



## The MultiTal NLP tool infrastructure

Driss Sadoun, Satenik Mkhitarian, Damien Nouvel, Mathieu Valette

► **To cite this version:**

Driss Sadoun, Satenik Mkhitarian, Damien Nouvel, Mathieu Valette. The MultiTal NLP tool infrastructure. Language Technology Resources and Tools for Digital Humanities, Dec 2016, Osaka, Japan. pp.156 - 163. hal-01425728

**HAL Id: hal-01425728**

**<https://hal-inalco.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01425728>**

Submitted on 9 Jan 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The MultiTal NLP tool infrastructure

Driss Sadoun, Satenik Mkhitarian, Damien Nouvel, Mathieu Valette

ERTIM, INALCO, Paris, France

firstname.lastname@inalco.fr

## Abstract

This paper gives an overview of the *MultiTal* project, which aims to create a research infrastructure that ensures long-term distribution of NLP tools descriptions. The goal is to make NLP tools more accessible and usable to end-users of different disciplines. The infrastructure is built on a meta-data scheme modelling and standardising multilingual NLP tools documentation. The model is conceptualised using an OWL ontology. The formal representation of the ontology allows us to automatically generate organised and structured documentation in different languages for each represented tool.

## 1 Introduction

The work reported in this paper is initiated by INALCO (*National Institute for Oriental Languages and Civilisations*, also called *Langues'O*), a Paris-based institution for teaching and researching. It spans about 95 languages from Central Europe, Africa, Asia, America and Oceania. Historically devoted to the teaching of languages and cultures, INALCO also conducts theoretical and applied research on languages. In the context of globalisation, some new language communities indeed require to access the information-based society and the Internet. Due to the lack of responsive services, these communities have difficulties accessing language resources for their respective languages and are forced to use one of the *lingua franca* already well established on the Internet. As a side-effect, this also raises the risk of language impoverishment. Yet, making those languages exist on the Internet is now a necessary step for the sustainability of language diversity. Language localisation on the Internet is not only an economic issue but also a social and cultural one. Faced with the rapid growth of demand for NLP technologies, we have started the project *MultiTAL* (<http://multital.inalco.fr:2230>) of systemic description of tools processing different languages in order (i) to promote and ease the accessibility of NLP tools, (ii) to document them, (iii) finally, to plan technology transfer from one language to another.

The stakes of such a challenge are many. First, humanities and social sciences have to deal with a deep change given the increasing disaffection of students and young researchers for their disciplines. The digitisation of patrimonial funds and the emergence of new forms of communication, culture and entertainment (gaming, social networks, etc.) help in opening up new research issues. Digital humanities (DH) is the credible response to those changes. INALCO, as one of the main stakeholders in language and culture studies in Europe, faces the gap between, on one hand, the fast evolution of new technology for a few number of cultures, and, the other hand, the richness and diversity of cultures left behind the technological progress. Moreover, economic demand for localisation of products leads us to offer linguistic solutions to solve it (eg. automatic translation).

Thus, complementing the already rich offerings by looking at existing NLP tools, our aim is to offer an easy-access expert service to an accurate and *critical* documentation for a selected set of NLP tools and languages in our scope, rather than providing a long list of tools for well-resourced languages -but not always verified, except by the author.

---

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. License details: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

What we mean by critical documentation is building a general framework and a standard for documentation, and testing its implementation on various NLP tools. In practice, the framework has been designed using an ontology. By formalising and standardising the documentation, we aim first at designing a kind of best practice guideline for tool developers; second, at making it easier for such documentation to be read and set up for new potential beneficiaries i.e. non-expert users, for instance, linguists, students and scholars in DH, but also opinion analysts, companies that aim to enter new foreign markets, etc. - in brief, all the people who have to process foreign languages with weakly documented NLP tools. Thus, we require descriptions to be as concise, understandable and uniform as possible.

We focused first on a set of the so-called Eastern languages: here, Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Hungarian, Japanese, Russian, Tibetan, etc. These languages present major interests for our purpose: they use different writing systems (logographic, alphabetic, etc.) which are also typographic challenges; they come from various linguistic families (Indo-European, Japonic, Semitic, Sino-Tibetan) and, even if for some they are not, strictly speaking, under-resourced languages, the tools for processing them are not always easy to handle.

