか。

組合員数 3771 名 (正会員 1848 名 (49%)、準会員 1923 名 (51%))

3 組合で発泡スチロールの餌箱の適正処理を指導しておりますか。

イ している 11 組合 (約 52%) ロ していない 10 組合 (約 48%)

イと答えた方はその内容

- ①再利用を指導している
- ②清掃業者に委託処理させている
- ③リサイクル又は焼却施設で処理させている

4 船内で発生したゴミの持ち帰りの指導はしておりますか。

イ している 14 組合 (約 67%) ロ していない 7 組合 (約 33%)

イと答えた方はその内容

- ①分別持ち帰りの指導をしている
- ②入港後指定された網こんへ投棄させている
- ③分別して港内の捨て場に置くよう指導をしている。

5 停泊中整備に伴うゴミ・ビルジ等の処理はどの様に指導しておりますか。

イ している 12 組合 (約 57%) ロ していない 9 組合 (約 43%)

イと答えた方はその内容

- ①港内の一定の場所に置いている
- ②施設内で焼却処理をしている
- ③処理業者での回収処理をしている

6 港内の清掃は定期的に行っておりますか。

イ 行っている 19 組合 (約 90%) ロ 行っていない 2 組合 (10%)

ロと答えた方はその内容

- ①行事前に行なっている
- ②定期的に行なっている
- ③組合員、又は委託業者に委託して行なっている

7 所属組合員の美化意識 (活動) は高いと思いますか。

イ 非常に高い 1 組合 (約 5%) ロ 高い 11 組合 (約 52%) ハ 低い 9 組合 (約 43%)

8 海浜、海域等のゴミの散乱状況は悪化していると思いますか。

イ 非常に悪化している 7 組合 (約 33%) ロ 悪化しつつある 13 組合 (約 62%)

ハ 思わない 1 組合 (約 5%)

9 もずく網の洗浄残渣の処理はどのようにしていますか。

- ①漁港内で海中に沈め腐敗するまで放置した後に陸上に揚げ、処理している
- ②回収して網干場で洗浄し海に流している
- ③洗浄し自然に沈下している
- ④港内で洗浄してある程度溜まったら、回収して陸上に埋めている。

10 沖縄県のポイ捨て等防止条例「美ら島環境美化条例」をご存知ですか。

イ 知っている 4 組合 (約 19%) ロ 全く知らない 9 組合 (43%) ※8 組合無回答

11 その他にゴミ問題について、ご意見があれば何でも記入して下さい。

- ①港内での釣人のモラルが低い、釣人のマナーが悪いので困っている
- ②行政側は産業廃棄物の早急な受入態勢を整えるべきである
- ③港内に家庭のゴミを捨てているのが現状である。又、釣人がゴミを持ち帰らず捨てていく
- ④河川からのゴミが港内に流れて、特にビニール類が漁船の航行を阻害している
- ⑤車で港内に入り、ゴミを捨てていく者が多くなっている

Finalists

The following six entries (#4, #17, #25, #30, #79, #83) have made it to the final round.

Entry 4

Litter Reduction Plan

The 11th Regional Coast Guard Headquarters conducted a survey on what people whose lives are affected by the ocean think about the trash situation there to provide reference on measures to deal with the garbage. The survey was conducted via questionnaires answered by 95 fishing tackle and equipment stores on Okinawa Island.

The survey was conducted a second time via questionnaires to the island's fishing industry associations. The results appear below.

Questionnaire on the Ocean Litter Reduction Plan (Fishing Industry Association Version)

1. In what month does your association hold its general meeting each year?

A. May (9 associations, 43%) B. June (11 associations, 52%) C. December (1 association, 5%)

2. How many members does your association have?

Total Members: 3,771 (Regular Members: 1,848, 49%; Associate Members: 1,923, 51%)

3. Does your association encourage the proper disposal of polystyrene bait boxes?

Yes: 11 associations (52%) No: 10 associations (48%)

Those who answered "Yes" encourage recycling, have them cleaned, or dispose of them at recycling or incineration facilities.

4. Does your association encourage members to bring back trash produced on boats?

Yes: 14 associations (67%) No: 7 associations (33%)

Those who answered "Yes" encourage members to separate and bring back their trash, throw it away in designated nets after returning to port, or separate the trash and throw it away at designated dumping areas at port.

5. Does your association in some way direct its members to dispose of garbage, bilge etc. produced during maintenance while anchored?

Yes: 12 associations (57%) No: 9 associations (43%)

Those who answered "Yes" gather it at one place in the port, incinerate it at a facility, or have it collected by a waste disposal company.

6. Does your association conduct periodic cleanups at port?

Yes: 19 associations (90%) No: 2 associations (10%)

Those who answered "Yes" do so before events, clean up periodically, or leave it to members or other companies.

7. Do you think your association's members are highly conscious of beautification or engage in a high amount of beautification activity?

Very high: 1 association (5%) High: 11 associations (52%) Low: 9 associations (43%)

8. Does your association think the trash situation on the seaside and in the ocean is getting worse?

Much worse: 7 associations (33%) Worse: 13 associations (62%) Not worse: 1 association (5%)

9. How does your association treat residue from mozuku net cleaning?

- A. Leave them to sink and decompose in the fishing port, then bring them to land for treatment.
- B. Collect the nets, take them to be cleaned at a place for drying nets, then let them float in the ocean.
- C. Wash them and let them sink.
- D. Clean them as much as possible at the port, then bury them on land.

