Association for Computational Linguistics

2001 Annual Reports

July 2, 2001

Contents

1 ACL management

1.1 President's report – Eduard Hovy

President's Report
Edouard Hovy

In the near-decade since Don Walker's passing, the ACL has undergone an almost continual series of changes. Mostly the changes were required to make the Association run more smoothly. Many of them resulted form the fact that except for the Business Office manager, all its operations are performed by volunteers, often inexperienced, all with limited time.

The first phase of these changes focused simply on understanding how to run the Association: how the bank accounts were managed, how conferences were initiated and managed, even just where the archives were. In 1996, a report written by Eduard Hovy and Kathy McCoy (available at http://www.aclweb.org/archive/HovyReport.html) outlined a number of problems plaguing the Association, and recommended changes. Over subsequent years, many of these problems were addressed: ACL now has a North American Chapter, and is in discussion with several NLP associations and groups in Asia about forming some kind of regional presence there; elections for ACL officers now have more than one candidate per position; the VP-Elect position provides a longer training runway for the eventual President; the position of Secretary-Treasurer has been split into two, and so on.

Throughout this time, despite a period of decline in membership, the ACL has remained financially and interpersonally healthy, and has succeeded in maintaining its conference series as the venue of choice for a growing number of different research directions.

Still, certain challenges have arisen, and other long-standing challenges remain. I list some of the ones addressed over the past year, or currently being dealt with.

1. Bank accounts for chapters and SIGs. Although ACL funds are administered centrally, certain political reasons make it necessary for chapters (and eventually, other affiliated groups) to hold some funds independently. In addition, chapters and SIGs that bring in funds (through conferences, workshops, etc.) need to have the amounts recorded, for their subsequent use. The Executive is in the process of formalizing 'shadow accounts' for this purpose.

2. Relationships between the International ACL and its chapters (and potential later affiliations). The specifics of the duties and powers of the chapter Boards, especially with regard to chapter conferences, has been formalized. The policy will be posted on the ACL website.

3. Conference organization. As our conferences grow larger and more diverse, it is becoming increasingly difficult to organize them, especially for volunteers who may not have had similar experiences before. A Conference Organizing Handbook has been compiled and is being maintained and updated with recent experiences; it will be posted on the ACL website soon.

4. DARPA HLT conferences. Last year, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency DARPA revived its Human Language Technology conference series, but decided to make them open technical conferences, rather than closer fundee meetings. As a result, the meetings have come into direct competition with the conferences of the North American chapter NAACL. Negotiations are underway among DARPA, the NAACL Board, and the ACL Executive, in order to try to merge the two meetings whenever an NAACL conference is held.

Other challenges remain.

1. COLING. The ACL's more explicitly international orientation, and the broadening of its conference into parallel tracks and a wider range of topics, has made it resemble the COLING conferences much more closely. While these changes have helped stem the drift of members from ACL, they raise the question of how the ACL and COLING conferences relate. Discussions between the ACL Executive and the ICCL, the self-perpetuating body that oversees COLING, were begun in 2000 and are still underway.

2. Outreach to Asia. The ACL Executive recently decided to reach out explicitly to Asia, whose considerable Computational Linguistics has traditionally been represented much more at COLING conferences. The fist ACL conference in Asia was held last year, and the international ACL conference will be held there every third year. Although an ACL chapter for Asia is unlikely in the near future for several reasons, researchers in Asia have formed an umbrella organization for the sharing of Asian-language resources. A representative of this organization acts as liaison with the ACL Executive.

3. Outreach to related research fields. For a long time, ACL has acted as if it lived in a vacuum. So have a number of related technical associations. By however creating explicit links with the organizations as SIGIR, ISCA, IAMT, and the groups of people organizing related conferences, including ICASSP, PACLING, RANLP, TMI, etc., we cxan promote the spread of ideas and the connection of software to our mutual benefit. ACL has entered into discussions of reciprocity with ISCA and AMTA, and should continue with the other organizations as well.

4. Greater visibility to the public. The recent blossoming of language-related companies on the internet has underscored the importance of Computational Linguistics. At present, ACL has no organized method of publicizing the aims, work, and achievements of its members, of computational linguists at large. The benefits of such publicity range from more new students and increased funding for research to, eventually, greater impact on society. This is a matter that has to be addressed.

It is with considerable pleasure that I can report that the ACL is in a good and healthy state, thanks especially to the very hard work of the members of recent ACL Executives (particularly of Kathy McCoy, the former Secretary-Treasurer and current Treasurer), of the volunteers who organized our past conferences, and of Priscilla Rasmussen, who runs our Business Office in exemplary fashion.

Eduard Hovy, President
Marina del Rey, California
June 2001

1.2 Secretary's report – Sandra Carberry

ACL Secretary's Report
Sandra Carberry

The ACL Board met on January 20, 2001 in New Jersey. Minutes are posted on the web site in the ACL archive.

There is a need for better documentation of ACL policies, practices, and procedures. The following work is underway:

1. Conference Handbook:
   Ed Hovy compiled a draft conference handbook which is being updated to include suggestions and practices from recent conferences. This will be posted on the web and be accessible to conference organizers.
2. ACL Policies:
   A set of written policies are being collected and will be posted on the ACL web site.
3. ACL Practices:
   Although not formal policies that must be adhered to, there are certain common practices within ACL. These are being compiled and will be posted on the web.
4. ACL officer duties:
   To help new ACL officers benefit from the insight of former officers, each current officer is compiling a list of his or her duties, along with strategic dates, standard procedures, and recommendations.

A revised election procedure is being followed this year.
The slate of candidates proposed by the Executive Committee will be announced at the ACL business meeting and will be posted on the web site. Nominations from the membership will be accepted until Friday, August 10. (The Constitution requires a 1 month period for additional nominations.) Statements from the candidates will be posted on the web by Thursday, August 16 and electronic voting will begin on Monday, August 20. Voting will end at 5pm on Friday, September 21.

1.3 Treasurer's report – Kathleen F. McCoy

Treasurer's Report
Kathleen F. McCoy

[Report not available]

1.4 ACL European Chapter Chair – Donia Scott

EACL REPORT
Donia Scott (Chair), John Carroll (Secretary)

1. Constitution

A new EACL constitution has been approved by the Board and ratified by the membership. It regularises a number of financial and organisational issues relating to the management of the Chapter, and adds a new post, the "Chair-elect", to give a newly elected Chair some experience of the running of the Chapter before he/she actually takes over. The result of the membership ballot was 59 votes in favour and 1 against. The new constitution now awaits final approval by the ACL Executive Committee.

2. Conference Schedule

According to a schedule decided last year, there will be an international ACL conference in Europe every 3 years, hosted jointly with EACL. Given this, EACL conferences will no longer be held biennially, but triennially, coincident with the year that the International ACL is in Asia. This means that there will be a computational linguistics conference in Europe held under the auspices of ACL two out of every three years.

3. EACL'03

The next meeting of the EACL will be in 2003. We issued a Call for Bids on 9 Mar 2001 (repeated on 29 Mar), the deadline

for which was June 15. We have received three very interesting bids: from Budapest, Heidelberg and Trento. We hope to be able to report on the chosen site in Toulouse.

4. Sponsorships

EACL continues to sponsor an introductory or foundational course in computational linguistics at the ESSLLI Summer School. At ESSLLI'2001, which this year will be in Helsinki, we are sponsoring "An Introduction to Computational Semantics" by Patrick Blackburn and Johan Bos. Members of EACL will be eligible for discounted registration at ESSLLI.

5. Newsletter

We have started a biannual newsletter to all EACL members, reporting on the activities of the Chapter. The first issue, edited by Claire Gardent, went out on 22 June 2001.

6. Student Board

EACL has recently formed a Student Board whose role is to generally assist the senior Board in carrying out EACL-related tasks.
In a first phase, the Student Board will concentrate on two main tasks: the extension and maintenance of the EACL web site, and the organisation of the EACL conference Student Session. The current board is composed of: Malte Gabsdil (University of Saarbruecken), Jon Herring (University of Brighton), and Julia Hockenmaier (University of Edinburgh).

Addendum: Report from EACL secretary (John Carroll)

This report covers organisational and internal matters that are not covered in the main EACL report.

1. Board Members and Responsibilities

As of 1 January 2001 the membership of the EACL Board (with areas of responsibility noted) is as follows:

Chair: Donia Scott
Secretary: John Carroll
Treasurer: Mike Rosner

Conference (ACL'01 Toulouse): Philippe Blache

Education and training:
ESSLLI, ELSNET, etc: Mike Rosner

Euromasters in Language and Speech: Hans Uszkoreit
Industrial liaison: Piek Vossen & Hans Uszkoreit

Outreach:
East-west (Central / Eastern Europe): Tomaz Erjavec
North-south (North Africa / Middle East): Philippe Blache

Publicity:
News: Claire Gardent
Web site: Mike Rosner

2. Domain Name

EACL has registered a domain name, eacl.org, pre-paid for 10 years. The following emails @eacl.org are redirected to the relevant board member(s):

board
chair
chairperson
comments
newsletter
secretary
treasurer
webmaster

3. New EACL Conference Schedule

With the agreed 3-year rotation cycle of ACL conferences between the three "international zones" (Europe, North America, Asia), the Board has decided to change the schedule of EACL conferences from a biennial to a triennial cycle, with the next conference being in 2003. So the schedule of EACL and ACL conferences in Europe for the next 10 years is:

2001	ACL/EACL, Toulouse
2003	10th Meeting of the EACL (call for bids to host out now)
2004	ACL/EACL, Europe
2006	11th Meeting of the EACL
2007	ACL/EACL, Europe
2009	12th Meeting of the EACL
2010	ACL/EACL, Europe

4. Constitution Vote

The new EACL constitution regularises a number of financial and organisational issues relating to the management of the Chapter, and adds a new post, the "Chair-elect", to give a newly elected Chair some experience of the running of the Chapter before he/she actually takes

over. In summary, changes from the old constitution are:

Sections added:
- Registered Office
- Financial Management
- Dissolution

Other main changes:
- the name "ACL / EUROPE" is replaced with "EACL"
- the former "Advisory Committee" is now called the "Board"
- the Chair-elect becomes an ex-officio member of the Board
- apart from the officers and the Chair-elect, the Board contains 4 (rather than 3) Chapter members
- no Board member (apart from the Treasurer) may serve more than 2 terms in any single office, and no longer than 6 consecutive years on the Board
- members of the Nominating Committee are elected from the outgoing Board
- membership of the Chapter is automatic for ACL members in the Middle East and Africa

The new constitution had to be ratified by the membership of the European Chapter, so a ballot was held, conducted by email, between 19 April and 19 June 2001. Members could register a "Yes" vote, by sending an email to new-constitution-yes@eacl.org, or a "No" vote by an email to new-constitution-no@eacl.org. There were no problems reported with the ballot. The final result was 59 votes in favour, 1 against, out of a total of some 480 Chapter members at the time of the ballot. The new constitution now awaits final approval by the ACL Executive Committee.

