ICELANDIC LANGUAGE TECHNOLOGY FUND (LTF, Máltæknisjóður) 2016

<u>EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS</u>

Introduction
Each proposal will be assigned to at least 3 reviewers, who will answer each question below to produce a final score for the purpose of placing each proposal in a 1-dimensional list sorting the submitted proposals by (a) merit and (b) appropriateness for support from the Language Technology Fund. Proposals are first evaluated on the Prerequisites of the Fund. Proposals that meet the Prerequisites are evaluated based on four (4) criteria: 1) Relevance to the Icelandic language, 2) Reach/generality, 3) Need, and 4) Likelihood of project meetings its proposed target. Each question for these four criteria weighs equally towards a final score.

PREREQUISITES

Does the proposal describe one (or more) of the following:

1. Method: A research project in which new methods in the field of language technology are developed or known methods adapted for the Icelandic language (spoken or written)?

2. Tools: A research and/or development (R&D) project in which (a) particular language technology tool(s) is/are developed for the Icelandic language (spoken or written)?

3. Application: A project that aims to develop one or more Icelandic language technology tools for use in a particular environment or for a particular use / application?

4. Systems & Data: An infrastructure project, for example the development and maintenance of linguistic databases such as lexica, text and/or sound corpora, etc.in Icelandic?

[ ] Yes. (The proposal qualifies for the LTF. Please fill out remainder of evaluation.) Please provide 1-2 sentences below, summarizing the contribution of the proposed work in the above categories.

[ ] No. (The proposal does not qualify for the LTF. Remaining evaluation not necessary.)

1. RELEVANCE TO THE ICELANDIC LANGUAGE

How central is the Icelandic language in the proposed work?

a. [ ]   Not very central, but important enough to qualify the proposal for the LTF.
b. [ ]   Somewhat central. Language technology and the Icelandic language are important, but the work also involves other unrelated work.
c. [ ]   Very central. The majority of the proposed work focuses exclusively on the Icelandic language.
d. [ ]   Critical. The proposal would be meaningless without the Icelandic language.

   - Explanation / supporting argument(s):

2. REACH / GENERALITY

2-A. How likely is the proposed work to result in increased use of the Icelandic language in information technology systems?

a. [ ]   Somewhat likely.
b. [ ]   Rather likely.
c. [ ]   Very likely.
d. [ ]   Extremely likely.

   - Explanation / supporting argument(s):

2-B. How general-purpose / specific-use is the output of the project likely to be?

a. [ ]   Specialized. (If e.g. the output is an algorithm that detects common grammatical mistakes involving nouns.)
b. [ ]   Somewhat special. (If e.g. the output is a piece of software for spell-checking commonly-used words with possibilities of being extended via online collaboration from the general public.)
c. [ ]   General.
d. [ ]   Very general. (If e.g. the output is a general part-of-speech tagger with a large dictionary.)
e. [ ]   Fundamental. (If e.g. the output is a complete speech recognition system with a large dictionary and low error rate.)

   - Explanation / supporting argument(s):

2-C. What is the potential of the work for producing something that will be used by, or directly benefit, a large number of users?

a. [   ]   Minimal. (If e.g. little or none of the work is planned for public distribution, or e.g. the proposed work will produce a component for a future system that's still missing some necessary parts.)
b. [   ]   Small but notable. (If e.g. some sub-parts of the work will be published, or e.g. specialized components of the technology may be available and of use to other language technology projects, companies or institutions.)
c. [   ]   Good / reasonable. (If e.g. the main results will be published in journals or conferences, or made available in publicly available technology report(s), or e.g. the work will produce a fairly general and deployable tool likely to be of use to a notable proportion of Icelandic-speaking people.)
d. [   ]   Significant / Great. (If e.g. parts of the results / code / technology will be distributed in an open fashion, e.g. open-source code or publicly accessible databases, or e.g. the work will produce a fairly general and deployable tool likely to be of use to a large proportion of Icelandic-speaking people.)
e. [   ]   Excellent / Enormous. (If e.g. well-documented code / technology and scientific papers will be distributed in an open fashion, via for instance open-source code or publicly accessible databases, or e.g. the work will produce general technology likely to be of common use soon - whether standalone or as a component of a larger system - to the whole population of Icelandic speaking users.)

   -   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

3. NEED

Does the project propose knowledge / technology / products / data with significant potential for increasing the use of the Icelandic language in technology / systems?

a. [   ]   Not so much. (If e.g. the project proposes to produce notable but incremental improvements over available knowledge / technology / products / data.)
 b. [   ]   To some extent. (If e.g. the project proposes to produce useful knowledge / technology / products / data.)
c. [   ]   Yes. (If e.g. the project proposes to produce important or critical knowledge / technology / products / data.)
d. [   ]   Absolutely. (If e.g. the project proposes to produce sorely missing knowledge / technology / products / data.)
e. [   ]   Critically so. (If e.g. the project proposes to produce critical non-existent knowledge / technology / products / data.)

   -   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

4. LIKELIHOOD OF PROJECT MEETING ITS PROPOSED TARGET

4-A. In light of the stated goals and objectives, is the proposed work plan and timeline adequate and well described?

a. [ ] No. (If e.g. work plan and timeline are somewhat faulty and unlikely to result in the projected outcome, or descriptions are inadequate.)
b. [ ] Not quite. (If e.g. work plan and timeline leave some key aspects unaddressed, or descriptions are not sufficiently detailed.)
c. [ ] Yes and no. (If e.g. work plan or descriptions address key aspects for the most part but are not sufficient on one or a few important aspects.)
d. [ ] Yes, for the most part. (If e.g. work plan and timeline address key aspects and descriptions leave out only a few details.)
 e. [ ] Very much so. (If e.g. work plan and timeline are convincing and descriptions address all key aspects and most of the key details.)

   -   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

4-B. In light of the stated goals and objectives, is the team adequately put together and adequately described?

a. [ ] No. (If e.g. the team has inadequate knowledge or experience or lack access to the necessary facilities to perform the proposed work, or the description thereof is lacking necessary information.)
b. [ ] Not quite. (If e.g. the team seems to be missing some necessary expertise or access to necessary facilities, or the description thereof is missing some important details.)
c. [ ] Yes and no. (If e.g. the team has adequate expertise but facilities are not convincingly described, or vice versa.)
d. [ ] Rather likely. (If e.g. the team has adequate expertise and access to necessary facilities, and description leave out only a few details.)
e. [ ] Very likely. (If e.g. the team and facilities are adequate and well described, including key details.)

   -   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

6. OTHER COMMENTS

7. CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE BOARD OF THE LTF