10. Is your association aware of Okinawa Prefecture's Island Beautification Act to prevent litter?

Yes: 9 associations (19%) No: 9 associations (43%) No answer: 8 associations

11. Please give us your opinion on any other garbage problems.

- A. The unethical behavior and manners of fishermen in ports is a problem.
- B. The government should take urgent action on industrial waste.
- C. Household garbage is being thrown away at ports, and fishermen are throwing garbage away rather than bringing it back with them.
- D. Garbage is flowing into ports from rivers, and vinyl garbage in particular is hindering fishing boats' navigation.
- E. Many people are coming to ports in their cars to throw away garbage.

* All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number and further adjusted so that they add up to a total of 100% for each question.

Entry 17

Anti-Littering Measures

The Eleventh Regional Coast Guard headquarters conducted a survey among 95 fishing tackle retailers in Okinawa Main Island in order to examine the awareness of marine pollution among those who spend time at sea. The survey is also going to be used for reference purposes for anti-littering measures in the future.

As the second part of this research series, they did a survey among fishermen cooperative societies in Okinawa Main Island. The results of the survey are as follows.

Results of the survey on anti-littering measures at sea (among fishermen cooperative societies)

1. In what month does your fishermen cooperative have a general meeting?

- A. May, 9 cooperatives (43%)
- B. June, 11 cooperatives (52%)
- C. December, 1 cooperative (5%)

2. How many current members does your cooperative have?

Total membership 3771 - 1848 regular members (49%), and 1923 associate members (51%).

3. Does your cooperative advise the members to appropriately dispose bait boxes made of expanded polystyrene?

- A. Yes, 11 cooperatives (approx. 52%)
- B. No, 10 cooperatives (approx. 48%)

If you answered yes to the question 3, what is your advice regarding appropriate disposal?

- A. Encourage the members to reuse the bait boxes.
- B. Advise them to have the bait boxes disposed by waste collectors.
- C. Encourage recycling or disposal of bait boxes at incineration facilities.

4. Do you advise the members to take the garbage with them when leaving the ship?

- A. Yes, 14 cooperatives (Approx. 67%)
- B. No, 7 cooperatives (Approx. 33%)

If you answered yes to the question 4, please explain.

- A. Advise the members to separate the garbage and take them off board.
- B. Advise them to dispose the garbage in assigned plastic containers after arriving to a port.
- C. Advise them to separate the garbage and dispose them in trash receptacles at a port.

5. Do you advise the members regarding the waste and bilge water disposal during their ship's stay at a port?

- A. Yes, 12 cooperatives (approx. 57%)
- B. No, 9 cooperatives (approx. 43%)

If you answered yes to the question 5, what is your advice?

- A. Leave them at an assigned location in a port.
- B. Dispose them at an incineration facility.
- C. Have them collected by waste disposal specialists.

6. Do you clean ports regularly?

- A. Yes, 19 cooperatives (approx. 90%)
- B. No, 2 cooperatives (approx. 10%)

If you answered yes to the question 6, please explain further.

- A. Clean before events.
- B. Clean regularly.
- C. Have members clean or hire professional cleaners.

7. Do you think the cooperative members are environmentally conscious?

- A. Highly conscious, 1 cooperative (approx. 5%)
- B. Conscious, 11 cooperatives (approx. 52%)
- C. Not conscious, 9 cooperatives (approx. 62%)

8. Do you think the problem of litter at sea and surrounding areas is worsening?

- A. Extremely worsening. 7 cooperatives (approx 33%)
- B. Starting to get worse. 13 cooperatives (approx. 62%)
- C. Not worsening. 1 cooperative (approx. 5%)

9. What do you do with remaining dirt in the fishing nets after cleaning?

- A. Leave the nets in the sea in fishing ports until the remaining dirt gets decomposed. Then dispose them on shore.
- B. Collect and wash the fishing nets at a cleaning location. Throw the used water and dirt into the sea.
- C. Wash the fishing nets and let the used water and dirt subside naturally.
- D. Wash the fishing nets in ports. When a certain amount of dirt is accumulated, collect and dispose by

landfill.

10. Do you know the anti-littering ordinance, Churashima Environmental Beautification Ordinance?

A. Yes, 4 cooperatives (approx. 19%)

B. Never heard of it, 9 cooperatives (approx. 43%)

8 cooperatives did not answer this question.

11. Please share any opinions and concerns you may have regarding littering problems.

A. Troubled because of fishermen's low moral and lack of manner.

B. Administrative organs need to regulate industrial waste disposal methods immediately.

C. Household wastes are left in ports. Also, fishermen leave their garbage in ports.

D. Garbage from rivers flows into ports. Especially plastics are obstructing the paths of fishing boats.

E. Increasing numbers of people drive to ports to throw away their garbage.

Entry 25

Measures to Prevent Littering

In order to improve anti-littering initiatives in the future, the 11th Regional Coast Guard Headquarters conducted a survey of 95 fishing supply stores on Okinawa Island to see what those who live and work around the sea think about garbage in the ocean.

In this second round, we surveyed the member cooperatives of the Okinawa Island Fisheries Cooperative Association. The results of the questionnaire are as follows.

