norway grants

Project ID:	**7F14047**
Reporting period:	**1. 10. 2014 – 31. 12. 2014**

Evaluation Report of the Project

Recommended outline of opponent s review
1. **Evaluation of project periodic/final report**
2. **Evaluation of activities, outputs and objectives of the project set in the decision on the provision of the institutional support including its annexes** (herein after referred to as "decision")
   a) The progress and results of the project, conceptual clarity of project realization, compliance with project time schedule, achievement of the project objectives set in the decision.
   b) Utilization and exploitation of results of the project (currently and in the future) ...
3. **Evaluation of scientific realization of project**
   a) *The scientific level of the project, professional quality of team, its balance and readiness ...*
   b) *Comparability of project in the Czech Republic and abroad ...*
4. **Assessment of actual incurred expenditure of project**
5. **Requirements on project report modification**
6. **Final evaluation of project**

Surname, first name, degree	Borin, Lars, PhD, Professor of natural language processing
Work place:	University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Statement of opponent:
I declare that I have been given all the necessary information about the project and all the required documents for assessing of this project from the principal investigator, and I was solely driven by objective considerations.

Date:

26th January, 2015

Signature:

Evaluation report: HaBiT (CZ09-7F14047)

Lars Borin / 2015-01-26

This evaluation report concerns the periodic project report covering the first three months (out of a total project duration of 31 months) of the HaBiT project (CZ09-7F14047), i.e., the project activities for the period 2014-10-01–2014-12-31. Given this, this evaluation evidently cannot be very detailed.

Also, since the funding decision is available only in Czech for the time being (according to section 2.5 of the periodic report), I will not be able to comply with the instructions that the report should be evaluated against the "activities, outputs and objectives of the project set out in the decision", but will base this evaluation solely on the periodic report.

1   Evaluation of project periodic report

The report covers all relevant aspects of the initial project period. It is clearly written and well-structured, and it is not difficult to understand what has been achieved in the project during the period covered by the report.

2   Evaluation of activities, outputs and objectives of the project

Given that the HaBiT project has run for a mere three months, the progress and results as presented in the periodical report are in excess of expectations. All scientific project activities are either completed on or – in some cases – ahead of time.

The changed staffing situation at NTNU is understandable, given the circumstances, and adequate plans for dealing with this are presented in the report (section 2.5.3), so that the project can proceed as intended.

The project management activities (section 2.5–2.6) seem entirely reasonable for a project of this size, at this stage in the project, as do the dissemination activities (section 2.9).

3   Evaluation of the scientific realization of the project

The project is timely and fits well with a growing awareness in the international research community of the urgent need to cater for under-resourced languages in the global information society. HaBiT will be able to make a substantial contribution here.

The project team is strong and well-balanced. The group at Masaryk University are internationally renowned especially for their work in computational lexicology. Both the Text Lab (University of Oslo) and the group at Masaryk have a strong track record in the development of sophisticated corpus processing infrastructure. The team at NTNU adds a strong general language-technology research component to the project consortium, as well as concrete experience of work on languages of Ethiopia.

A very positive indicator is the fact that the project has already generated some scientific publications, the four workshop papers listed in section 2.8 of the report.

4   Assessment of actual incurred expenditure of project

The report makes it clear that the project so far has spent less of its budget than originally planned for, due to a four-month delay in the start of the project, with correspondingly less costs incurred. This is satisfactorily made clear in the report, and entirely unproblematic, in my view.

5   Requirements on project report modification

I see no need to modify or revise the present report.

However, for the future, in regard to section 2.7 of the present periodic report, I would like to draw the project team's attention to the fact that sometimes a distinction is made between *open content* (freely accessible, modifiable and redistributable content) and *open access* ([only] freely accessible content). It should be made clearer in the future – perhaps by mentioning concrete license formats – what kind of access will be offered to project output of various kinds.