5. Sponsorships

In 2000, EACL sponsored the ESSLLI course ‘An Introduction to Grammar Engineering using HPSG’ given by Ann Copestake and Rob Malouf. The amount was 2,006 euros, covering travel and accommodation costs for one of the two lecturers. In return for sponsorship, members of EACL got a reduced registration fee at ESSLLI.

EACL was also a sponsor of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Language Engineering for Lesser-Studied Languages, July 2000, held at Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. Amount: 1,945 euros.

1.5 ACL European Chapter Treasurer – Mike Rosner

ACL EUROPEAN ACCOUNT
Mike Rosner

I. SWISS CURRENT ACCOUNT AS AT 31.12.2000

31.12.1999   17,959.82

INCOME

eacl99	11,228.05
pubs	2,656.71
dues	2,316.55
mail	468.20
interest	109.75
late fee	32.50
overpay	872.90
total	17,684.66

EXPENSES

Sponsorship	-3,054.55
Charges	-357.90
total	-3,412.45
net change	14,272.21
31.12.2000	32,232.03

II. FRENCH CURRENT ACCOUNT AS AT 31.12.2000

	FF	Euro
01.01.1999	66,338.95	10,113.31

INCOME

interest	3,127.84
dues	3,046.00
pubs	510.33
donation	181.88
mail	100.00
late fee	100.00
total	7,066.05

EXPENSES

Sponsorship	-12,756.75
Charges	-30.44
total	-12,787.19
net change	-5,721.14

31.12.2000	60,617.81	9,241.13

III. END OF YEAR STATEMENT OF ASSETS

Date	All Swiss CHF	All Swiss EUR	French FF	French EUR	TOTAL EUR
31.12.95	164,340	102,427	54,683		
31.12.96	183,317	114,255	59,740		
31.12.97	189,427	118,063	61,850		
31.12.98	201,725	125,728	58,987		
31.12.99	198,877	123,952	66,388	10,113	134,065
31.12.00	217,923	143,238	60,617	9,241	152,479

All Swiss = Current + Investment + any outstanding interest

1.6 ACL North American Chapter Chair – Diane Litman

Report from NAACL
Diane Litman, Chair

The NAACL Executive Committee met on June 2, 2001, at the NAACL conference in Pittsburgh, PA. The agenda included:

* Reports from NAACL Officers
* NAACL-01 Report
* ACL-02/NAACL-02 Report
* NAACL-03/HLT Discussion
* Discussion of Past and Upcoming Elections
* Constitutional Issues
* Discussion of Policies
* Web/Email Issues
* Formulation of Exec Job Descriptions
* Discussion of New Initiatives

The minutes of this meeting will soon be available on the NAACL webpage (http://www.naacl.org).

Last year we ran our first elections. The nominating committee suggested 9 candidates, 5 of whom agreed to be nominated. An additional nomination came from the NAACL membership. The vote was conducted electronically, using new software developed at ISI. The election exposed some problems with the current constitution, so the membership was also asked to vote on two amendments. 890 emails were sent (although about 100+ messages bounced), resulting in 285 votes being cast. The new executive board members are Graeme Hirst and Dan Jurasky; the changes to the constitution were approved with wide majorities. We also used this opportunity to ask our members to fill in a survey, but the results were very heterogeneous. We have found a student volunteer to reduce the email problems experienced last summer.

The NAACL-01 conference (our first solo conference) was extremely successful. We attracted approximately 500 people, have heard nothing but very positive feedback, and expect a financial surplus. The program included 31 papers (acceptance rate of 28%, mostly from North America), 3 invited speakers, a student research workshop, 4 other workshops, co-location with EMNLP, 4 tutorials, 27 demonstrations, and a full-day exhibit program. Reports from all of the conference chairs will be archived, and are available upon request. The conference website is still active, and can be found at http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~ref/naacl2001.html.

The planning of the NAACL-03 conference has begun. We are in continuing discussions with representatives of various funding agencies, regarding the merger of the NAACL and HLT conferences. Ed Hovy is in the process of negotiating a final "Memorandum of Understanding."

We are currently working on other goals of our organization, e.g. supporting new educational initiatives.

1.7 ACL North American Chapter Treasurer – Barbara Di Eugenio

NAACL Treasurer
Barbara Di Eugenio

(Please see the NAACL-01 Treasurer's report, prepared by Alon Lavie and included with the NAACL-01 General Chair's report.)

1.8 Special Liason with Asia – Jun'Ichi Tsujii

Report from the Asian Liaison Officer
Junichi TSUJII

(1) The Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing Association was formally established. The first preparatory meeting of AFNLP was held in October during ACL Hong Kong. We had a follow-up meeting in January, when the federation was formally established.

(2) The home page of AFNLP was prepared by Korean colleagues at KAIST: http://www.asianlp.org/index.html

(3) Unlike ACL, AFNLP is a federation of national associations of NLP of individual countries and other international bodies. We would like to see the Federation help Asia-wide initiatives to flourish. It is the belief shared by the members of AFNLP that such a bottom-up approach will be more effective than establishing the Asian Chapter of ACL. AFNLP established a committee for resource sharing, the chair of which is Prof.H.Tanaka (Japan)

who will co-ordinate the resource sharing activities together with two co-sub-chairs, Prof.Huang (Taiwan) and Prof.Tokunaga (Japan).

(4) Japan made a bid for ACL2003. The candidate location is Sapporo, which is the capital of the northern island of Hokkaido. You can see the bid at

http://acyo8.media.eng.hokudai.ac.jp/araki/secret/sec1.html
(id:guest, password: acl2003)

The printed version of the bid was sent out to Toulouse by Prof,Araki (the proposed chair of the local organizing committee)

(5) While there are no official links with ACL, there will be several international conferences by Asian researchers in Asia this year, like Pacling, NLPRS, etc. It is my impression that strong co-operative spirits are now emerging among Asian researchers.

1.9 Nominating Committee – Eva Hajicova, Philip Cohen, Wolfgang Wahlster

Nominating Committee Report
Eva Hajicova, Philip Cohen, Wolfgang Wahlster

The Nominating Committee has finally proposed (with the approval of the nominated candidates) the following slate:

a) Exec member:

Prof. Hiroshi Nakagawa (http://www.r.dl.itc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~nakagawa/)

Prof. Yuji Matsumoto (http://cl.aist-nara.ac.jp/staff/matsu/home-e.html)

Our statement (perhaps should be placed at the beginning of the slate):

For the past 3 years, the ACL has been attempting to internationalize the organization and its management. Although there is no set formula, it is the opinion of the ACL Executive that each of the major continents should be represented on the Executive Board. Accordingly, the Nominating Committee is proposing two candidates from Europe for the Vice-President elect position and two from Asia, for a vacant position on the ACL-executive board.

b) vice-President elect:

Johanna Moore (http://www.cogsci.ed.ac.uk~jmoore/)

Claire Gardent (http://www.loria.fr/~gardent/short_cv.html)

2 ACL-2001

2.1 General Conference Chair – Bonnie Webber

ACL-2001 GENERAL CHAIR
Bonnie Webber

Since the scope of the General Chair's responsibilities is still in flux, I start off with a list of what I as General Chair was involved in doing. Then I list specific problems that came up that I was called in to help solve, and finally I list issues on which I believe policy should be made, so that Chairs in subsequent years can just look this material up.

I. TASKS

1. Chair appointments: All of these involved finding out from the previous year's chairs, just what the jobs involved. The manual currently under development goes some way towards alleviating this informational need, but it needs revision.
   A. Appoint tutorial chairs (2) - Probably one is sufficient next time, given the number of proposed tutorials. Information about tasks of tutorial chair(s) should also include what is/is not provided to tutorial presenters.
   B. Appoint workshop chair (1) - Expand to two, given the number of proposed workshops, the need to negotiate with proposers, and the interactions with workshop chairs over deadlines and volume publication.
   C. Appoint student workshop chairs and student workshop advisor - The former involves finding out from the previous year's chairs who they identified as possible chairs for the current year, as the student workshop is supposed to be self-organising.
   D. Appoint publications chair
   E. Appoint demo chair and publicity chairs: I was not successful in these tasks. I think the latter didn't make a difference. However, there are no scientific demos scheduled as a result of the former failure.
   F. Provide feedback to Program Chairs on proposed Program Committee.
   G. Help establish a clear policy on who needs to give what to whom when, especially important vis-a-vis Publications Chair.

2. Panels: Work with Donia (as Chair of EACL) and Patrick (as local arrangments chair) to organise special panels and get funding for one from ELSNET. Topic accepted for latter was Language Technology.
3. Call for Papers: Editorial assistance to Program Chairs
4. Workshop Deadlines: Assistance to Workshop Chair to get submission dates fixed, and what needs to be sent to Publication Chair by when.
5. Proposals to fund Student Workshops: Editorial assistance to Workshop Chairs and Workshop advisor.

6. Direct outside questions/requests to the appropriate person
7. Helped to schedule Student Workshop - special needs regarding time, desire not to compete with regular sessions or special events.
8. Dealt with an irate author whose paper arrived too late for review, thereby taking the heat off the Program Chairs who were busy with more important matters.
9. Assisted Program Chairs in the identification and selection of invited speakers.

II. Problems that needed to be sorted out

1. Should there be blind reviewing of both regular papers and student workshop papers?

2. What should be the submission dates for ACL, given response dates for NAACL and the possibility of allowing rejected papers to be revised and resubmitted: Problem if no revision, then little difference with multiple submissions.

3. Whether reviewers are called "reviewers" or "program subcommittee members", to look better on their CVs.

4. What to charge for workshops: 1-day vs. 2-days. Whether additional support given to workshops for receptions (no), invited speakers (no).

5. Late paper pre-registration: While this shouldn't be made public to authors, policy on this should be made clear to the next set of Program Chairs -- i.e., continuing to turn a blind eye, if the numbers remain low.

6. Child care and other types of extra-ordinary support for members to attend the program committee meeting: it is probably the case that a general policy is needed, to avoid people feeling unfairly dealt with.

III. OUTSTANDING PROBLEMS

1. Better record keeping needed. For example, there appeared to be no easily obtainable list of previous tutorials and tutorial registrations to use in decision making about this year's tutorials. Similarly for workshops.

2. Policy regarding under-subscribed tutorials: Should there be deadlines by which (a) tutorials that do not have a minimal enrollment are encouraged to further advertise, and (b) tutorials have to meet this minimal deadline or be cancelled?