Questionnaire Survey on Measures to Prevent Littering in the Sea (Fisheries Cooperative Assoc. edition)

1. In what month is the cooperative's yearly general meeting held?

In May - 9 co-ops (43%) In June - 11 co-ops (52%) In December - 1 co-op (5%)

2. How many co-op members are there currently?

3771 members (Full members: 1848 (49%), associate members: 1923 (51%))

3. Does the co-op actively encourage the proper disposal of polystyrene foam bait boxes?

Yes - 11 co-ops (approx. 52%) No - 10 co-ops (approx. 48%)

Detailed responses from those who answered Yes to Question 3:

1. Encourage their reuse

2. Contract with a cleaning agency to dispose of them

3. Recycle them or dispose of them at an incineration facility

4. Does the co-op instruct fishing crews to bring their on-board garbage back with them?

Yes - 14 co-ops (approx. 67%) No - 7 co-ops (approx. 33%)

Detailed responses from those who answered Yes to Question 4:

1. Encourage crews to separate and bring back garbage

2. Have crews dump garbage in designated containers upon returning to port

3. Instruct crews to separate and place garbage in harbor dumping sites

5. Does the co-op encourage the disposal of waste, bilge, etc. produced while undergoing maintenance at anchor?

Yes – 12 co-ops (approx. 57%) No – 9 co-ops (approx. 43%)

Detailed responses from those who answered Yes to Question 5:

1. Deposit waste/bilge at a given place within the harbor
2. Incinerate waste/bilge on-site
3. Have a waste disposal company collect it

6. Does the cooperative clean the harbor periodically?

Yes – 19 co-ops (approx. 90%) No – 2 co-ops (10%)

Detailed responses from those who answered No to Question 6:

1. Cleaning is done prior to events
2. Harbor is cleaned periodically
3. Cleaning is done by co-op members or a contracted company

7. Do you think your co-op's members' awareness of beautification efforts is high?

Very high – 1 co-op (approx. 5%) High – 11 co-ops (approx 52%) Low – 9 co-ops (approx 43%)

8. Do you think that trash scattered onto the shore and into the ocean has become worse?

It is much worse – 7 co-ops (approx. 33%)

It is growing worse – 13 co-ops (approx. 62%)

It is not becoming worse – 1 co-op (approx. 5%)

9. How does your co-op clean residue off of its mozuku seaweed nets?

1. Immerse the net in the harbor and leave it until the residue decays, then haul the net onshore and clean it
2. Take in the net, clean it in the drying area, then rinse it in the sea
3. Clean the net and then let it sink naturally
4. Clean the net in the harbor, then once the residue has accumulated collect it and bury it on shore

10. Have you heard of Okinawa Prefecture's "Chura-shima Environmental Beautification Ordinance," an anti-littering ordinance?

Yes – 4 co-ops (approx. 19%) No – 9 co-ops (43%) No response – 8 co-ops

11. Please let us know if you have any opinions concerning littering and trash issues.

1. The poor manners and morals of fishermen in the harbor are a problem
2. The government should arrange to take in industrial waste as soon as possible
3. The reality is that people throw their household waste into the harbor, and fishermen do not take their garbage with them when they leave
4. Garbage, especially plastic items, flows from rivers into the harbor and blocks fishing boats from moving
5. The number of people coming to the harbor by car and throwing garbage away is increasing

Entry 30

Measures to Prevent Trash Being Thrown into the Ocean

To help identify measures to prevent trash being thrown into the ocean, the 11th Regional Coast Guard Headquarters has conducted a survey of people involved in ocean-related work for their opinions on the current state of the seas around Okinawa. The survey was carried out in two parts: the first part surveyed 95 fishing tackle stores on Okinawa's main island, while the second part questioned representatives of the main island's fishery cooperatives. Results for the second part of the survey are as follows.

Survey to Identify Measures to Prevent Trash Being Thrown into the Ocean (Fishery Cooperatives)

1. Which month does your cooperative hold its annual general meeting?

- ① In May: 9 fishery cooperatives (43% of total respondents)
- ② In June: 11 (52%)
- ③ In December: 1 (5%)

2. How many members does your cooperative currently have?

3,771 members in total: full members, 1,848 (49%); associate members, 1,923 (51%)

3. Do you instruct your members on how to appropriately dispose of Styrofoam bait boxes?

- a) Yes: 11 (approx. 52%)
- b) No: 10 (approx. 48%)

Examples of answers provided by "Yes" respondents

- ① We provide instructions on reusing the boxes.
- ② Our members outsource the disposal of the boxes to specialist contractors.
- ③ Our members recycle the boxes or dispose of them at an incinerator.

4. Do you instruct your members on how to stow and bring back the trash they generate onboard when at sea?

- a) Yes: 14 (approx. 67%)
- b) No: 7 (approx. 33%)

Examples of answers provided by "Yes" respondents

- ① We provide instructions on separating trash and returning with it to port.
- ② Our members dispose of the separated trash in designated collection bins on returning to port.
- ③ We provide instructions on separating and disposing of the trash at a designated site within the port.

5. Do you provide instructions on how to correctly dispose of trash and similar substances, such as bilge, that are generated when the boat is undergoing maintenance within port, and if so, what kind of instructions?

- a) Yes: 12 (approx. 57%)
- b) No: 9 (approx. 43%)

Examples of answers provided by "Yes" respondents

- ① We have established a designated site within the port for the disposal of trash and similar substances.
- ② Our members incinerate trash and other waste at a facility within the port.
- ③ Trash and other waste are collected by specialist contractors for disposal.

6. Are the port facilities cleaned regularly?

- a) Yes: 19 (approx. 90%)

b) No: 2 (approx. 10%)

Examples of answers for “Yes” respondents

- ① Cleaning is carried out prior to an event taking place at the port.
- ② Cleaning is carried out regularly.
- ③ Cleaning is carried out by members of the cooperative or outsourced to a cleaning contractor.

7. Do you think member awareness of the need to keep the oceans clean is high and are they actively doing so?

- a) Extremely aware: 1 (approx. 5%)
- b) Very aware: 11 (approx. 52%)
- c) Not very aware: 9 (approx. 43%)

8. To what extent do you think the problem of people incorrectly throwing away trash at beaches and into the ocean is getting worse?