Another benefit is that properly storing structured information related to NLP tools will greatly facilitate automatic generation of their descriptions. As such, our project is constrained on both aspects: relevant existing information about tools has to be saved into our inventory in order to generate concise and informative documentation.

## 2 Related work

Over the last few years, the number of digitized materials has considerably grown. The willingness to take into account this new digital content has led to the popularization of the use of Language Resources (*LR*) and NLP technologies. However, *LR* are still difficult to find because they are drowned in the mass of web content. Moreover, their documentation is often monolingual and written either in the developers' language (such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese or Russian) or in a *lingua franca* (such as English or French) (cf. section 3.1). This situation makes it difficult for scholars to use or re-use *LR* that could be useful for their work or research. Hence, storing and distributing *LR* has become an issue in itself. This has been addressed by many initiatives all around the world as the CLARIN projet (Váradi et al., 2008), the *Central and South-East European Resources* (CESAR) (VÁRADI and TADIĆ, 2012) which is a part of *META-SHARE* (Piperidis, 2012), the *INESS Norwegian* infrastructure for the construction and exploration of treebanks (Rosén et al., 2012), the large scale database *SHACHI* for collecting *LR* in Asian and Western countries (Tohyama et al., 2008), the *Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities* (Tonne et al., 2013) or the LRE MAP (Calzolari et al., 2012). These initiatives are essential to promote the research and development of language technologies. They also may provide a real picture of tools and resources that are currently available for several languages (Skadina et al., 2013; TADIĆ, 2012; Del Gratta et al., 2014). Collecting and documenting *LR* makes them more accessible. However, regarding NLP tools it does not necessarily makes them more usable. Our approach focuses on detailing NLP tools usage from their installation to their execution.

In order to describe and share *LR*, different meta-data models have been proposed (Gavrilidou et al., 2011; Broeder et al., 2012; McCrae et al., 2015a). The models of each provider depend on their coverage and the kind of *LRs* they manage. Hence, there are as many meta-data models for describing *LRs* as *LR* infrastructures, which may represent a limit for resource sharing and lead to the re-creation of already existing *LR* resources (Cieri et al., 2010). To address this issue, different attempts have been made, such as an initiative for harmonising between *ELRA* and *LDC* catalogs (Cieri et al., 2010) and more recently ontologies were used to devise interconnections among resources (Chiarcos, 2012) or to make meta-data available from different sources under a common scheme (McCrae et al., 2015a; McCrae et al., 2015b). In the perspective of an interoperability between our meta-data model and the existing ones, and in order to ease a possible integration into large infrastructure as *CLARIN* or *META-NET* we chose to use an ontology for storing *MultiTal* infrastructure data. The resulting triple store is accessible and freely available at <http://multital.inalco.fr:2230>.

Most existing *LR* infrastructures focus on EU languages and invite developers of resources or tools

to describe them themselves. Even if it eases access to LR technologies, when it concerns NLP tools it does not necessarily make their use any easier. Indeed, most of the time their usage instructions remain too poorly documented. In our project, we ambition to inventory NLP tools processing written non-*EU* languages or more precisely languages taught at the *INALCO*. In this framework, each NLP tool is identified, tested and fully documented by an intern speaking the language the tool processes. Then, if the tool appears to run correctly its information is stored within our meta data model (ontology) and its resulting documentation is made available. Our aim is to ensure that tools described on *MultiTal* infrastructure can be properly installed and executed by end-users. As *MultiTal*'s end-users may not be language technology experts and their mother tongue may vary, we use an ontology verbalisation method (Androutsopoulos et al., 2014; Cojocaru and Trăușan Matu, 2015; Keet and Khumalo, 2016) detailed in (Sadoun et al., 2016) to automatically produce documentation in multiple languages. So that we provide end-users with simple, structured and organised documents containing NLP tool information and detailing instructions of how to install, configure and run tools fitting their needs.