3. Language policy: There is no statement in any call for papers (main conference, workshops, student workshop) as to the language in which papers may be written. Christian Boitet articulated the policy at ACL/Coling, but the question is whether to make whatever

policy is agreed on public, or leave it tacit (to be rediscovered or redecided each year).

4. Registration for invited participants (speakers and panelists). I think it is tacky for ACL not to cover this automatically.

5. Student helpers. ACL uses this as a way of enabling students to attend ACL who might not otherwise be able to. This year, Patrick did not ‘‘need’’ such helpers, but I think it should be a general policy to support at least some fixed number of them.

6. Policy on multiple submissions, where one submission is to the general meeting and another is to a workshop either for that meeting or for the regional meeting. Should there be a policy on this, or should it be left each year to the Program Chairs?

2.2 Program Co-Chairs – Norbert Reithinger, Giorgio Satta

ACL 2001 PC Co-Chair Report
Norbert Reithinger and Giorgio Satta

1. Submissions and Reviewing

The web pages for submission notification at acl2001.dfki.de were up and running at the beginning of December 2000. At the end of the registration deadline we had about 320 notifications with 260 papers being finally submitted. Due to the not so positive experience with last year’s thematic session and the short time frame we had for this year, we didn’t include those type of sessions this year.

As a surprise to some authors we really kept very close to the submission deadline. Since our overall schedule was pretty short, we had no buffer for late submissions. We had approximately 10 papers rejected for this reason.

The area chairs, Jennifer Chu-Carroll, Joshua Goodman, Pierre Isabelle, Adam Kilgarriff, Lillian Lee, Adwait Ratnaparkhi, Ehud Reiter, James Rogers and David Weir, selected 211 reviewers from 25 countries. Reviewing was blind to all of the reviewers. As in the last years, we started without disclosing author identities to the area chairs as well. Due to unexpected changes of paper distributions in the 9 areas, as compared with previous years, several area chairs rushed to get more reviewers after papers were already routed. It was then impossible for us to manage with the conflicts of interest that newly arose without slowing down considerably the reviewing process. So we decided to disclose author identities to the area chairs. After a posteriori discussion with all of the area chairs, we now believe that our decision is the one that minimizes the chances of incurring into conflicts of interest, since the area chairs have a much more detailed knowledge of possible relations between their own reviewers

and the paper authors, as compared with PC co-chairs.

To keep costs down, the PC meeting was held on April 1st-2nd, hosted by ITRI, Univ. of Brighton (many thanks to Donia for arrangements). All the 9 area chairs plus the two chairs attended. The area chairs and the reviewers all did a great job.

We spent the week after April 2nd solving the double submission conflicts. Papers accepted at ACL-2001 and with double submission were divided into two categories: A. multiple submissions of same paper; and B. submissions to different meetings of papers with apparently close matchings. All cases of A. resulted in the confirmation of the ACL-2001 submission and the withdrawal of the other submission, with the exception of two papers. One such paper was already in the NAACL-2001 program and had to be rejected by us; the other paper got accepted in the meanwhile at ICML, and was withdrawn by the authors from ACL-2001. The B cases (three papers) were more difficult: we gave to these authors the opportunity of arguing their point, and then discussed each case with all of the area chairs. At the end, all of the B. papers were confirmed to be in the ACL-2001 program. The problem of Minimal Publishable Units, as we called them, should be given a second thought for later conferences.

At the end of the whole process, we accepted 68 papers. The acceptance rate is thus 26.5%.

2. Breakdown of the Papers by Research Areas

The following table follows the break down according to area chairs.

area	accept	reject	submissions
Lexicon and Semantics	4 (16%)	20	24
Machine Learning and Statistical Methods for Syntax	8 (26%)	22	30
Parsing Algorithms	10 (27%)	27	37
Generation and Multi-Modality	8 (30%)	18	26
Discourse and Dialogue	7 (18%)	30	37
Speech, Systems and Evaluation	6 (46%)	7	13
Syntax, Grammars, Morphology and Phonology	10 (30%)	20	30
Corpus-based Natural Language Processing	8 (21%)	30	38
Machine Translation, Multilinguality	7 (28%)	18	25
result	68 (26%)	192	260

3. Geographical breakdown

This year, papers from 33 countries were submitted for the main program. Among the accepted papers 31 come from the European-African Zone (45.6%), 30 come from the American Zone (44%), and 7 come from the Asian-Pacific Zone (10%). The accepted papers were contributed by authors from 14 different countries.

The details according to zone are as follows. We also include the top three submission countries for each zone,

cont.	country	reject	accept	total
America				
	US	42	29	71
	Canada	10	1	11
	Mexico	2		2
total		55	30	85
Asia-Pacific				
	Japan	15	5	20
	China	4		4
	HK	3		3
	Korea	3		3
total		27	7	34
Europe-Africa				
	Germany	23	6	29
	UK	21	8	29
	France	19	6	25
total		110	31	141
Overall		192	68	260

Compared to last year's ACL, the submissions from the Asia-Pacific region for the main program were reduced by two-thirds, while the submissions from Europe-Africa increased by almost 50%. The American submissions increased slightly.

4. Paper processing

For the first time, the submission format was close to the final one

(two columns etc) to ease the transition from the submission version to the final one. The authors were also requested to submit an electronic version as backup.

Only in cases where an assigned reviewer couldn't review a paper properly we used the e-version as backup. The e-version were however used to generate proposals for the areas chairs and the reviewers. About 75% of our area selections coincided with the first or second ranked area proposal from David's and Radu's program. Our thanks go to David Yarowsky and Radu Florian who contributed this service.

Some people asked us to switch reviewing from sending around hardcopies to electronic distribution. We relied on hardcopies for this year. The reason maily was that we didn't have the infrastructure (scripts for automatic submission, unpacking etc) to handle an all electronic conference and were unable to set them up (or collect them from other sources) in the short time frame.

ACL should think about building up standard tools that can be handed to PC chairs (of ACL, NAACL, EACL) to switch to electronic handling of submissions and final versions.

For the final version we put LaTeX styles and Word .doc and .dot templates on the PC web site. This year we also worked closely with the publications chair Roberto Zamparelli to write very precise formatting instructions that authors should follow in the preparation of their finals, with the main goal of avoiding non-uniformity of paper format in the final proceedings. We have found that authors are not very sensible to this problem, and tend to ignore formatting instructions details. Several authors squeezed paper lines beyond our indications, or used smaller font sizes. Some authors even changed the .sty we distributed. We spent quite a lot of time in arguing with these authors, and due to the extremely small time interval between final submission and publisher dead-line, we had to give up on some cases. We think that further thought to this problem should be given for later conferences, especially in consideration of the fact that some authors pay extra money to have additional pages in the proceedings (as opposed to squeezing).

For the production of the CD-ROM the authors were also requested to submit electronic versions that were also used as back ups.

2.3 Local Arrangements – Patrick Saint-Dizier

ACL-01 LOCAL arrangements:
Patrick Saint-Dizier

On june 25th: 571 registrations, 453 payments recieved.
152 students and 419 regulars. About 40 more expected on site.
Participation from many countries, special note for the large participation of Koreans, Japanese and Taiwanese colleagues. A few new countries:

Jordan, Egypt, Morroco, Tunisia, South Africa. No one from Latin and South America.

11 workshops: a total of 823 workshop days, with participant per workshop ranging from 29 to 87

5 tutorials: 197 participants in total, ranging from 7 participants to 54.

For both workshops and tutorials, a large preference is observed for those with a clear 'applied' dimension.

Budget: will be presented on July 8th. A surplus of about 30 000 US$ is expected, provided we can collect all payments.

Some points to debate:
- main conference registration compulsory even for those who attend only a workshop: as a result a number of workshop participants have decided not to come.
- participants from emerging countries have difficulties paying all the fees in addition to the trip, a policy should be elaborated (this has been a problem for the workshop on processing Arabic, for example).

2.4 Tutorial Chairs – Paola Merlo, Gertjan van Noord

ACL-2001 TUTORIALS
Paola Merlo and Gertjan van Noord

The ACL 2001 tutorials were scheduled for the Sunday between the workshops and the main conference, with parallel tracks, both in the morning and the afternoon (a number of excursions were planned on this Sunday too). Reimbursement for presenters was the same as last year (US$500 per session plus $25 per registrant in the range 21-50 plus $15 per registrant in excess of 50).

The call for tutorial proposals was sent out to email lists in late November, calculating deadlines as for previous ACLs. The wording (but not the substance) of the reimbursement was changed from previous years' calls.

We solicited two tutorials on topics, which do not fall into the typical ACL expertise. Specifically, based on recent interest in empirical corpus-based methods and evaluations, we solicited a tutorial on experimental methodology and hypothesis testing techniques. We invited Harald Baayen (MPI) because of positive direct experiences as a tutorialist on these topics. We also solicited a tutorial on bioinformatics. Sequence comparison and alignment are hot topics in bioinformatics that are potentially relevant for NLP. We asked Rolf Backofen, as an expert in bioinformatics (author of a recent textbook on this subject) with a background in NLP. The idea of soliciting tutorials was quite successful, judging from the number

of registrants.

We received 11 submissions (including two solicited), which made for a difficult selection process. We considered several options, and selected five half-day tutorials, based on quality of submission, appropriateness of topic, and diversity of expected audiences. We considered having a one-day tutorial, but were strongly discouraged from doing so.

Morning

T1. Statistical Analysis of Experimental Data for NLP	Harald Baayen
T2. Very Large Lexical Databases	Pustejovsky and Hanks
T3. Recent Issues in Categorial Grammars	Christian Retor

Afternoon

T4. Bioinformatics Rolf Backhofen
T5. Automatic Summarization Mani and Maybury

The scheduling of the tutorial was motivated by expectations about popularity of the topics. This setup gives rise to a statistical track (1, 5), a large database track (2, 4), a formal languages track (3, 4), and an applied problem track (2,5).

Brief tutorial descriptions are on-line at the ACL 2001 web site, and were incorporated into the conference registration brochure, the conference proceedings companion volume and the CDROM. The fees for tutorials were reduced from ACL 2000 (early registration: 650 FF; late registration: 850 FF). Each participant receives a printed copy of the materials, containing the overhead transparencies and a bibliography.

Registration numbers appear satisfactory. (Update on the 18th of June, 2001 is as follows T1: 45; T2: 49; T3: 6; T4: 36; T5: 40.) As can be seen, one tutorial attracted many fewer people than the others. This was partly expected, due to the formal and specialised nature of the topic. We thought it was very important to provide at least one tutorial of this kind.

Based on our experience, we recommend:

1) Since there are strong valid reasons againsts one-day tutorials, the call for tutorials should be reworded so as to solicit only half-day tutorials.