- a) Getting much worse: 7 (approx. 33%)
- b) Getting worse to some extent: 13 (approx. 62%)
- c) Not getting worse: 1 (approx. 5%)

9. How do your members dispose of the waste residue that collects on mozuku* nets?

- ① Our members submerge the nets within the port until the residue decomposes and then clean the nets on land.
- ② Our members collect the nets, clean them at a net-drying area, and then dispose of the residue in the ocean.
- ③ Our members clean the nets within the port and let the residue decompose naturally.
- ④ Our members clean the nets within the port and, if a certain amount of residue remains, they collect it and bury it on land.

10. Are you aware of the “Ordinance for the Beautification of the Chura Islands,” an Okinawa Prefectural Government ordinance that aims to address the problem of trash being thrown into the ocean and related problems?

- a) Aware of it: 4 (approx. 19%)
 - b) Not aware of it at all: 9 (approx. 43%)
- (No responses from 8 cooperatives)

11. If you have any other thoughts about the problem of trash being thrown into the ocean or about related problems, please write them here.

- ① The bad manners of people fishing at the port is a problem.
- ② The government should make immediate preparations to accept industrial waste.
- ③ Some people dump their household trash in the port. Also, people fishing at the port are not taking their trash home but are rather throwing it away in the port.
- ④ Trash is flowing into the port from rivers. In particular, plastic trash causes problems for boats entering and leaving the port.
- ⑤ Many people are driving to the port to throw away their trash.

* An edible seaweed

Entry 79

Measures to deal with garbage dumping

The 11th Regional Maritime Safety Headquarters conducted a survey among people whose livelihoods are tied to the ocean to find out what they think of the current garbage situation in marine areas. A survey of 95 fishing supply stores on the main island of Okinawa was carried out for reference purposes in formulating future anti-garbage measures.

This was the second survey by questionnaire conducted among the Fisheries Cooperative Associations of the main island of Okinawa. The results of the survey are as follows.

Survey by questionnaire on measures to deal with marine garbage dumping (Fisheries Cooperative Association version)

1. In which month does your association hold its annual general meeting?

- ① May: 9 associations (43%)
- ② June: 11 associations (52%)
- ③ December: 1 association (5%)

2. How many members does your association currently have?

3771 members (1848 full members (49%), 1923 associate members (51%))

3. Does your association supervise the proper handling and disposal of styrofoam bait boxes?

Yes: 11 associations (about 52%), No: 10 associations (about 48%)

Responses of those who answered yes:

- ① We supervise the reuse of such boxes
- ② Disposal is outsourced to cleaners
- ③ Boxes are disposed of by recycling or incineration facilities

4. Do you ensure that any garbage on board a ship gets taken home?

Yes: 14 associations (about 67%), No: 7 associations (about 33%)

Responses of those who answered yes:

- ① We ensure that garbage is sorted and taken home
- ② Garbage is disposed of in designated nets after arrival at port
- ③ We ensure that garbage is sorted and placed at garbage dumps within the port

5. Do you supervise the disposal of garbage, bilge, etc that accompanies in-harbor maintenance while the ship is on the berth? How?

Yes: 12 associations (about 57%), No: 9 associations (about 43%)

Responses (to "How?") of those who answered yes:

- ① Placed at fixed locations within the port
- ② Disposed of by incineration within the facility
- ③ Collected and disposed of by waste disposal services

6. Is cleaning of the port carried out on a regular basis?

Yes: 19 associations (about 90%), No: 2 associations (10%)

Responses of those who answered no:

- ① Carried out before events and functions
- ② Carried out on a regular basis
- ③ Delegated to association members, or outsourced to cleaners

7. Do you think members of your association are highly conscious of beautification (activities)?

Extremely conscious: 1 association (about 5%), Highly conscious: 11 associations (about 52%), Not conscious: 9 associations (about 43%)

8. Do you think the garbage scatter situation in seaside and marine areas is deteriorating?

Seriously deteriorating: 7 associations (about 33%), Continuing to deteriorate: 13 associations (about 62%), Don't think so: 1 association (about 5%)

9. How do you dispose of the residue from cleaning the mozuku[1] seaweed nets?

- ① After leaving them submerged in the fishing harbor until they decompose in the sea, they are taken onshore and disposed of.
- ② They are collected, cleaned at the net drying area, and then flushed into the sea.
- ③ They are washed and allowed to settle naturally.
- ④ They are washed in the port. After a certain number has been gathered, they are collected and buried onshore.

10. Are you aware of Okinawa's Churashima Environmental Beautification Ordinance, which aims to prevent littering and garbage dumping?

Yes: 4 associations (about 19%), Not at all: 9 associations (43%) *8 associations gave no reply

11. If you have any other opinions about the garbage problem, please record them below.

- ① The lack of ethics and etiquette among fishermen at the port with regard to garbage disposal is a problem.
- ② The administration should arrange for the prompt removal of industrial waste products.
- ③ Disposing of household waste inside the port has become common practice. In addition, fishermen get rid of their garbage there without taking it home with them.
- ④ Garbage from rivers flows into the port. Plastic waste in particular obstructs the passage of fishing boats.
- ⑤ The number of people who drive into the port and dispose of their garbage there has increased.

[1] *Cladosiphon okamuranus* and *Sphaerotrichia divaricata*, types of edible seaweed.