### 3 MultiTal infrastructure

Nowadays, *language technologies (LT)* make it possible for scholars to analyze millions of documents in multiple languages with very limited manual intervention. However, retrieving and using appropriate *LT* is not always easy. The *MultiTal* infrastructure is designed to help scholars to integrate NLP technology into their activities. This by easing their access to, and their understanding of, NLP tools' usage. Tools described within the infrastructure are those that have been previously tested (cf. section 3.1). The reason is twofold: first, to promote tools that run satisfactorily, given that some of those found on the net are prototypes that may be obsolete or unfinished. Second, a major part of tools are designed by researchers or individuals who are not expert at tool packaging. Hence, even tools that run correctly may be poorly documented and so be difficult to install and execute even for an expert. Testing them allows us to dive into the difficulties that may arise and then formalize within our model (cf. section 3.2) the different steps of installation and execution procedures. Once a tool description is formalized within the ontology, we automatically generate a concise and structured description of the tool containing, among other things, the basic instructions that the user should execute to install and use it (cf. section 3.3).

Figure 1 gives an overall picture of the general data flow of *Multital* project. First, NLP interns speaking different languages capture information about NLP tools from existing web documentation and from what they learned by testing them. The gathered information is filled via a web platform and stored within an ontology. Ontology knowledge is then easily retrievable through a platform that provides fully documented NLP tools' descriptions. Moreover, the conceptualized information serves the automatic generation of multilingual documentations which are freely available for scholars via the *MultiTal* platform.




Figure 1: General data flow of MultiTAL project

#### 3.1 Tool documentation protocol

Over the last years, the number of NLP tools has considerably grown. However, as NLP tools are often developed by lone researchers, in the framework of temporary projects (PhD theses, funded projects)

they do not always follow guidelines and good practices for documenting their tools. Indeed, NLP tool developers are not expert at packaging and promoting their own tools. Thus, most of the produced tools are under-described (often for personal use) and often entirely or mostly described in a monolingual documentation either in developers’ native language or in English. For example, among the selected NLP tools documented in our platform, 77% of them had a documentation available only in a single language (cf. Table 1). Hence, available documentation for NLP tool usage is not always comprehensive or well structured and may be quite complicated for a non-expert which makes it difficult for non native speakers of that language to use the tool. This leads to a limited use of such NLP tools. *MultiTal* project aims at overcoming these drawbacks.

*MultiTal* project is highly multilingual by nature as it is aimed at scholars working on various languages: our assumption is that NLP tools processing a (or various) language(s) should provide well formed documentation for multiple languages to facilitate and foster their use. Indeed, it often happens that scholars want to use NLP tools for processing documents written in a language they do not fluently speak.

Within our framework, NLP Tools are selected for a given language and according to the NLP tasks they perform. We consider any repositories from academic, institutional or personal websites. Before being added to our inventory, each NLP tool is tested in order to ensure that it can be installed and executed properly. Table 1 shows that more than a half of tested tools were not kept by our interns. NLP tools processing a language are systematically tested by an intern speaking that language. Testing is a very valuable step because it allows for instance the intern to check on which operating systems (OS) the tool can run and which are the requirements to make it run correctly. The intern may have the possibility to offer some simple patches if the tool has bugs that can be easily fixed, as for instance: adding encoding declaration, correcting typos in the execution command or in function names, pinpointing intermediate steps omitted in the original documentation, etc. Moreover, it can detail installation and execution procedures as atomic instructions that end-users must perform in order to run the documented tool. Then, all gathered information is entered via a web platform and stored in an ontology that formalises our meta-data model. For example, our Russian intern retrieved 13 tools processing Russian (cf. Table 1), 9 of them were documented only in Russian. For each of them, the intern has tested their installation and execution procedures and their ability to actually process Russian. Then she provided detailed and structured information which is formalised according to our meta-data model (cf. section 3.2) which enables us to automatically generate documentation from the model in multiple languages -such as English and French (cf. section 3.3).

Language	selected	rejected	Monolingual documentation	Multilingual documentation
Arabic	25	15	20	5
Chinese	16	34	15	1
Hindi	14	4	14	0
Hungarian	3	0	3	0
Japanese	14	19	6	8
Marathi	3	0	0	3
Russian	13	15	9	4
Tibetan	4	7	4	0
Total	92	94	71	21

Table 1: NLP tools documentation within the platform.