2) Issues of copyright must be clarified. It should be decided whether the tutorial materials require a release of copyright. If so, the presenters should be informed in advance.

3) Presenters were required to register to the main conference. We recommend that this requirement is dropped for presenters who do not

participate in the main conference.

4) Tutorial materials are duplicated in black and white. This is unfortunate since most presenters provide colored sheets, sometimes with beautiful illustrations. We recommend to investigate the production of tutorial materials in full color.

2.5 Publication Chair – Roberto Zamparelli

ACL 2001 Publication Chair Report
Roberto Zamparelli

ACL published the proceedings of its annual conference for the second time this year, following a tradition inaugurated by David Yarowski, Publication Chair for ACL 2000.

This CD-ROM produced contained complete PDF and postscript versions for:

- the complete set of papers of the main conference;
- the papers from 10 of the 11 thematic workshops (one whorshop choose not to have proceedings);
- the papers of the Student Research Workshop;
- tutorial abstracts;

In addition, the CD-ROM contained:

- venue and sponsor information and an archive of the conference web pages (including author instructions for submission and publication);
- a BibTeX bibliographic entry for each paper;
- an author index for each workshop and a combined author index for all the articles in the CD-ROM.

The indexes were generated automatically by a set of software tools, developed last year by David Yarowkski, and updated this year to include the double PS/PDF option and the BIB entry. The layout of the CD-ROM closely follows the one developed last year by David Yarowsky, Silviu Cucerzan and Michaela Fok, with a few changes in the color schema and new pictures. The availability of these tools and of a layout to follow greatly simplified the job of assembling the hardcopy volumes and the CD-ROM.

The Program-Chair Giorgio Satta and I tried to give papers a more uniform look than in previous years by enforcing stricter formatting rules for the main conference and the workshops.

I should add that I had no experience with large-scale electronic publishing, just a basic knowledge of HTML, LaTeX, Postscript, and PDF. The job was done locally on a linux/win98 PC, with the help of an assistent funded by my department at the University of Bergamo. We encountered no particular technical problems.

I would like to acknowledge David Yarowsky's generous assistance on many aspects of the project. In particular, apart from updating and documenting the software tools, he created a site for automatic paper submission on the web, which proved quite useful. Special thanks also to Giorgio Satta and Norbert Reithinger for helpful, patient and constant support, my local assistant Nicola Benaglia and to the organizers of the conference I interacted with: Bonnie Webber, Patrick Saint-Dizier, Rebecca Bruce, Eleni Miltsakaki, Christof Monz and Antonio Ribeiro and Steven Krauwer.

Notes for future Publication Chairs

The job of the Publication Chairs for ACL 2001 consisted in preparing the CD-Rom described above and editing the hardcopy of the ``Companion Volume'', which contains the papers of the Student Research Workshop, and the Tutorial Abstracts (Demonstration Notes were not present this year).

WORKLOAD

It is difficult to quantify the amount of work this required. My assistant Nicola Benaglia was hired for 100 hours, but used up maybe 80% of that amount. To give an idea, the deadlines were as follows:

- April 20: Formatting instructions published on the web.

- May 12: Deadline to receive the camera-ready hardcopies (no page numbers) and their electronic versions from authors of the main conference. Workshops had various deadlines, all later than May 12.

- May 25: Deadline to have the camera-ready hardcopies of all volumes in France (with pages numbered) and for submitting the electronic version via the web interface (for the main conference) or via FTP (for the workshops)

- June 13: Deadline to send the CD-Rom to France. Eventually we opted for putting a .zip archive file with all the content of the CD-Rom and have the local conference organizer download it (about 260MB expanded).

By far the most labour-intensive part of the job was (1) checking that the electronic papers followed the formatting specs and (2) contacting the authors and/or the workshop organizers to ask them to (re)submit their work. We decided to accept papers well after the deadline, particularly when we had asked authors to resubmit, even though this meant a peak of work right before the deadlines.

FORMATTING ISSUES

To try to give a common look to all the papers in the main conference and workshops we gave more precise formatting specs that in previous ACL editions, partly adapted from the X IJCAI conference camera-ready guidelines. The camera ready-style was similar to the submission format (both required two columns and the dimensions were the same). However, the camera-ready specs asked to use "Times" fonts instead of the LaTeX default Computer Modern.

We provided a sample ".tex" LaTeX file, a LaTeX style ".sty" file, a sample Winword ".doc" file and a Winword style ".dot" file.

One problem we encountered was that many authors used (or thought they were using) the sample files and didn't check the correctness of their output. Due to differences in the printer driver they used and/or the process they used to produce PDF, these papers were often out of specs both in the printed and in the electronic version.

It is therefore crucial to convince the authors that the have to check what they produce WITH A RULER.

While we believe that a shift in the position of the paper on the page is not a real problem (we have on occasions corrected it on the postscript version with the UNIX command:

```
pstops '0@1(Xcm,Ycm)' original-file.ps moved-file.ps
```

which moves a file X cm. right and Y cm. up), the issue of different font sizes, baseline stretch and textbox size are significant. Since the policy for the main conference is to charge $250 per extra page, authors who fits more text on a page may save a considerable amount.

Under time pressure, we had sometimes difficult decisions to take. In general our policy was assume good faith in authors and to privilege completeness of content over perfection of form. We are aware that this led to some injustices.

One possibility for future publication editions to consider is to require an extra fee for authors who go over limit by number of pages OR total number of words OR total number of lines.

A related issue concerns the relation between the hardcopy and the electronic version. We required them to be identical, but in the case of the workshops this turned out ot be very difficult. The deadlines were tight for them, and right after mailing their hardcopies many authors submitted electronic versions which were totally or partially unreadable, or completely out of specs. We asked them to reformat and resubmit. At the end of the process, even if the content was unchanged (and we could hardly be sure, since the Publication Chair doesn't have access to the hardcopy version during the production of the electronic one) the format and even the number of pages was different.

Once again, we thought that having a readable paper was the main criterion. However, this could lead to potential problems for people who cite by page number.

Authors were asked to submit PDF and optionally postscript versions of their papers. In some cases one of the two versions was missing, unreadable or huge, and we had to reconstruct it from the other, using the UNIX tools pdftops or pstopdf or other systems. In a few exceptional cases we had to derive the .ps from a Winword document. Foreign fonts or symbols were rarely a problem. We had however underestimated the variability in margin text/sizes across various versions of Word and various printer drivers.

OTHER ISSUES

One issue that remains unresolved is whether or to what extent publication of the material on CD-Rom damages sales of the printed version.

A second issue concerns the dissemination of the information of the procedings via the use of the Research Citation Index (formerly Citeseer), on the web. Since this is something which can be done after the ruh of the conference I plan to bring up the issue in due time with the other chairs.

2.6 Student Session Chairs – Eleni Miltsakaki, Christof Monz, Antnio Ribeiro

ACL-2001 Student Research Workshop
Eleni Miltsakaki, Christof Monz, and Antonio Ribeiro

1. Program Committee

The co-chairs of the ACL-2001 Student Research Workshop, Eleni Miltsakaki (University of Pennsylvania), Christof Monz (University of Amsterdam), and Antonio Ribeiro (Universidade Nova de Lisboa) were nominated by this year's general chair Bonnie Webber, and approved by the ACL Executive Committee. Marilyn Walker was appointed by the ACL Executive Committee as Faculty Advisor. The program committee was initially formed from suggestions by Marilyn Walker and the co-chairs, and was later approved by the ACL Executive Committee. The final program committee consisted of 15 student members and 21 non-student members. Of the 36 reviewers, were 11 from Europe, 9 from North America, 6 from Asia, 5 from South America, and 5 from Oceania.

2. Submission

42 papers were submitted to the Student Research Workshop. The submission length was set to six (6) pages using the ACL style files. 35 papers were assigned two non-student and one student reviewer, 4 papers were assigned one non-student and one student reviewer, and 3

papers were assigned two non-student reviewers. Reviews were mostly done on-line. We accepted 12 of the papers. Some statistics for the submissions and acceptance are shown below (Tables 1-3).

3. Presentation Format

The papers will be presented in half-hour slots (organized into three parallel sessions) allocated from the main conference. Continuing last year's format, for each accepted paper we have invited two senior researchers to act as panelists to give detailed feedback to the student author(s). Each slot would thus start with author presentation (18mins), followed by panelists feedback/discussion (7mins) and general Q&A (5mins).

4. Panelists

Currently, we are in the process of recruiting 2 panelists for each presentation.

5. Problems

The three co-chairs found the experience from organizing the workshop invaluable and rewarding. We would like to thank ACL for offering us this opportunity.

5.1. Format and Scheduling

The format, i.e. whether it will be held during ACL or as a workshop before ACL, was not clear in the beginning. Due to this uncertainty we were not able to give the concrete date of the workshop before May 2001.

5.2. External Funding

There have have been three applications for external funding:
- Funding from the European Commission
  This proposal was turned down because it arrived one week after the deadline.
- Funding from the Portuguese Foundation for Science & Technology
  This proposal was turned down because this type of events is not covered by this agency.
- Funding from NSF
  This proposal is still pending

5.3. Student Status

Although it was clearly stated in the call for papers that ``all authors must be students'', we have received a submission where one of the co-authors was a non-student. Since we have found out after accepting the paper, we had to withdraw it and instead accepted a submission which was held back in case of withdrawal.

Given this experience we advise that each submission should be accompanied by a document confirming the student status of each author. (As it was recommended in the guidelines by the ACL Executive committee.)

Table 1: Papers by country

Country	Submitted	Accepted
USA	8 (19.05%)	3
UK	7 (16.66%)	2
France	6 (14.29%)	0
Canada	3 (7.14%)	1
China	3 (7.14%)	0
Czech Republic	3 (7.14%)	1
Netherlands	2 (4.76%)	2
Portugal	2 (4.76%)	0
Spain	2 (4.76%)	0
Greece	1 (2.38%)	1
Israel	1 (2.38%)	0
Italy	1 (2.38%)	1
South Korea	1 (2.38%)	0
Poland	1 (2.38%)	0
Sweden	1 (2.38%)	1

Table 2: Papers by geographical area

Area	Submitted	Accepted	Acceptance rate
North America	11	4	36.36%
Europe	26	8	30.76%
Asia	5	0	0.00%

Table 3: Papers by topics

Topic	Submitted	Accepted
1. Syntax and Parsing	5 (11.90%)	4
2. Knowledge acquisition/extraction	14 (33.33%)	4
3. Generation	1 (2.38%)	0
4. Statistical language processing	0 (0.00%)	0
5. Natural language systems	0 (0.00%)	0
6. Discourse and dialogue	2 (4.76%)	0
7. Grammar	0 (0.00%)	0
8. Semantics	8 (19.05%)	2
9. Corpus analysis	2 (4.76%)	0
10. Machine translation	2 (4.76%)	0
11. Speech	2 (4.76%)	0
12. Morphology	4 (9.52%)	2
13. Other	2 (4.76%)	0

2.7 Workshop Chair – Rebecca Bruce

ACL01 Workshop Chair
Rebecca Bruce

There was a strong response to the call for workshop proposals this year; nineteen high-quality workshop proposals were received. Of the nineteen, one proposal, SENSEVAL, had been prearranged. Seven proposals were submitted by European organizers, six by organizers located within North America, and six were a collaboration of organizers located in both Europe and North America.