Entry 83

Anti-Littering Measures

The 11th Regional Maritime Safety Headquarters conducted an investigation to find out how people involved with the sea perceived the marine litter situation in their area. A questionnaire survey of 95 Okinawa Island fishing gear shops was also conducted for use as reference material in developing future anti-littering measures.

For the second part of this investigation, a questionnaire survey of Okinawa Island fisheries cooperatives was conducted. The results are as follows:

Questionnaire Survey of Fisheries Cooperatives regarding Marine Litter Countermeasures

1.) When does your cooperative hold its annual general meeting?

- May - 9 (43%)
- June - 11 (52%)
- December - 1 (5%)

2.) What is the current total number of cooperative members?

- Full members - 1,848 (49%)
- Associate members - 1,923 (51%)
- Total - 3,771

3.) Does your cooperative have a policy in place for the proper disposal of polystyrene bait boxes?

- Yes - 11 (52%)
- No - 10 (48%)

If "Yes," describe:

- Boxes are reused
- Co-op contracts with a professional garbage-collecting service for disposal
- Boxes are disposed of at recycling or incineration facilities

4.) Does your cooperative have a policy regarding taking home garbage produced on fishing vessels?

- Yes - 14 (67%)
- No - 7 (33%)

If "Yes," describe:

- We have a policy of sorting and taking home garbage
- Trash is disposed of in designated receptacles after returning to port
- We have a policy of sorting garbage and leaving it at garbage collection points in the harbor

5.) Do you have a policy regarding the disposal of garbage, bilge water and other waste while vessels are in harbor for maintenance?

- Yes - 12 (57%)
- No - 9 (43%)

If "Yes," describe:

- Garbage is left at a designated spot within the harbor
- Garbage is incinerated on-site
- Garbage is collected by a professional disposal service

6.) Do you engage in harbor cleanups on a regular basis?

- Yes - 19 (90%)
- No - 2 (10%)

If "Yes," describe:

- Carried out before major events
- Carried out on a regular basis
- Cleanups carried out by co-op members or outsourced to professionals

7.) How high a level of awareness of and participation in cleanup efforts do you feel your cooperative's members have?

Very High - 1 (5%)

High - 11 (52%)

Low - 9 (43%)

8.) Do you think the litter situation on the beach and on the sea has gotten worse?

It's gotten extremely worse - 7 (33%)

It's getting worse - 13 (62%)

Don't think it's gotten worse - 1 (5%)

9.) How do you dispose of the residue left after cleaning your seaweed nets?

- The nets are submerged in the fishing harbor until the residue decomposes; the nets are then hauled in and the residue disposed of

- Nets are hauled in, and the residue is washed off at the net drying place and allowed to flow out to sea

- Residue is washed off and naturally sinks to the bottom of the harbor

- Residue is washed off into the harbor, and recovered and buried on land after enough of it accumulates

10.) Have you heard of the Chura-shima Environmental Beautification Ordinance enacted by Okinawa Prefecture to help stop littering?

Yes - 4 (19%)

No - 9 (43%)

No answer - 8 (38%)

11.) Please add any other comments you have regarding the litter problem.

- The inconsiderateness and bad manners shown by people fishing in the harbor is a big problem.

- The government needs to take immediate action to deal with industrial waste.

- The reality is that people dump their household garbage in the harbor. Also, fishermen leave their garbage behind instead of taking it home.

- Garbage from rivers is carried into the harbor; plastics bags in particular are interfering with the sailing of fishing boats.

- More and more people are driving into the harbor to dump garbage.

RESULTS

The judges of the 5th annual JAT translation contest for new and aspiring translators have made their final decision, and the results are as follows:

The semi-finalists, in order of the numbers assigned to their entries, were:

4. Alexander Farrell

17. Miyako Dubois

25. Grayson Shepard

30. Mark Kelly

79. Darryl Wee

83. Jonathan Merz

After much deliberation, the judges awarded prizes as follows:

First place: No. 83, Jonathan Merz (Wakayama, Japan)

Second place: No. 25, Grayson Shepard (Kanagawa, Japan)

Many thanks to everyone who applied. Choosing the winners was a difficult task, given the number of entries and their level. I observed the judges' deliberations via e-mail, and they they took their responsibilities very seriously. Even if you didn't win, I hope you found the contest to be a challenging and worthwhile exercise, and I hope that some of you will try again next year.

Mike Sekine
Contest Liaison

Commentaries from the Judges

Malcolm James

The stated purpose of the contest is "to cultivate new talent in commercial non-literary translation." In judging, I was trying to find the person with the most talent to become a top commercial translator, not the person who produced the best translation at this stage. Simple misinterpretations are likely to disappear with experience, so I regard them as less of a problem than if this were an actual commercial translation. I'm much less willing, however, to be lenient on translators who submit a translation that doesn't seem to have got a final read-through, or who produce a translation that doesn't seem to have considered the document's context and purpose. Each of the entries commented on below has its own merits and displays the signs of a competent translator. All the finalists have the potential to be good commercial translators and are to be congratulated on their efforts.

General points

The passage for translation is part of a website report on a survey conducted by the local branch of a government agency. The Japanese is generally easy to read, well-structured, and quite accessible. The translation should be, too. Unlike previous contests, but like many commercial translation projects, the genko had some errors and inconsistencies. It also assumed a familiarity with local conditions and subject matter, which had to be interpreted for the target audience - readers of an international organization's Internet presentation on efforts to reduce marine pollution.