### 3.2 MultiTal meta-data model

To be effective, our meta-data model of NLP documentation should contain all the information needed by an NLP tool user. The kinds of information that should be included in tool documentation is typically those that should be include in a *ReadMe* file: a simple and short written document that is distributed along with a piece of software. It is written by the developer and is supposed to contain basic, crucial

information that the user should know before running the software. Writing a clear *Readme* file is essential for effective software distribution and use: a confusing one could prevent the user from using the tool. To our knowledge there are no established best practices for writing a *ReadMe*. So, in order to determine what kinds of information should be included, we proceeded to a joint study of:

1. NLP tool documentation for various languages (Chinese, English, French, Japanese, Tibetan, Hindi, Russian, etc.) that we have already tested.
2. Structured *ReadMe* files (more than fifty thousands) crawled from GitHub repositories.
3. Other meta-data models as *META-SHARE* (Gavriliadou et al., 2011) or *CMDI* (Broeder et al., 2012).

This study allowed us to identify the most frequent and pertinent information used to document an NLP tool. We based the conceptualization of the ontology representing our meta-data model on these results. As done for the *META-SHARE* and *CMDI* meta-data models, we define bundles of properties (super properties). These properties define the characteristics of an NLP tool such as its name, its date of creation, its *affiliation* (author, institution, project), its *licence*, the system *configuration* on which it could run, its *installation* procedures or the *tasks* it performs, etc. Figure 2 details the conceptualized bundles of properties, together with examples of some sub-properties for the bundles *Affiliation* and *Task*. Currently, the ontology contains 46 *concepts*, 52 *object properties* and 167 *data type properties*.




Figure 2: A piece of the ontology properties

We distinguish two levels of meta-data: a *mandatory level* which provides everything the user should know before using the tool, i.e. basic elements that will commonly form a *ReadMe* ; and a *non mandatory level* that contains descriptions which could be helpful to relate the tool to other tools, labs, methods or projects. Properties depicted in Figure 2 are all of the *mandatory level*.

The originality of the proposed model is that it focuses on NLP tools usage. The aim is to promote the use of language technologies within communities which are not familiar with their use. Hence, the model is task- and language-oriented as the choice of an NLP tool depends mostly on these two features. As a result, tools are characterized by the tasks they can perform on a given language. Indeed, tools may perform different NLP tasks and for the same tool processed languages may vary according to each task. Moreover, a task may have several execution procedures depending on the targeted language, the *OS*, the system configuration, the terminal or graphical mode and so on. In addition, a tool may have several installation procedures which depend also on the same factors. These procedures represent the core information for running a tool. As they can be long and tedious, it is important to describe them in a simple and comprehensive way. To do so, in our conceptual model, both installation and execution procedures are divided in their atomic instructions. Thus, when an intern enters a new procedure via the web platform, the procedure is split into atomic instructions. Each instruction is then conceptualised as triple <subject - **property** - object>. Figure 3 depicts an example of how an installation procedure ( $IP_i$ ) of the *Morphological Analyzer & Stemmer Darwish* is conceptualised within the ontology. First, the procedure is split into its atomic instructions (on the left of the figure). Then each instruction is

conceptualised as a semantic triplet (on the middle of the figure). In addition, instructions of a procedure are numbered in order to be ordered when translated from the ontology to a documentation in a targeted language. As for the French translation depicted on the right part of the figure. Indeed, the final aim is to provide end-users structured multilingual documentation detailing the different installation and execution procedures that an NLP tool may be characterised by. The automatic generation of multilingual documentation is discussed in the next section.

The produced ontology is downloadable and queryable via *SPARQL* from the *MultiTal* infrastructure interface. From a medium-term perspective, we plan to provide automatically generated executable scripts for tools installation and execution for different OS. Moreover, *SPARQL* queries allows us to identify compatible NLP tools in terms of tasks, languages, OS, inputs, outputs, etc. -such that they can be associated in parallel or in pipeline to improve or compare their performance.




Figure 3: Conceptualisation of an installation procedure for the NLP tool *Darwish*.

