

**Identifikační kód projektu/Project ID:** 7F14047

**Doba implementace/Implementation period:** 1. 10. 2014 – 30. 4. 2017

## **Závěrečný oponentní posudek** **Final Evaluation Report**

Povinná osnova závěrečného oponentního posudku (tj. body 1-5). Posudek k výzkumnému projektu musí být vypracován **v anglickém jazyce**/The mandatory outline of the final evaluation report of the project (points 1-5). The report must be filled out in English.

<b>1. Zhodnocení dosažení plánovaných cílů a výsledků stanovených v právním aktu v době řešení projektu/Evaluation of achievement of the planned objectives and outcomes set in the project contract during the project implementation.</b>
Komentář (min. 300 znaků)/Comment (min. 300 characters): In my view, the project has more than achieved its goals as set out in the original project proposal (2014-01-27) and the proposal for additional research activities (2016-03-10). Its publication output has been impressive, and the tools and resources developed in the project have been made freely available so that further research and development can build on the results of the project without artificial and unnecessary obstacles, thus serving these under-resourced language communities in the best possible way.
<b>2. Zhodnocení kvality vědeckého publikování vzešlého z projektu/Evaluation of the scientific publications originated from the project.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Outstanding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Unsatisfactory Komentář (min. 300 znaků)/Comment (min. 300 characters): The publication output of the project is of high quality as well as prolific (well in excess of one publication per project month). It includes a number of high-profile international conference publications (ACL conferences and workshops, RANLP, TSD), a couple of articles in respected journals, and also contributions to conferences and workshops focusing on particular under-resourced languages. Apart from advancing the state of the art of the growing field of under-resourced language technology as well as language processing of social-media content, the project also makes a notable contribution to a so far relatively little acknowledged but much-needed methodological discussion on evaluation practices in language technology.
<b>3. Zhodnocení Závěrečné zprávy o řešení projektu a požadavky na úpravy či doplnění Závěrečné zprávy o řešení projektu/Evaluation of the Final Project Report and requirements on modifications and completion of the Final Project Report.</b>
Komentář (min. 300 znaků)/Comment (min. 300 characters): The final project report conveys in a clear and concise manner what the outcomes of the project have been, putting them in relation to the original project goals. As far as I am able to judge, there are no unclarities or questions raised in the mind of the reader. Therefore, I do not see a need for any modifications of or additions to the final report, but recommend that it be accepted as-is.
<b>4. Závěrečné celkové hodnocení celého projektu včetně nesouhlasných názorů/Final overall evaluation of the whole project including dissenting views.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Outstanding <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Unsatisfactory Komentář (min. 300 znaků)/Comment (min. 300 characters): The project represents an impressive achievement, as already noted above. My one possible reservation concerns integration. Looking through the publication output of the project, I note a distinct lack of publications with co-authors from more than one of the collaborating groups. Both the MU group and the NTNU group have produced high-quality scientific outputs that in all cases conform to and promote the project goals as set out in the project proposal; there is no question in my mind about this. However, a collaborative project of this kind should ideally exhibit a greater degree of

integration in its outputs, and the lack of this mars the overall impression somewhat. This is something that the project partners may want to consider in planning future collaborations (I know from my own practical – negative – experiences that in order for this to come about, it requires active attention on the part of the project coordinators).

**5. Byl projekt dokončen podle právního aktu? Vyberte jednu z možností Ano, či Ne/ Was the project completed according to the project contract? Choose Yes, or No.**

☒

**ANO/YES**

☐

**NE/NO**

Komentář (min. 300 znaků). Pokud NE, uveďte konkrétně/Comment. If NO, specify (min. 300 characters):

**Příjmení, jméno, titul oponenta/Surname, first name, degree of the opponent:**

**Borin, Lars, PhD (professor of NLP)**


**Pracoviště/Work place:** University of Gothenburg, Sweden

**Čestné prohlášení oponenta/Statement of the opponent:**

**Čestně prohlašuji, že mi byly řešitelem projektu včas poskytnuty všechny potřebné informace a předloženy mnou požadované doklady a při posuzování tohoto projektu jsem se řídil(a) výhradně objektivními hledisky./I hereby declare that I have been given all the necessary information about the project and all the required documents for assessment of this project from the principal investigator, and I was solely driven by objective considerations.**

**Datum/Date:** 22 June 2017

**Místo/Place:** Gothenburg



**(e-)Podpis/(e-)Signature:**