Most of the entrants handled the task well, including the problems in the genko. The only real issue was with Q6 ("港内の清掃は定期的に行っておりますか"), where the follow-up question was the only one in the questionnaire that wanted details for NO answers ("ロ 行っていない") instead of YES answers ("イ 行っている"). The problem was that one of the NO answers "②定期的に行なっている" contradicted the NO. Some entrants concluded that the NO (ロ) was a typo for YES (イ), but answer ② didn't really work for that either. I don't know for certain what was actually intended, but since only two Co-ops answered with NO, I wondered if a superfluous line break had turned two answers into three. Conflating answers ② and ③ to give "定期的に行なっている組合員、又は委託業者に委託して行なっている" might work - the Co-op doesn't do regular cleaning itself, it gets either members or professionals to do it instead.

Specific points for #04

This translation gave a good overall impression, but there were places where a better grasp of who was doing what would have helped. For instance Q3 asked "Does your association encourage the proper disposal of ..." but the response had the same subject for "encourage" and "dispose." Similarly, there were contradictions between different parts of the genko. Q9 has "let them float" and "let them sink" applying to the same object ("residue"? "nets"?), and the questionnaire is titled "Questionnaire on the .. Plan," but doesn't really seem to be asking about the "Plan." This translator writes well, and has potential to be a good translator. Further improvement would come from making a habit of reading through the genko several times and actively thinking about what it all means before starting to translate.

Specific points for #17

This translation was let down by grammatical errors and misuse of English, such as the "regulate" in "regulate industrial waste disposal methods," which produces a translation meaning "impose controls on disposal methods" instead of "put in place a system for proper disposal/collection" for "受入態勢を整える." There were places where a better grasp of who was doing what would have helped. For instance, in the second paragraph "they (did a survey)" is confusing. "We (did a survey)" would have made the relationships clearer. Likewise, using "fishermen" for both "漁協組合員" and "釣人" makes it difficult to tell who's being complained about in Q11. The translator seems to have a good grasp of the genko text, so in addition to doing lots of target-language reading to improve grammar etc., improvement would come from making a point of taking a closer look at the larger context - in this case, the rest of the website and similar websites - to gain a deeper overall understanding of the topic.

Specific points for #25

This was perhaps the most accurate translation, and certainly had very few actual mistranslations. I particularly liked the phrasing of Q4 ("Does the co-op instruct fishing crews to bring their on-board garbage back with them?"). However the translation trailed the winner on readability and overall impression. The translator has a good understanding of the genko, so improvement would probably come from reading lots of well-written English on the same subject and in the same sort of style as the project. That would help in spotting places where it's OK to move away from the literal text of the Japanese. For instance, think about whether "In order to improve anti-littering initiatives in the future" actually needs the "in the future" at the end.

Specific points for #30

I liked the way that this translator handled the percentages, and particularly the format distinction for Q2, which was the percentage of members, not the percentage of respondents like the other questions. Like the overall winner, this translator made a clear distinction between the current survey and the previous one in the second paragraph, but spoiled it with "the first past" instead of "the first part." A more careful read-through would eliminate that sort of typo. Otherwise, the overall impression is good. Improvement would come from practicing editing the finished translation to make it sharper. This has a word count that is 13% higher than the translations produced by the winner and runner-up, so it might be an idea to go back and try to reduce the count by 10%-15%.

Specific points for #79

There were several points where I particularly liked this translator's choice of words. Examples include the question in Q3, and in Q11, "etiquette" for "マナー," and "has become general practice" for "現状である."

However, there were also discrepancies such as "in-harbor maintenance while the ship is on the berth" (either "in-harbor" or "... berth," not both) and the disconnect between the uses of "How?" between question and response in Q.5 (How do you supervise ...?/How is garbage etc. disposed of?). These would probably have been caught by a more careful read-through. Improvement would probably come from leaving the translation for a while before coming back to do the read-through with a fresh mind.

Specific points for #83

I liked this translation because the translator had obviously thought carefully about the topic and worked out how to say the same thing in natural English. The introductory paragraphs are particularly good at making a clear distinction between the current survey and the previous one, and I liked the "investigation to find out how people ... perceived the marine litter situation in their area. Compare that with the same part by some of the other finalists: "survey ... to examine the awareness of marine pollution," "survey to see what [people] think about garbage in the ocean." I liked the simplicity of "seaweed nets" (Q9) and phrasing such as "sorting garbage" (Q4) and "does your cooperative have a policy in place for..." (Q3). Improvement would probably come from making a point of re-reading the genko and then doing a read-through of the translation with a fresh mind to catch oddities such as "survey of ... gear shops was also conducted" ("also"?) and "driving into the harbor" (splash?).

Ken Wagner

Several different field-specific conceptual and terminology challenges were hidden in the seemingly innocuous survey questionnaire on marine litter used as this year's Japanese-to-English contest passage. Lodged in deceptively short sentences and often shorter responses were words and ideas from the fields of commercial fishing, aquaculture, Japanese commercial fishing organization management, and marine environmental protection. A considerable amount of leg work would have been required to research each of these areas and render a translation that was appropriate in tone and register as well as technical parlance.

This year's contest finalists deserve praise for extracting the meaning from the questionnaire and its responses and continuing to lead the reader in the right general direction in a manner that was generally pleasant to read. They maneuvered around a couple of confusing typos left in the text, and went through several levels of depth in research to find correct official names and terminology. Admirably, no one took the bait of transferring the down arrow (↓) into English to mean "see below."

In the world of commercial translation, it is still possible to get largely incorrect or incomprehensible translations, so the candidates, none with more than three years experience, are on the right track in their development as translators.

