



SKOLEEKSAMEN

Autorisasjonsprøve i oversettelse. Prøve 2: Oversettelse fra engelsk til norsk

Dato: 24.04.2025

Tidsrom: 09:00 – 16.00

Antall timer: 7

Koordinator kan kontaktes av eksamensvakt på telefon: 55 95 94 02

TILLATTE HJELPEMIDLER:

I forskrift for translatøreksamen pkt. 2. Utfyllende bestemmelser for § 5 skoleeksamen:

2.6 Teknisk utstyr og hjelpemidler

Det er tillatt å benytte:

- a) alle typer trykte oppslagsverk, filer og programvare lagret lokalt på egen datamaskin, samt internett med unntak nevnt i punkt f.
- b) én ekstern skjerm, i tillegg til én egen bærbar datamaskin. Ekstern skjerm skal være kablet.
- c) eksternt tastatur og mus, så lenge dette utstyret er kablet.

Det er ikke tillatt å:

- d) kommunisere med andre under eksamen, ved f.eks. bruk av e-post, chat, mobiltelefon, skytjenester, o.l.
- e) ha klokke (verken analoge eller digitale), nettbrett og mobiltelefoner tilgjengelig.
- f) benytte noen form for maskinoversettelse eller hjelpemidler som er basert på kunstig intelligens.

Brudd på disse bestemmelsene betraktes som fusk/forsøk på fusk.

Antall sider, inkludert forside: 6

2025 engelsk (økonomisk-administrativ tekst)

Et oversettelsesvalg henger alltid sammen med vurderinger knyttet til det konkrete oversettelsesoppdraget (*translation brief*). Derfor følger her beskrivelsen av et tenkt oppdrag for oversettelse av nedenstående tekst, hentet fra https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6721199c4da1c0d41942a8bd/Corporate_Tax_Roadmap.pdf [sist lastet ned 28.03.2025]

Oversettelsesoppdrag: Den oversatte teksten skal brukes av en bedrift som vurderer å etablere seg i Storbritannia, for å vurdere de skattemessige konsekvensene av en slik etablering.

HM Treasury

Corporate Tax Roadmap

Corporation Tax

Approach

2.1 The government's aim is to make the UK the most attractive major economy in which to invest and do business. The approach set out in this Roadmap reflects the government's view on how the Corporation Tax system can best support this aim, taking account of the latest evidence and engagement with a range of stakeholders.

2.2 The key principles governing how Corporation Tax liabilities are calculated will not undergo major change, providing stability and predictability for taxpayers.

2.3 Central to this approach is a competitive and sustainable main rate of Corporation Tax – which remains the lowest in the G7. This is supplemented by some of the most generous business investment tax reliefs and allowances in the OECD, including capital allowances, R&D reliefs, and the Patent Box – measures which directly incentivise business investment in a targeted and fiscally sustainable manner.

2.4 The UK is also an attractive location for international headquarters and holding companies.

[...]

Corporation Tax base

2.11 The current Corporation Tax base is competitive internationally, with generous treatment of tangible and intangible assets, well-established loss relief rules, and a largely territorial Corporation Tax system. The government commits to keeping this approach in place.

2.12 The current losses regime provides a flexible approach on loss relief for both standalone companies and groups. The government will provide stability by maintaining the key features of the regime.

2.13 While the government acknowledges the arguments that have been put forward for restricting the deductibility of borrowing costs in the light of the introduction of full ->

expensing, it has not seen evidence of material adverse impacts and does not intend to make changes in response.

Territorial structure of Corporation Tax

2.14 With a broad exemption for gains on disposals of substantial shareholdings, a broad exemption for dividends paid to UK companies, and limited withholding taxes on outbound payments, the UK is an attractive location for groups to locate their headquarters or holding companies.

[...]

2025 engelsk (juridisk tekst)

Et oversettelsesvalg henger alltid sammen med vurderinger knyttet til det konkrete oversettelsesoppdraget (*translation brief*). Derfor følger her beskrivelsen av et tenkt oppdrag for oversettelse av nedenstående tekst hentet fra supremecourt.uk/uploads/uksc_2022_0064_judgment_c3d44bb244.pdf. [sist lastet ned 28.03.2025]

Oversettelsesoppdrag: Den oversatte teksten skal brukes i forbindelse med en utredning bestilt av Olje- og energidepartementet.