Due in part to resource limitations, selection of a sub-set of the workshop proposals was necessary. For example, the projected attendance for the combined 19 workshops exceeded the projected attendance of the ACL conference. In the future, it would be helpful to have guidelines regarding the maximum number of workshops to be sponsored by an ACL conference.

Selection decisions were made by myself with much appreciated advice from Bonnie Webber. During the selection process three pairs of workshops were merged, one organizer was asked to resubmit their proposal as a tutorial, and four organizers were given a brief review and asked to resubmit their proposals next year. In conclusion, we ended up with five two-day workshops and six one-day workshops. None of these workshops received financial support from the ACL, although conference and workshop fees were waived for one workshop organizer. Two of the workshops did receive financial support from external sponsors.

The preparation of the workshop web page (http://www.cs.unca.edu/~bruce/acl01/workshop.html) went smoothly. All calls for papers were posted by Feb 19, 2001 and programs were added as they became available. The workshop information for the conference brochure was send to Priscilla on April 20, 2001. All questions regarding local arrangements have been handled very well by the local arrangements chair, Patrick Saint-Dizier.

The most difficult aspect of the workshop organization process was the establishment of guidelines for publication of the workshop proceedings. In the end, these guidelines were provided by David Yarowsky in the form of a well organized set of instructions, programs and sample documents. I strongly recommend that this package become part of the documentation regarding ACL conferences. Perhaps it could be incorporated in the, "Conference Organization Handbook" compiled by Ed Hovy, which already contains a great deal of useful information.

3 Journal and Publications

3.1 Journal – Julia Hirschberg

Computational Linguistics Report for 2001
Julia Hirschberg, Editor

64 Papers were submitted to Computational Linguistics in 2000. The mean time to first decision was 190 days. 23 of these submissions were to a special issue on anaphora and ellipsis resolution, edited by Ruslan Mitkov, Bran Boguraev and Shalom Lappin, to appear this year. Seven were submissions to an upcoming special issue on summarization, edited by Dragomir Radev, Kathy McKeown and Eduard Hovy, which had a total of fifteen submissions. Three papers were submitted in the new "short paper" category. As of June 19, 24 papers have been submitted in 2001.

We apologize for the late delivery of the December 2000 and March 2001 issues of the journal; MIT Press experienced some personnel difficulties that apparently led to these delays. The June 2001 issue has been delivered in June and we are assuming the problems have now been resolved. Thanks for your patience.

CL is sorry to lose its long-time editorial assistant, Ana Pereira, who is moving to Philadelphia. We are happy to welcome Kathy Vesonder, our new editorial assistant, to the journal.

===

Disposition of manuscripts by type of first decision:

2000 1999 1998 1997 1996

Submitted 64 47 48 69 57
Accepted 15 13 9 21 9
Rejected 11 9 7 15 15
Resubmission 27 12 4 27 26
No decision yet 7 8 28 5 6
Withdrawn 3 2 1 1
Resub as squib 1 3 2

For the 1999 papers the completed disposition of mss (by first decision) was:

accept 8 17%

accept 5 11%
w/revisions

resubmit 19 40%

resubmit 3 6%
as squib

reject 10 21%

withdrawn 2 4%

===

Distribution of submissions by location of first author:

ASIA/PACIFIC

Australia 2
China 2
Japan 2
Korea 2
Singapore 1
India 2

Total 11

EUROPE
Finland 1
Germany 3
Greece 1
Italy 2
Netherlands 3
Russia 1
Spain 2
Switzerland 1
Turkey 2
UK 7
Portugal 1
Czechoslovakia 1

Total 25

NORTH AMERICA
USA 23

Total 23

LATIM AMERICA
Brazil 1
Mexico 1

Total 2

AFRICA
Tunisia 1
South Africa 1
UAR 1

Total 3

3.2 Book Reviews – Graeme Hirst

Book Review Editor’s report
Graeme Hirst

BOOK REVIEWS PUBLISHED

We continue to publish about five book reviews plus a couple of brief notices in each issue of Computational Linguistics.

Most reviews are published in a timely manner -- that is, within 12 months of receipt of the book. This allows six months for the reviewer (some take less) and five months for journal production.

MATERIAL REVIEWED

I am continuing to be fairly strict in deciding if a book is to be reviewed, but try to include all books that are in "core" computational linguistics, as well as a variety of books from adjacent and overlapping disciplines that are likely to be useful in CL. We do not review technical reports, doctoral theses, conference proceedings, or workshop proceedings, except if revised for publication as a book by a recognized publisher.

PRODUCTION MATTERS

I am indebted to Nadia Talent for long hours of reading out loud with me to check the galleys.

3.3 Squibs and Discussions – Pierre Isabelle

Squibs and Discussions
Pierre Isabelle

At the beginning of year 2000, there were 3 (re-) submissions in the pipeline. In the course of year 2000, 8 additional papers were (re-) submitted. At the end of the year, there was only one submission left in the pipeline. Thus, 10 decisions were made over year 2000. The results were as follows:

* 3 papers accepted
* 3 papers rejected
* 4 invitations to revise and resubmit

The mean time taken for these 10 decisions was 120 days, but on the on the 7 papers submitted in 2000, the mean time was down to 101 days. The geographical distribution of the 10 submissions by location of first author was:

* Asia: 1
* Europe: 5
* North America: 4

Thus far, 10 papers have been (re-) submitted in 2001. This higher-than-usual rate partly due to a rise in the number of irrelevant submissions.

3.4 Book Series – Bran Boguraev, Steven Bird

CUP/ACL Book Series "Studies in Natural Language Processing"
Bran Boguraev and Steven Bird

CUP data data concerning sales figures, print runs, and distributions cannot be made public. However, the series is progressing on its agenda of seeking and publishing work representative of the state-of-the-art in a number of topics of interest to the CL/NLP community. Feedback from sales suggests that interest in the community is maintained at level similar to prior years; levels of sales are in line with the types of scholarly books that have been published recently.

Since the last report, Steven Bird has joined Bran Boguraev as an Editor of the Series. Currently, we are in the process of migrating between Acquisitions Editors (Alan Harvey -> Andy Beck) at CUP (and moving the Series headquarters from the CUP office at Stanford to the main CUP office in New York).

Below is an enumeration of on-going projects, at different stages of progress:

1. Books that were published since the last report:

```
 *  Cole,R. et al. (eds.),   "Survey of the State of the Art
                              in Human Language Technology"
 *  Bosch,P. &               "Focus: Linguistic, Cognitive,
    van der Sandt,R. (eds.),  and Computational Perspective"
 *  Kornai,A. (ed.),         "Extended Finite State Models for NLP"
 *  Busa,F. & Bouillon,P.,   "The Language of Word Meaning"
 *  Carter,D. & Rayner,M.,   "The Spoken Language Translator"
 *  Sproat,R.,               "A Computational Theory of Writing Systems"
 *  Reiter,E. & Dale,R.,     "Building Natural Language Generation Systems"
```


[Note: The Kornai book is an interesting experiment, where a volume in a book series is closely tied in, in a complementary way, to a special issue of a journal ("Natural Language Engineering; special issue on FS Models of Language"); as a very successful experiment, we are planning other similar projects]

2. The following new projects have been approved (Syndicated and contracted) over the last period:

```
 *  Wilks,Y.,                 "Machine Translation; Its Scope and Limits"
 *  Karttunen,L. &            "Finite State Morphology"
    Beesley,K.
```

3. Forthcoming titles (without projected publication dates):

```
 *  Asher,N. &                "From Discourse to the Lexicon:
    Lascarides,A.,             Interpretation in Context"
 *  Basili,R. et al.,         "Lexical Acquisition for Practical NLP Systems"
 *  Carroll,J.,               "Practical Natural Language Parsing"
 *  Ellison,M.,               "Machine Learning of Phonological Structure"
 *  Wilks,Y.                  "Language, Cohesion and Form:
                               Selected Papers of Margaret Masterman"
 *  Carl Pollard              "Generalized Phrase Structure Grammars"
```

4. Titles currently in production

```
 *  Kiraz,G.,                 "Computational Nonlinear Morphology"
```

4 Recent Conferences

4.1 NAACL-01 General Chair – Lori Levin

NAACL-2001 General Chair
Lori Levin

We planned this conference as a small, high-quality gathering. Having picked a date that was only one month away from ACL and EACL, and not being a joint conference, we expected attendence to be between 300 and 400 people. We had three tactics to draw more people: co-locate with EMNLP, focus on diversity (try to attract papers on areas not well represented at ACL meetings), and have an industry exhibits session. Attendance turned out over target -- 460 people are currently pre-registered.

Detailed reports from the sub-chairs are attached. Here is a summary of the highlights and problems.

Submissions and Attendance:

The number of submissions was low for the main session, but attendance is higher than expected. Low submissions could be

attributed to getting a late start on publicity, or just that the submission deadline was at an unusual time. High attendance could be attributed to several factors: workshops, tutorials, and EMNLP; a huge number of computational linguists, speech, and machine learning people in living in Pittsburgh; a large number of demos; a huge amount of contact with industry (even though they were reluctant to sponsor or exhibit); quality of the program; quality of the web site; CMU's reputation (#2 in Computer Science).

Budget:

When we saw that submissions were low and that sponsors withdrew (because of the economy), we raised the registration fee in order to make sure that the budget balanced, and are now showing a surplus in the budget because of high enrollment.

Publications:

Some of the publications (the companion volume and program brochure) were put together at the last minute, due to lack of planning on my part. As a result, the companion volume is not very beautiful, but at least contains all of the relevant information. I hope that the program brochure does not contain mistakes. The production of the CD ROM was also rushed.

On-Line Registration:

The publicity chair report below contains some suggestions for making it easier to implement on-line registration in coming years. (It is in the publicity report because it was handled by the web master.)