This year's winner, Entry No. 83, produced far-and-away the most accurate and succinctly expressed translation. The evaluation system that I use assigns negative points for errors (e.g., misunderstanding, syntax, technical terminology, register), positive points for displaying subject familiarity or good writing, and has an "artistic impression" score (the general visceral reaction I get from reading the translation after not having seen the Japanese text for a while). Entry No. 83 only had one-half to two-thirds the error points and had two to three times the positive points of the second and place finishers. The translation featured a clean title (Anti-Littering Measures), clear introduction, and smoothly worded questions and responses. Entry No. 83 called bilge water "bilge water" which sounds so much better to my Pacific coast ear than just "bilge," the term used by four of the other six finalists.

The second place winner, Entry No. 25, actually prompted the best visceral reaction when I read the translation after not having seen the Japanese text for a while, and there were considerable fewer error points than the other four finalists.

The third place winner, Entry No. 30, produced the second best visceral reaction when I read it independent of the text, but on closer examination had quite a few errors and clearly fewer positive points for subject familiarity or outstanding writing.

Since Entry No. 83, Entry No. 30, and Entry No. 25 will be immortalized on the translation contest web page, I would like to mention here, before it's too late, that I rated Entry No. 4 slightly above Entry No. 25 and Entry No. 4 was my choice for third place. I found significantly (in a non-statistical sense) fewer errors in Entry No. 4 than Entry No. 25, but the judges eventually agreed that Entry No. 25 edged out Entry No. 4 overall.

A few specific items I might note are:

Certain parts of the English version of the questionnaire could have been more in the register of the fields of fisheries bureaucracy and industry and marine environmental protection bureaucracy. The questionnaire was, after all, issued by a marine activities-regulating bureaucracy to organizations in the fisheries industry. An example of such jargon can be found in [Chapter 18 of the Preliminary Report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy - Governors' Draft](#). Reading a few pages of that will get you in a marine bureaucratic mood in short order. It was on the first page of hits returned by searching [+"marine litter" +"commercial fishing" on Google](#). (Other judges may feel that a general tone is fine for this piece.)

The name of the organization that issued the questionnaire (第十一管区海上保安本部) posed a terminology challenge. Although the Eijiro online dictionary glosses this without the number as "Regional Marine Safety Headquarters," the organization's own website, which can be found by simply pasting the character string into Google, identifies the organization as the 11th Regional Coast Guard Headquarters. The site provides a link to the main Japan Coast Guard page that contains enough English-language information to confirm the current English name is Japan Coast Guard. There is, however, conflicting information on the web as to the name this organization, and Japanese organizations frequently change their English names over time for various reasons, so this simple name presents a bit of a research problem. Two of the six finalists chose the wrong name for this organization. Ironically, the 11th Regional HQ website is the site where the contest passage could be downloaded.

Another terminology challenge, and somewhat of a technical challenge, was what to call the fisheries cooperative associations (漁業協同組合) in the face of some seemingly contradictory evidence on the web.

The Japanese Wikipedia entry for 漁業協同組合 provides a link to a list of all 34 local cooperatives on and around the main island of Okinawa and suggests that the standard English is fisheries cooperative. The webpage of the national federation of local fisheries cooperative associations (JF Zengyoren) mentions both "fisheries cooperatives" and "fisheries cooperative associations" at the local level. However, there is quite a bit of English-language evidence in the form of academic and bureaucratic literature to suggest that "fisheries cooperative association" is the accepted term, including the fact that the abbreviation FCA is accepted. Of the six finalists, two actually used fisheries cooperative association, one used fisheries cooperative, and the other terms used varied from fishermen cooperative societies and fishery cooperative to fishing industry association.

Another interesting challenge was the question (No. 9) on how people disposed of the residue from

cleaning the mozuku nets. The translations of Response No. 2 to this question differed greatly. This response was "2) Haul in the nets, clean them in the drying area, and then flush [hose] the residue back into the water. (回収して網干場で洗浄し海に流している.) The "flush or hose into the water" proved especially troublesome for the finalists, with the top three finalists rendering it as "allowed to flow out to sea," "rinse it in the sea," and "dispose of the residue in the ocean." This conjures up very different mental pictures of the process. I would picture large concrete-paved work areas to lay out gear on, and high-pressure industrial hoses for knocking the residue off and flushing it out to sea. In fact, there is a nice video of a person hosing off a mozuku net on youtube ([watch this](#) or search モズク網洗浄 on youtube). The water is flowing off the edge of the dock, and a couple of swipes with the stream of the hose would get it all back in the ocean.

Regarding the word mozuku itself, most of the six finals either mentioned it was an edible seaweed or provided some type of note describing it and identifying it by scientific name. The contest winner chose to drop the term mozuku entirely, which may have been a judicious editing move, considering the translation instructions given with the passage.

The purpose JAT Translation Contest is to encourage new and aspiring translators with no more than three years of experience. The six finalists produced translations that were clearly superior to those of the other contestants and demonstrated potential for growth in the craft.

I congratulate them for their accomplishment and hope that they will continue to stay active in the field.

Lee Seaman

First, my compliments to the finalists. The overall quality of translation was excellent, and I predict promising careers as professional translators for all of you.

I also complement the organizers of the contest, and particularly the people who selected the test translation. This is a challenging piece, with considerable room for the translator to demonstrate his or her ability to provide a clean, clear, and accurate translation.

Each finalist made at least a few errors. My picks for first and second place were those passages that I felt most clearly communicated the meaning of the Japanese with the fewest errors and areas of potential misunderstanding.

Working premises

I have been a professional translator for over 25 years, and it is not uncommon for clients to have me evaluate a newer translator's work. So I approached these translations from that perspective.