### 3.3 Automatic generation of multilingual documentation

Before using any tool, it is generally recommended and sometimes unavoidable to read its documentation. To be understandable, this documentation should indeed be in a language that the user can read. When it comes to software products, this documentation is often called a *ReadMe* file (cf. Section 3.2).

In our framework, we focus on NLP tools processing languages that are taught at INALCO. These languages are for most of them not *lingua franca*. Till now, for the eight languages we investigated, 77% of the selected tools were documented only in the developer’s mother tongue or in English (cf. Table 1). Otherwise, a version in English or French was also available. So, in order to ease and improve the experience of end-users, the *MultiTal* infrastructure aims at providing multilingual documentation for NLP tools processing different languages. To do so, we use an ontology verbalisation approach detailed in (Sadoun et al., 2016) that benefits from the formalization of NLP tools information to automatically generate multilingual *ReadMe* files that contain simplified and structured information about each tool such as its license, its installation, execution or training instructions or the language it processes etc.

### 3.4 MultiTal infrastructure in practice

The *MultiTal* project is conducted at the *INALCO* institution which is a crossroads for Languages and Civilizations. It hosts students, lecturers and researchers of several disciplines from all around the world practicing almost one hundred different languages. Many of these scholars are confronted to a constantly increasing number of digitized data, so that the use of NLP technologies becomes more and more valuable for their practice. *MultiTal* infrastructure is dedicated to making such technologies more accessible regardless of the expertise or spoken language of end-users.

Currently, the infrastructure contains documentation for 92 NLP tools. These documented tools perform 202 NLP tasks of 46 different types. They are distributed across more than eight languages as some of them process more than one language. Though, for each tool a distinction is made between the languages it manages that have been tested and those that have not been tested yet.

The *MultiTal* infrastructure website is currently available in seven languages (English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic and Japanese.). Figure 4 shows a fragment of the research interface. Selection of tools can be made according to the NLP task they perform, the language they manage, their developer(s), their institution, the way they are accessible (downloadable, on-line or web-service), etc. In addition, NLP tools’ documentation inventory gives us key information and statistics. For example,




Figure 4: List of task types (in French) performed by the documented NLP tools.




Figure 5: Distribution of NLP tasks performed by documented NLP tools.

the Pie chart depicted in Figure 5 details the distribution of NLP tasks performed by all the documented tools. On the chart, we can see the eight most performed tasks. We can also produce statistics regarding each language (or family) of languages to see, for example, how advanced those languages are in terms of NLP processing and whether they are under-resourced languages or not.

Finally, we count on *INALCO*'s scholars diversity to make the infrastructure grow. Our scholars will both have the benefit of the multilingual NLP documentation provided by the *MultiTal* infrastructure and the opportunity to help us to make it evolve.

## 4 Conclusion

For a typical scholar, finding NLP tools relevant to their need is not as easy as it should be. Even when relevant NLP tools are found it appears that they are not that simple to use. The *MultiTal* infrastructure is initiated to overcome this situation. In this paper, we described the *MultiTal* infrastructure meta-data model based on the use of an ontology. We motivated our choice which aims to ease and foster the use of NLP tools by scholars of different disciplines. In a short term perspective, we plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the produced documentation, to see whether it provides all the needed information and if it is easy to follow for non NLP experts.

In the future, by considering the produced expertise about NLP tools, we ought to be able to develop methods for adapting some of the tools to languages they have not been designed for, by training them. Indeed, alongside tool identification, we collect information about tagged corpora in order to use them as training ones. Finally, the formalisation of execution procedures into their atomic instructions already allows us to run execution scripts. We intend to use these scripts to combine the execution of different NLP tools either in pipelines or in parallel in order to compare and/or increase their performance.



