norway grants

Project ID:	**7F14XXX**
Reporting period:	**01. 01. 2015 – 31. 12. 2015**

Annex V - Evaluation Report of the Project

Mandatory outline of opponent´s review (for writing the evaluation, please, use the headings 1-6).

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** (hereinafter 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 NLP)**
Work place: University of Gothenburg
Statement of opponent: I hereby 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:** 25th January 2016   **(e-)Signature:**

Evaluation report: HaBiT (CZ09-7F14047)

Lars Borin / 2016-01-25

This evaluation report concerns the periodic project report covering the year 2015, or months 4–15 (out of a total project duration of 31 months) of the HaBiT project (CZ09-7F14047), i.e., the project activities for the period 2015-01-01–2015-12-31.

I have not seen "the decision on the provision of the institutional support including its annexes" mentioned under numbered point 2 in the instructions for this report. For this reason, I will base my evaluation exclusively on the periodic report itself and the material avaliable on the HaBiT project website <http://www.habit-project.eu/>.

1   Evaluation of project periodic report

The report covers all relevant aspects of the project period reported on. 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

As far as I can ascertain from the report and the information available on the project website, the HaBiT project is on track. Milestones and deliverables have been achieved more or less as planned. There are some small deviations, but they actually go both ways: There have been some delays, but also some earlier achievement/delivery dates.

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 promotion and information activities (section 2.9).

It is stated explicitly in the report that resources and tools are to be made "open access" (section 2.7) or "openly accessible" (section 2.5). As the term "open access" in practice is used to mean different things in different contexts, it would be good if both the reports and the website could provide pointers to the resources and tools being developed in the project as well as provide the actual licenses for these (preferably widely used standard licences, e.g., some Creative Commons or CLARIN license for resources and MIT, BSD, GPL, or the like for tools). Perhaps it would suffice to simply publish the relevant portions of the "Technology Management Plan" (referred to in section 2.7, but not available to me).

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 is obviously making a substantial contribution here. A very positive indicator of this is the fact that the project has generated a respectable number of scientific publications, including some in high-profile international venues (section 2.8).

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 devel-

opment 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.

I note with approval that the project consortium is actively endeavoring to extend the cooperation beyond the initial group (section 2.10).

4   Assessment of actual incurred expenditure of project

The small and well-motivated adjustments to the budget described in the report (section 3) are entirely unproblematic, in my view.

5   Requirements on project report modification

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