Exhibits Session:

Organizing the exhibits session and attracting sponsors was much harder than we expected. We came up with the idea of an industry exhibits day during NAACL 2000 where industry made a very strong showing and was recruiting heavily. The idea of the exhibits session was for the academic ACL crowd to find out about the companies that were springing out of the woodwork, started by people that are not in our field. There were two problems. One is that the economy went bad and many companies had to cut back or even close. The other was that some companies weren't as interested in meeting us as we were in meeting them. If they weren't recruiting, or if their target customer base wasn't attending, they didn't want to come. One company asked me to invite venture capitalists and even drafted a letter for me to send to them. (I apologized and didn't do it.)

Sponsorships:

For the same reasons, sponsorships were lower than expected. NAACL 2000 had over $50,000 in sponsorships. This year we went under even

the ACL 99 level ($18,000 in 1999) with $15,000 in sponsorships. In addition to the $15,000, the CMU School of Computer Science organized the opening reception and will pay for it on an as-needed basis. The Student Research Workshop also brought in an NSF grant. EMNLP's budget is also relevant in that if EMNLP has a surplus and NAACL doesn't, EMNLP's surplus will go to NAACL. (Currently both are showing a surplus.) EMNLP has a $6,000 sponsorship and a free reception.

MAIN SESSION SPONSORSHIPS

IISI (Cornell)	$5000
Mitsubishi Electric	$1000
SRA	$1000
AT&T	$1000
Nuance	$1000
Lingomotors	$1000
Lexis-Nexis	$1000
ISL (CMU)	$1000
LTI (CMU)	$1000
Trados	$1000
Clairvoyance	$1000

	$15,000

School of Computer Science, CMU, will fill in money as needed.

EMNLP SPONSORSHIPS

IISI (Cornell)	$6000
Whizbang	free reception at Whizbang

STUDENT RESEARCH SESSION SPONSORSHIPS

NSF ????
In addition, the AT&T sponsorship for the main session is earmarked for student use.

****
Report from the Student Research Workshop Chairs
Krzysztof Czuba (CMU) and Lisa Michaud (University of Delaware)

The co-chairs of the NAACL-2001 Student Research Workshop, Krzysztof Czuba (Carnegie Mellon University) and Lisa Michaud (University of Delaware), were nominated by last year's co-chairs, Donna Byron and Peter Vanderheyden, and approved by the NAACL executive committee. We decided to continue last year's extended presentation format with feedback from assigned panelists, in emulation of many Doctoral Consortium programs at other conferences. We also added to this program a poster session, in order to give our presenters a broader exposure to the conference at large.

We selected a Program Committee consisting of 13 students and 5 non-students recruited from last year's NAACL papers, student participants, and personal recommendations. The 5 non-student members, including 3 academics and 2 from industry, were approved by the NAACL Executive Committee.

Fifteen papers were submitted to the workshop and were subjected to review panels consisting of at least two students and one non-student reviewer (some papers had three student reviewers). We originally accepted seven papers for presentation in the workshop, but one of those papers was withdrawn after the author informed us that it had been accepted for presentation at another conference.

The six authors presenting at our workshop are evenly divided between men and women and are affiliated with universities in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan. They will each speak for 25 minutes, after which two panelists assigned to each paper will have time to deliver prepared feedback. The floor will then be opened to general questions.

In addition to this specific panel format, we will be holding a general career panel at the conclusion of the workshop. We have invited all of our panelists to participate and to offer their perspectives on work in academia, industry, and government in order to aid the student audience as they prepare for their future careers.

The concluding poster session will take place near the demonstrations and exhibits and will allow general conference attendees additional exposure to the student work.

We have applied for an NSF grant to cover the participation costs for the workshop presenters and organizers. The grant budget includes the registration, travel and housing costs as well as the banquet ticket costs. In addition we have requested funds to cover a part of the costs of producing the proceedings. The grant has been recommended for full funding but it is still being processed by the NSF.

In addition to the NSF grant, we have obtained funds from the conference organizers to cover part of the Student Business Lunch and the lunch for the SRW participant during the workshop.

We would like to acknowledge the assistance we have received from the conference organizers that helped us to prepare a successful workshop.

Total number of submissions: 15

Submissions by Country (based on authors' first affiliation):

US	6	40.00%
Canada	2	13.33%
Malaysia	2	13.33%
Algeria	1	6.66%
Estonia	1	6.66%
Japan	1	6.66%
Portugal	1	6.66%
UK	1	6.66%

Submissions by Geographical Area:

North America	8	53.33%
Europe	3	20.00%
Asia	3	20.00%
Africa	1	6.66%

Total number of papers accepted: 6

Acceptance Rate:

37.5%	North America
66.6%	Europe
33.3%	Asia
0%	Africa

Acceptances by Geographical Area:

North America	3	50%
Europe	2	33.3%
Asia	1	16.6%

Submissions by Gender (subject to error):
47.05% Male
52.95% Female

Acceptances by Gender:

Male	3	50%
Female	3	50%

Submissions by Topics:

1	Syntax and parsing	15%
2	Knowledge acquisition/extraction	5%
3	Generation	-
4	Statistical language processing	10%
5	Natural language systems	10%
6	Discourse and pragmatics	-
7	Grammar	5%
8	Semantics	5%
9	Corpus Analysis	5%
10	Machine translation	10%
11	Speech	-
12	Other (Document Categorization)	10%

13	Other (Question Answering)	15%
14	Other	10%

Accepted papers by Topics:

1	Syntax and parsing	22.2%
2	Knowledge acquisition/extraction	11.1%
3	Generation	-
4	Statistical language processing	22.2%
5	Natural language systems	-
6	Discourse and pragmatics	-
7	Grammar	-
8	Semantics	-
9	Corpus Analysis	11.1%
10	Machine translation	11.1%
11	Speech	-
12	Other (Document Categorization)	11.1%
13	Other (Question Answering)	11.1%
14	Other	-

****

NAACL 2001 WORKSHOPS REPORT

Lillian Lee, Cornell University

Five workshop proposals were submitted, and all were accepted. After the fact, two (one on WordNet and one on extending and customizing lexical resources) were merged, after some discussion initiated by the SIGLEX community. [This does not count the Student Research Workshop, which the student organizers handled independently].

The pre-registration numbers are as follow (courtesy of Alon Lavie):

[one-day] Automatic Summarization: 56
[one-day] MT Evaluation: 17
[one-day] Adaptation in Dialogue Systems: 55
[two-day] WordNet: 99

Overall, things went relatively smoothly, thanks in large part to the efforts (and patience!) of Bob Frederking, Jodi Hauck, Alon Lavie, and Priscilla Rasmussen.

A few suggestions for the next time:

1. As suggested by Scott Miller (previous workshops chair), it is best to have clear as early as possible how much is budgeted for each workshop, what page limits/cost factors come into play for the workshops proceedings, and what the various deadlines (such as camera-ready due dates) are. PDF files were requested for the CDROM, which seems like a good idea, but notification of the request came a bit late.

2. On the various registration forms/media, it might be good to make clear whether or not registration for the workshops without registering for the main session is "allowed".

3. A multiple submission/publication in workshops and "main conferences" policy should probably be put in place (this year, the ACL exec decided that double publication in an NAACL workshop and ACL is not permissible. Should this or something else be made a permanent policy?) I understand this is a controversial topic, though.

-- EMNLP --
http://www.cs.cornell.edu/home/llee/emnlp.html

This meeting combined SIGDAT's two usual annual meetings (the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the Workshops on Very Large Corpora) into a single two-day conference preceeding NAACL 2001 and co-occurring with the workshops. The program committee contained over 40 members, including the Co-Chair, Donna Harman, and Publication Chair, David Yarowsky.

Partial support came from a very generous donation from the Intelligent Information Systems Institute (IISI), which is a joint Cornell University/Air Force Research Labs organization.

The pre-registration count was 163 people.

The issue was raised about the co-scheduling of EMNLP with the NAACL workshops, with the concern being that this could potentially hurt the workshops. I am not sure what the effect was. The number of proposals and perhaps the registration numbers seems to have been down this year, but this may have been affected by the closeness in timing to the ACL meeting in Toulouse.

****

Report from Tutorial Chair

Dekang Lin, University of Alberta

Proposals for tutorials for ACL 01 were solicited by a public announcement, and by a couple of private invitations. 11 proposals were received by January 2001. 9 were from the North America, 1 from Europe and 1 from Asia. The general topic areas of the proposals were as follows:

Machine Translation: 2
Speech: 4
Language Technology Start-up: 1
Logic and Symbolic NLP: 2

Statistical Language Processing: 1
Question Answering: 1

Four proposals were selected:

1. "How May I Help You?": Automated Customer Service via Natural Spoken Dialog. Alicia Abella, Allen Gorin, Guiseppe Riccardi, Tirso Alonso, Jerry Wright, AT&T Shannon Laboratory

2. Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: What's Happened Since the First SIGDAT Meeting? Kenneth Ward Church, AT&T Labs-Research

3. Building Synthetic Voices. Alan W Black and Kevin A. Lenzo,

4. Open-Domain Textual Question Answering. Sanda Harabagiu and Dan Moldovan, Southern Methodist University

****

Report from the Demonstrations Chair
Ronnie W. Smith, East Carolina Univeristy

In the spirit of outreach to related communities, my philosophy with regards to acceptance of demos was to be very open-minded to work related to issues studied in Computational Linguistics (provided the work appeared to be of academic interest) in order to broaden participation in the conference. Consequently, all 29 submitted demos were accepted for presentation, however we have had two withdrawals up to this point (May 25). Approximately 50% of these demos are related to speech and/or dialogue. Twenty of the 27 demonstrators are from North America (the two who have withdrawn were from Europe), but I am encouraged that there are several demonstrations coming from Europe even with ACL being held in France.

In terms of initial recruiting of demos, I attended the AAAI Fall 2000 Symposium on building dialogue systems for tutorial applications and extended invitations at that meeting. Several attendees from that symposium are giving demonstrations. Otherwise, normal advertising techniques were used (i.e., society mailing lists). A few personal invitations were extended, some submitted while others did not.

In terms of scheduling, the decision was made to run the demo sessions roughly in parallel with the first 9 regular sessions of the conference. In order for there to be equity among the sessions, they have all been set at 75 minutes in length, and in order to facilitate setup time, some sessions overlap slightly with break periods. All demos are offered as informal walk-in, small group format.

In terms of logistics, it is important to solicit information from the demonstrators early and frequently, and to keep a steady flow of communication with local arrangements to maximize the probability that

the demonstrations will go smoothly. We of course will not know the outcome of our efforts for another two weeks, but I have nothing but the highest regard for the work of Local Arrangements chair, Alon Lavie, with regards to coordination of logistics for the demos.

To summarize, I believe the key logistics issues for planning demonstrations at future conferences are the following:

* Availability of large monitors to improve displays of the notebook
* and laptop machines that most demonstrators bring

* Availability of Internet connections (a small but significant number
* of demonstrators require this capability)

* Frequent communication between Demonstrations Chair and Local
* Arrangements Chair with regards to planning

* Proximity of demonstrations area to the regular presentation room.
* We are fortunate for this conference to have them very near each
* other, facilitating ease of movement for conference attendees
* between paper presentations and live demonstrations.