I made two hypothetical assumptions: (1) that this is a commercial translation, performed for a paying client, and (2) that the client wants to know the content of the questionnaire from a technical/scientific perspective (rather than, for example, a scholarly linguistic analysis of the language used in Japanese questionnaires).

Given this perspective, clearly some errors are more important than others. Errors that cause a misunderstanding of content, or that cause the reader to question the validity of the document, are more serious than errors that are simply awkward.

General comments

I would like to focus on three points in the Japanese document that I thought were particularly challenging.

1) ゴミのポイ捨て

Four finalists translated this as "littering", one as "throwing trash into the ocean", and one as "garbage dumping". I found over 500 entries online for "marine littering", which I would recommend in this context.

2) 港内

This was translated as "port" in some cases and "harbor" in other cases. Confusion ensued when translators did not distinguish between "in the port" (meaning within the physical area of the port, including roads, buildings, and trash receptacles), and "in the harbor" (meaning in the water).

Thus, in Question 11-3, "港内に家庭のゴミを捨てているのが現状である" was in some cases translated to imply that families were bringing their garbage to the port facility and dumping it in trash bins there, rather than dumping their garbage directly into the water. My reading of the Japanese is that some people are dumping garbage directly into the water, but there may be a mixture of behaviors (dumping in the water and dumping in the port facility trash receptacles). For a commercial client I would add a translator's note asking for clarification, or use a workaround that does not specify where the garbage is dumped.

3) 港内での釣人のモラルが低い、釣人のマナーが悪いので困っている

This is an excellent example of Japanese words that "look like" they should be English but are actually not. A direct translation of "poor morals" suggests that fishermen are having or promoting illicit sexual encounters at the port or onboard their boats, and "bad manners" suggests rude speech and actions. Refusing to take care of their own garbage and trash would be better described as "irresponsible", "thoughtless", and/or "inconsiderate".

Individual comments

1) No. 83

An elegant and easy-to-read translation. I particularly appreciated the phrasing of the questionnaire elements (for example, "If 'Yes', describe:" is a very readable translation of "いと答えた方はその内容"), and the use of "you". The extra care given to layout contributed to readability.

See comments above regarding "littering" and "manners". Also, "inconsiderateness" would be better rendered as "lack of consideration".

2) No. 25

A very good translation clear and accurate. I particularly appreciated the phrasing "In the second round" for "この調査の第2弾として", and your clear translation of the responses to Question 4.

See comments above for "littering" and "morals and manners". In Question 9-3, your translation of "Clean the net and then let it sink naturally" implies that the net is sinking, rather than the residue cleaned from the net; "let the residue sink naturally" would be clearer. I also wonder if you considered that "口と答えた方はその内容" in Question 6 might be a misprint for "いと答えた方はその内容", which seems to make more sense in the context. In a commercial translation, I would probably add a translator's note here.

Other translations:

No. 04: A good translation, but less clear and somewhat more confusing than the two winners. For example, you reformatted the responses, changing them from bulleted lists to "Those who answered 'Yes' ... " My personal experience is that bulleted lists are generally easier to read and process, particularly at speed. In Response 9-a you wrote "Leave them to sink ... ", which at first made me think you meant the nets. "Leave it to sink ... " is correct if you are referring to the residue. Also, in the second paragraph of the introduction you translated "この調査の第2弾として" as ""The survey was conducted a second time," but actually this is the second round of a single survey, which is important if the client also had the first round translated or might want to consider having it translated. Good catch on the possible typo; I agree.

No. 17: A good translation, and laid out very nicely, but with enough grammar and vocabulary errors that the questionnaire is difficult to read. For example, "dispose the garbage" should be "dispose of garbage", ""extremely worsening" should be "Growing much worse", and "remaining dirt on the fishing nets" should be "residue on the fishing nets" ("dirt" means "earth", and would only be on fishing nets if they were dragged along the ground). I liked your last sentence, "Increasing numbers of people drive to ports to throw away their garbage"; this is a nice workaround of the problem I described above, because it doesn't specify whether the garbage is thrown in the water or dumped on the ground or in garbage receptacles at the port, while still making it clear that there is a problem.

No. 30: A good translation, clear and easy to read, with attractive layout, but some awkward expressions kept me from putting it in my top two. Just for example, "incorrectly throwing away trash" might be better phrased as "improperly disposing of trash". In terms of content, "throwing it away in the port instead of taking it home" implies to me that fishermen are throwing their trash away in receptacles; if that is the case, "at the port" would be more accurate than "in the port". On the other hand, if they are throwing trash directly in the water, "dumping it in the harbor" would be more accurate. You could "write around" this by saying, for example, "leaving it at the port". I prefer your title to simply "littering", but "marine littering" is also a good alternative (see comments above).

No. 79: A good translation, and attractively laid out, but with some errors in content and usage. For example, you translated "この調査の第2弾として" as "the second survey", but "second half of a survey" or "second part of a survey" would be more accurate. Also, in Question 4 you also translated 指導 as "ensure". That implies that the port authorities make sure that owners take their garbage home, rather than simply telling them to do it. I like your title; "garbage dumping" is more accurate in this situation than "littering" in my opinion, although "marine littering" appears to be coming into wide usage.

A final word

Reading these translations, I noticed again what a difference a little extra formatting makes. In today's market, readers are in a hurry. And this is even more the case if the customer is passing the translation on to someone else, whether a news reporter, a prospective stockholder, or an employee at a regulatory agency. To be effective, a good translation needs to be clear and readable as well as accurate and grammatically correct. I recommend that all new professionals invest an hour in their word-processing software, learning to use style sheets. Your clients will thank you.

Again, my congratulations to all contestants on a job well-done.

-END -