Judgment

R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) v Surrey County Council and others

[...]

These proceedings

The claim

44. The claimant, who lives near the site and represents an association called the Weald Action Group, has brought this claim for judicial review of the council's decision to grant planning permission for the project. Her primary ground of challenge (and the only one still relevant on this appeal) is that the council did not comply with the obligations imposed by the EIA Directive and the 2017 Regulations because, in carrying out the EIA required for the project, it failed to assess the combustion emissions that will result from the oil to be produced. There are three defendants to the claim, all of whom oppose it. They are the council, the developer and the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

The High Court decision

45. In the High Court, Holgate J dismissed the claim for reasons given in a characteristically clear and comprehensive judgment: [2020] EWHC 3566 (Admin); [2021] PTSR 1160. The judge found, at para 69, that it is impossible to say where the oil produced would be refined or used and whether this would be in the United Kingdom or abroad. [...]

[...]

This Appeal

49. On this further appeal by the claimant, the parties' positions are as follows:

- (i) The claimant contends that, on the proper interpretation of the legislation, the "effects of the project" on climate which the council needed to assess as part of the EIA included the combustion emissions.
- (ii) Two of the defendants - the council and the Secretary of State - invite this court to endorse the analysis of the majority of the Court of Appeal (and alternative approach of the judge) that the council was entitled to decide, as a matter of evaluative judgment, that the combustion emissions were not "effects of the project" on climate.

->

- (iii) The developer submits (as its primary position) that the judge was right to hold that the combustion emissions cannot as a matter of law be regarded as “effects of the project” on climate.

[...]

2025 engelsk (teknisk tekst)

Et oversettelsesvalg henger alltid sammen med vurderinger knyttet til det konkrete oversettelsesoppdraget (*translation brief*). Derfor følger her beskrivelsen av et tenkt oppdrag for oversettelse av nedenstående tekst, et utdrag av en tekst publisert av US Nuclear Regulatory Commission i oktober 2024, hentet fra <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML0318/ML031830809.pdf> [sist lastet ned 28.03.2025]

Oversettelsesoppdrag: Oversettelsen skal brukes av *Norsk Kjernekraft AS* i forbindelse med en informasjonsbrosjyre om atomkraft som en sikker energikilde.

Nuclear Reactor Risk

Background

Potential nuclear power plant accidents have a very small risk of releasing enough radioactivity to affect the public. The NRC further minimizes that risk in several ways. The agency requires U.S. nuclear power plants to have multiple, redundant barriers to contain radioactive material, as well as numerous safety systems, properly trained staff and ongoing testing and maintenance activities. NRC inspectors check on all these areas.

Nuclear power plants are designed to operate safely and protect public health and safety and the environment. Any industrial activity, however, involves some risk. Nuclear reactors keep radioactive material isolated from the environment with several barriers. The first barrier is sealed metal tubes that encase the ceramic uranium fuel pellets. The second barrier is the heavy steel reactor vessel (nine inches to a foot thick) and the piping that carries cooling water to and from the reactor. The third barrier is the heavily reinforced concrete and steel containment building (up to several feet thick) that surrounds the reactor and would hold in radioactivity in the unlikely event a serious accident challenges the first two barriers.

A nuclear power plant uses water to cool its fuel and prevent damage. Diverse and multiple systems at each plant, mostly running on electricity, provide this cooling water. Plants therefore use emergency diesel generators to provide backup electricity if their main power source is lost. In addition, plant operators must keep the plant within safe operating limits and under safe conditions as part of their license. These limits and conditions cover such things as operability of plant equipment, plant operating procedures, periodic equipment testing and maintenance.

Policy, Regulations, and Regulatory Framework

The Commission set nuclear power plant safety goals in a 1986 NRC policy statement, specifying expectations for an acceptably low level of risk to public health and safety. This includes how the risk of cancer fatalities to people near a normally operating nuclear power plant should not exceed 0.1% of the total cancer fatality risks from all other causes.

[...]