****

NAACL-2001 INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITS
Lynn Carlson, Department of Defense

A new focus for this year's conference was the idea of giving a prominent role to industrial exhibits, by sponsoring a full day event designed to showcase the latest commercial trends in language technology.

The Process

I worked very closely with the Sponsorships Chair, Kurt Godden. This arrangement was very beneficial for both efforts. We not only shared all our contacts and leads, but also made companies aware of the opportunity to sponsor as well as to exhibit. By doing so, we were able to attract some companies originally intending just to sponsor to become exhibitors, and vice versa. I concur with Kurt Godden's recommendation that the sponsorships and exhibits committees be combined in the future, with two co-chairs.

Kurt and I originally sent out a solicitation letter for sponsors and exhibitors to about 100 recipients in October 2000, including organizations that had previously sponsored ACL events. A number of reminders were then sent out periodically over the next several months to the same general mailing list. In addition to this broad distribution email list were the following approaches:

1) personal emails and phone calls to known colleagues

2) "cold calls" to companies, with requests to speak to the marketing manager

3) an on-line application form for the exhibits session on the NAACL Web site

4) emails sent to the "info@" addresses of companies that advertised in Multilingual Computing

In the end, we were able to attract the following companies, academic institutes and book publishers to the Exhibits Day Session:

Applied Technical Systems
Apptek
Blackwell Publishing
Cambridge University Press
Carnegie Mellon University, School of Computer Science
Cornell University, Intelligent Information Systems Institute
Intel
John Benjamins Publishing Company
Kluwer Academic Publishers
LexiQuest
LingoMotors
Multicorpora R&D Inc.
Nuance
Tata Infotech, Ltd.
Trados Corporation
Transclick

Lessons Learned

The amount of time invested in preparing for this exhibits session was considerable. I would advise future Exhibits and Sponsors committee members to start early and be persistent. In my experience, the least effective results stemmed from the generic emails. People are extremely busy, and these emails are easy to ignore.

Phone calls and personal emails were much more effective, and the on-line application form also drew in a few applications from companies we had not originally contacted. Surprisingly, we acquired two exhibitors from the emails sent to the "info@" addresses of Multilingual Computing advertisers. Follow up emails and phone calls were an essential part of the process.

The turndown in the economy had an effect on our ability to attract exhibitors, as well as sponsors. When the idea for the Exhibits Day session was first conceived (summer 2000), it was hard to imagine that we would have any problems attracting companies. However, the reality was that many companies that originally expressed keen interest in both the exhibits and sponsorships had to pull back for financial reasons. The economy also had an impact on the number of book

publishers we were able to attract this year. It is my hope that the success of this year's event will be a catalyst for an even more successful event next year.

****

Report from the Sponsorship Chair
Kurt Godden, Justtalk

Sponsorship report:

The sponsorship committe consisted of Arendse Bernth, Jeff Allen, and Kurt Godden (chair).

As of this writing, we have actually received money from only five Bronze sponsors, at $1k each. These five are: MERL, Nuance, SRA, AT&T Labs, and Clairvoyance. We *expect* to receive additional contributions from: LingoMotors (Bronze, $1k), TRADOS (Bronze, $1k), and Lexis-Nexis (Bronze, $1k).

Clairvoyance originally planned to be a Silver sponsor, but had to scale back due to economic reasons. This was actually a strong theme for the year, with two companies originally expecting to be Gold sponsors, but pulling out altogether due to the weak economy, and several other companies having similar cutbacks. I am disappointed, since I set a goal for myself to obtain more sponsorship money than last year's conference, but ended by obtaining far less.

All of last year's sponsors were solicited to become repeat sponsors, even to the point of personal communcation, but with little success. Some of this may be locale related, since, for example, Microsoft and Boeing were sponsors last year when the conference was in Seattle, but are not repeat sponsors this year.

I believe it is very helpful to have the exhibits and the sponsorship chairs work together, as Lynn Carlson and I did this year, beginning with our original solicitation announcement. Offering an exhibits discount to sponsors is also helpful. Some organizations originally contacted Lynn to become exhibitors and ended up also becoming sponsors, so I would encourage future chairs to continue working together. It may even be beneficial to have co-chairs of ONE committee on sponsorhips and exhibits, but I would not ask one person to perform both duties.

It also certainly helps to send repeated reminders to contacts, once they have expressed an interest in sponsorship, although you have to be careful not to be perceived as a spammer. We sent out one mass mailing, then a second reminder. After that, it was limited to people who expressed an interest. You can give a deadline to sponsors to sign up and contribute, but the deadline is not enforceable! And if it were enforceable, you would end up with fewer sponsors because organizations wait until the last minute to actually send their money.

One difficulty involves communications. Even though my instructions to sponsors clearly stated that I wanted them to inform me when they sent their checks to Priscilla, no one did. Therefore, I had to continue asking Priscilla to let me know who had sent her money, and how much. As a way to improve this, I would suggest that we accept the fact that sponsors will not bother to inform the chair of their payment. Rather, we ask Priscilla to send a quick email to the chair notifying them as checks are received. She ends up doing this anyway when the chair has to bother her, and since she is so remarkably efficient anyway, I am hoping this would not be perceived as a burden by her.

****

NAACL-2001 Publicity
Robert E Frederking and Ralf D Brown, Carnegie Mellon University
5/28/2001

Website and Related Issues

The conference webmaster (REF) was kept fairly busy keeping the website up-to-date. I believe this was successful, and that it was also reasonably attractive and easy to navigate. I made a serious attempt to make sure the website was equally usable under Netscape and IE, and from PC, Mac, and Unix platforms. Due to concern about possible negative pre-conceptions about visiting Pittsburgh, we produced a "Local Attractions" page early in the process, highlighting the nice qualities of the area, and the current lack of a steel industry. A web form was created for the "Call for Exhibitors" page, to accept and mail contact information to the Exhibits chair. Fairly late in the process, a shorter alias for the webapge was created, at the request of the Carnegie Mellon publicity person (Anne Watzmann).

I believe the only serious difficulty involving the website was the Online Registration. This was very late coming online (after the end of Early Registration) for several non-technical reasons, plus two technical ones: the changes required to move from one conference to another were very significant, and the NAACL webmaster did not have direct access to the ACL website (this latter added about three weeks to the delay).

If this package is going to continue to be reused for ACL-sponsored conferences, it would be worthwhile to redesign it to be more modular. (I have added notes to the NAACL version with suggestions. The main problem is that, currently, four separate source files need to have corresponding extensive changes made to them for events, dates, and prices; these might all be auto-generated from a single database in a redesigned system.) Otherwise a full student volunteer for just online registration will be needed for each conference, and they

should be given direct access to the ACL website.

In addition to conference-specific information changes, I:
-- Stripped out the Javascript due to security and modifiability concerns; I moved validation into radio-buttons and Perl, and moved the early/late distinction into separate webpages, requiring a manual link change at the end of Early Registration and at the end of Late Registration.
-- Changed the turquoise-on-gray color scheme. Also made the form look reasonable on non-Microsoft platforms.
-- Changed the CGI mechanism to work with the CGI package installed at Carnegie Mellon, for testing (which then had to be converted back again at ACL).

A second recommendation for future conference Webmasters (and Sponsorship chairs): it would be good to acquire high-resolution logos from the sponsors at the same time as the logos for the website are acquired. Website logos need only 72 pixels per inch, whereas any other publicity use (involving printing) requires much higher, typically at least 300 pixels per inch. This might be obvious, but was not obvious to us.

Other Publicity

Carnegie Mellon School of Computer Science development person (Matt Hughes) and publicity person (Anne Watzmann) helped in some fashion, but I (REF) was not directly involved in most of it.

(Anne Watzman sent out a press release to local and national news agencies. So far the NY Times and the Boston Globe have called asking for stories about language technologies, though they won't cover the conference.--LL)

Ralf Brown posted the conference announcement on mailing lists and news groups that were not on Priscilla's list.

We had a glossy conference brochure that was handed out at ACL, ICSLP, and AMTA. We also handed something out at HLT. For ICSLP we added a special note on the cover of the brochure, "speech and language papers welcome". For AMTA the note said "MT papers welcome".

==

NAACL-2001: Local Arrangements Report
Alon Lavie, Local Arrangements Chair

Local arrangements for NAACL-2001 started about 12 months in advance of the conference date, and have generally progressed smoothly throughout the year of planning and preparation for the conference. Preliminary planning focussed on putting together a local team of area coordinators, determining the general and preferred venues for the conference events, and setting up a working relationship with the office of conference services at Carnegie Mellon. At the point that our proposal to host NAACL-2001 at CMU was accepted, we had already determined that all conference sessions would take place at CMU's University Center (UC), and, based on availability constraints for the UC, that the proposed dates for the conference would be the first week of June. We then held a preliminary meeting with Lorrie Safar - the director of CMU Conference Services, and decided to hire the services of her office as a central logistics coordinator with all internal and external venues and vendors for the conference. The main advantages of working through CMU Conference Services were:

- Organizational: central coordination with all needed vendors by a knowledgeable professional familiar with the vendors and venues.
- Financial: An internal CMU account was opened for NAACL-2001, allowing all related expenses to be centrally charged and payed off after the conference.
- Preferred Rates: Since all financial commitments were done via CMU, we got to enjoy preferred rates offered to the university and tax free status.
- On Campus Housing: Lorrie's office is responsible for arranging all on-campus housing for outside events, and this service was thus naturally added to their responsibilities.

We next organized a local two-day site visit in mid July-2000 to review the main conference plans. Participants included: Diane Litman (NAACL President), Priscilla Rasmussen (ACL Business Manager), Lorrie Safar (CMU Conference Services), Lori Levin (conference General Chair) and Alon Lavie (conference LA Chair). We toured the meeting location site at the UC, reviewed tentative meeting rooms and event locations, and toured the proposed banquet location at the Carnegie Museum of Natural History. Priscilla and Diane stayed at the proposed conference hotel - the Holiday Inn University Center.