## References

- Ion Androutsopoulos, Gerasimos Lampouras, and Dimitrios Galanis. 2014. Generating natural language descriptions from OWL ontologies: the naturalowl system. *CoRR*, abs/1405.6164.
- Daan Broeder, Dieter Van Uytvanck, Maria Gavrilidou, Thorsten Trippel, and Menzo Windhouwer. 2012. Standardizing a component metadata infrastructure. In *the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012)*, pages 1387–1390. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- N. Calzolari, R. Del Gratta, G. Francopoulo, J. Mariani, F. Rubino, I. Russo, and C. Soria. 2012. The LRE map. Harmonising Community Descriptions of Resources. In *LREC*, pages 1084–1089.
- Christian Chiarcos. 2012. Ontologies of linguistic annotation: Survey and perspectives. In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*.
- Christopher Cieri, Khalid Choukri, Nicoletta Calzolari, D Terence Langendoen, Johannes Leveling, Martha Palmer, Nancy Ide, and James Pustejovsky. 2010. A road map for interoperable language resource metadata.
- Dragoş Alexandru Cojocaru and Ştefan Trăuşan Matu. 2015. Text generation starting from an ontology. In *Proceedings of the Romanian National Human-Computer Interaction Conference - RoCHI*, pages 55–60.
- Riccardo Del Gratta, Francesca Frontini, Anas Fahad Khan, Joseph Mariani, and Claudia Soria. 2014. The Iremap for under-resourced languages. *CCURL 2014: Collaboration and Computing for Under-Resourced Languages in the Linked Open Data Era*, page 78.
- Maria Gavrilidou, Penny Labropoulou, Stelios Piperidis, G Francopoulo, M Monachini, F Frontini, Victoria Arranz, and Valérie Mapelli. 2011. A metadata schema for the description of language resources (Irs). *Language Resources, Technology and Services in the Sharing Paradigm*, page 84.
- C. Maria Keet and Langa Khumalo. 2016. Toward a knowledge-to-text controlled natural language of isizulu. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 1–27.
- John P. McCrae, Penny Labropoulou, Jorge Gracia, Marta Villegas, Víctor Rodríguez-Doncel, and Philipp Cimiano, 2015a. *The Semantic Web: ESWC 2015 Satellite Events*, chapter One Ontology to Bind Them All: The META-SHARE OWL Ontology for the Interoperability of Linguistic Datasets on the Web, pages 271–282.
- J.P. McCrae, P. Cimiano, V.R. Doncel, D. Vila-Suero, J. Gracia, L. Matteis, R. Navigli, A. Abele, G. Vulcu, and P. Buitelaar. 2015b. Reconciling Heterogeneous Descriptions of Language Resources. *ACL-IJCNLP*, page 39.
- Stelios Piperidis. 2012. The meta-share language resources sharing infrastructure: Principles, challenges, solutions. In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*.
- Victoria Rosén, Koenraad De Smedt, Paul Meurer, and Helge Dyvik. 2012. An open infrastructure for advanced treebanking. In *META-RESEARCH Workshop on Advanced Treebanking at LREC*, pages 22–29.
- Driss Sadoun, Satenik Mkhitarian, Damien Nouvel, and Mathieu Valette. 2016. Readme generation from an owl ontology describing nlp tools. In *2nd International Workshop on Natural Language Generation and the Semantic Web at INLG*.
- Inguna Skadina, Andrejs Vasiljevs, Lars Borin, Krister Lindén, Gyri Losnegaard, Bolette Sandford Pedersen, Roberts Rozis, and Koenraad De Smedt. 2013. Baltic and nordic parts of the european linguistic infrastructure. In *Proceedings of the 19th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics (NODALIDA 2013)*, pages 195–211.
- Tamás VÁRADI and Marko TADIĆ. 2012. Central and south-east european resources in meta-share. In *24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, page 431.
- Hitomi Tohyama, Shunsuke Kozawa, Kiyotaka Uchimoto, Shigeki Matsubara, and Hitoshi Isahara. 2008. Construction of a metadata database for efficient development and use of language resources.
- D. Tonne, J. Rybicki, S.E. Funk, and P. Gietz. 2013. Access to the daria bit preservation service for humanities research data. In *Parallel, Distributed and Network-Based Processing (PDP), 21st Euromicro International Conference*, pages 9–15.
- Tamás VÁRADI and Marko TADIĆ. 2012. Central and south-east european resources in meta-share. In *24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 431–437.
- Tamás Váradi, Peter Wittenburg, Steven Krauwer, Martin Wynne, and Kimmo Koskenniemi. 2008. Clarin: Common language resources and technology infrastructure. In *6th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2008)*.