In early fall, we assembled a local team of area coordinators, and divided the main responsibilities:
- NAACL-2001 Website: Bob Frederking
- Publicity: Ralf Brown
- Email and Networking: Alan Black
- CD-Rom Production: Eric Nyberg

We also assembled a team of local student volunteers to assist with pre-conference work in the various areas, and began holding regular local arrangement meetings throughout the fall and winter. Main student area coordinators:
- AV coordinator: Greg Aist
- On-site Conference Student Volunteer coordinator: Kenji Sagae
- T-shirt and Music Band: Ariadna Font-Llitjos
- Local Information: Chad Langley
- CD-Rom: Stan Jou

- Signs: Stefanie Shriver
- Misc Projects: Benjamin Han

This team continued to meet regularly during the spring months leading to the conference (weekly in the two months before the conference). Coordination and contracting with all internal and external vendors was handled for the most part via Lorrie Safar, including:
- UC space and facilities
- Hotel Accommodations at the Holiday Inn
- On Campus Housing Accomodations
- CMU IT for all AV equipment
- CMU Catering for all on-site food
- Banquet hall rental and catering at Carnegie Museum
- Vendors for Bags, Badges, T-shirts

Late in the planning stages (April-2001), the School of Computer Science Development office came to our assistance in organizing the conference reception, some help with PR and with an offer for financial backing, in case of possible budget deficits. With their help, we moved the conference reception to the School of Computer Science, and put together a nice and impressive reception combined with an open-house of the Language Technologies Institute.

Main Problems and Lessons Learned:

(1) Some tasks should have been assigned to local coordinators earlier. One obvious example is the setup of online registration. Locally this fell on the shoulders of Bob Frederking, the web maintainer. We should have assigned this earlier on to someone with more time. Problems with getting online registration up in time were not just local in nature - this *really* requires some central streamlining from the ACL. See also Bob's report.
(2) We relied a bit too much on the services of CMU Conference Services. Lorrie Safar did a great job overall, but was over-committed and was not available as much as I would have liked in the critical last couple of weeks before the conference.
(3) Difficulties in accurately estimating the number of projected attendees. We estimated much too conservatively, and when we lost most of our tentative sponsorship money, we were forced to raise registration fees. This turned out to be completely unnecessary at the end. See details in the financial report.
(4) Overall, I feel that we did a good job of structuring and distributing the huge work load of preparing for the conference. The clear division of responsibilities among the various team coordinators and frequent timely coordination meetings kept the entire process both manageable and effective. I worked with a collection of competent and very dedicated people to which I owe many many thanks. I could have never done this job without them!

NAACL-2001 Financial Report
Alon Lavie, Local Arrangements Chair

The financial picture for NAACL-2001 was particularly difficult to predict and has changed significantly during the planning process and the months leading to the conference. We went from a feared deficit of $15K in March to our current estimate of a surplus of $28K. While our cost estimates were predicted with a fair degree of accuracy from early on in the process, income predictions changed dramatically due to two main factors:

(1) Tentative sponsorship money in the order of $20K evaporated in the Spring months due to the collapse of the high-tech industrial market.

(2) Projected attendance levels were initially low (~300 people), but proved to be extremely below actual registration levels -- pre-registration ended with ~450 registered participants. This completely changed the income picture, but late in the game. Registration fees had been fixed based on the predicted low numbers.

The way this played out was the following: We had initially planned a balanced draft budget, based on the predicted low number of participants, and a tentative level of $35K in sponsorship contributions. We calculated proposed registration fees based on these estimates (see details below). The loss of $25K in pledged sponsorship money put this budget into an alarming predicted deficit of $15K. After consultations with members of the NAACL Exec, we revised proposed registration rates by raising them approximately $25 across the board. This resulted in a revised budget with still a deficit of $9K. Pre-registration numbers then exceeded all our expectations. By the end of pre-registration, we had ~450 participants registered. Revising both income and expenses based on these new figures results in a budget surplus projection of up to $28K. Some expense categories are still based on estimated figures, and there were some additional unexpected expenses in the last few days of preparation for the conference. I believe we will end up with a final budget showing a surplus of about $20K. Both Barbara Di Eugenio and Kathy McCoy reviewed our draft budgets throughout the planning process and, assisted us with some suggestions, participated in the decision making process, and approved the draft budgets.

For comparison purposes, here are the initial proposed registration fees and the registration fees that were eventually adopted:

Initial proposed fees:

- Regular ACL member	$250 (early)	$300 (late, on location)	
- Regular Non-ACL member	$310 (early)	$370 (late)	- includes ACL memb dues
- Student ACL member	$100 (early)	$125 (late)	
- Student Non-ACL member	$130 (early)	$155 (late)	- includes ACL memb dues

- Workshops (each, 1 day)	$50 (early)	$75 (late)
- EMNLP (2 days)	$100 (early)	$150 (late)
- Tutorials (each, 1/2 day)	$100 (early)	$125 (late)
student	$75 (early)	$100 (late)
- Banquet tickets	$65 (regular)	$40 (student)

Final registration fees:

- Regular ACL member	$275 (early)	$325 (late)	$375 (on site)
- Regular Non-ACL member	$335 (early)	$385 (late)	$435 (on site)
- Reg Student ACL member	$120 (early)	$145 (late)	$170 (on site)
- Reg Student Non-ACL member	$150 (early)	$175 (late)	$200 (on site)
- CD-Only Student ACL member	$100 (early)	$125 (late)	$150 (on site)
- CD-Only Student Non-ACL member	$130 (early)	$155 (late)	$180 (on site)
- 1-day Workshops Reg Mem	$75 (early)	$100 (late)	$125 (on site)
- 2-day Workshops Reg Mem	$125 (early)	$150 (late)	$175 (on site)
- EMNLP (2 days) Reg Mem	$125 (early)	$150 (late)	$175 (on site)
- 1-day Workshops Student Mem	$50 (early)	$75 (late)	$100 (on site)
- 2-day Workshops Student Mem	$100 (early)	$125 (late)	$150 (on site)
- EMNLP (2 days) Student Mem	$100 (early)	$125 (late)	$150 (on site)
- Tutorials (each, 1/2 day)	$125 (early)	$150 (late)	$175 (on site)
Tutorial Student	$75 (early)	$100 (late)	$125 (on site)
- Banquet tickets	$65 (regular)	$40 (student)	

A copy of the current conference budget is available upon request.

4.2 NAACL-01 Program Chair – Kevin Knight

NAACL-01 Program Chair Report
Kevin Knight
June 13, 2001

1 The Program

For this year's NAACL, we got 110 submissions, of which 31 papers were accepted, for a main session acceptance rate of 28%. Here is the submission profile by region: 80 from North America (73%), 19 from Europe (17%), 11 from Asia (10%). Accepted papers included 22 from North America, 8 from Europe, 1 from Asia -- according to the location of the contact author. A high degree of collaboration indicates more participation from all regions. By contrast, last year's NAACL received 166 submissions and accepted 43, for an acceptance rate of 24%. ACL-97, ACL-99, and ACL-00 had acceptance rates between 24% and 26%.

I invited three speakers specifically in areas just a bit outside those researched by "typical ACLers" (as has been the custom). The speakers were: Jon Kleinberg ("Structure and Content in World Wide Web Search"), Tom Mitchell ("Machine Learning and Extracting Information from the Web"), and Aravind Joshi ("Language Modeling of Biological Data").

The paper presentations and invited talks fit into a "single-session" format.

2 The Process

We used a web-based "notification of submission" form that generated code numbers for submissions. This was extremely useful in tracking papers throughout the entire process.

We used hard copy for actual submission and distribution of papers to reviewers. This ensured that reviewers spent the maximum amount of time reviewing, and no time navigating or printing. This was important for them, given the extremely tight holiday-infested reviewing schedule. The burden of printing and copying was thereby placed on the submitting authors. It was not necessary to maintain a secure 24/7 web site throughout November, December, and January.

We used electronic mail for review submission and discussion among reviewers. This was serviceable, but required substantial amounts of work in passing the reviews up to the senior program commitee and program chair.

We used electronic mail for author notification. This worked fine.

Reviewing was blind.

I recruited the senior program committee (SPC): Eric Brill, Ann Copestake, Marti Hearst, Aravind Joshi, Andrew Kehler, Elliott Macklovitch, Fernando Pereira, Owen Rambow, Elizabeth Shriberg, and Ralph Weischedel. They were involved in many time-consuming activities, including assembling the program committee of 111 reviewers, assigning reviewers to papers, organizing in-depth discussions among reviewers of many papers, assembling reviews, and participating in the SPC meeting held in Los Angeles. I would like to thank them for this very hard work!

In contrast to previous years, SPC members were not assigned to particular sub-areas, but recruited for wide-ranging research experience. Similarly, SPC members in turn recruited reviewers (now called the "program committee" on the suggestion of the NAACL exec) based on who would be the most capable. I suggested to some SPC members that they try to make sure certain sub-areas were covered, and that was sufficient. The SPC/PC organization was not hierarchical. In assigning reviewers to particular papers, we found it very useful to be able to draw on all of the reviewers in the program committee rather than a subset dedicated to a particular area. For example, it was easy to assemble reviewers for a paper on morphology in language XYZ that would include experts in both morphology and XYZ.

There was no special track for "applications" papers this year, but papers were encouraged in the call and by the inclusion of applications-oriented researchers on the SPC. Six of the thirty one accepted papers described work on a large end-to-end system (for Q/A, speech, translation), while the rest described techniques that could be applied to many such systems.

SPC members were able to inspect paper titles from the "notification of submission" web page, and they could optionally indicate interest in certain titles by e-mail to me. I assigned each paper to an individual SPC member. I distributed paper hardcopies to the relevant SPC members, along with a reviewer-assignment matrix. I requested four suggested reviewers per paper. The matrix already blocked out many reviewer/paper conflicts, which I determined manually. The matrix came in several formats; some SPC members chose the paper format, making X's on it and fedexing it back to me; others

chose to do things by e-mail. I manually assembled the results, assigning three final reviewers to each paper, taking care not to overload individual reviewers.

Reviewers returned reviews to SPC members in charge of individual papers (some returned different reviews to different SPC members). The SPC organized discussions in cases of disagreement, also by e-mail. Reviews for papers were packaged and sent to me. I created paper booklets that included all of the reviews, and these booklets formed the basis of discussions at the face-to-face SPC meeting. Authors were notified (ahead of schedule) as to which papers were accepted and declined.

3 Things that went well

The process was very smooth. All the deadlines were made, despite a tight schedule that involved both November and December holidays. There were no problems with security (e.g., reviewer or author identities leaked incorrectly). The bulk of conflicts of interest were taken care of early in the process. The SPC/PC organization worked well.

4 Things that went wrong

The deadline for paper submissions was in November, earlier than typical ACL/AAAI/IJCAI deadlines. More papers might have been submitted if this deadline were later; heavier promotion would have been good, also.
As it was difficult to predict the number of submissions, we erred on the side of getting too many reviewers. This made the match between papers and reviewers very good, of course, but some reviewers were placed on "stand by."

5 Acknowledgements

Lori Levin, Alon Lavie, Bob Frederking, and Ralf Brown provided plenty of assistance from the Pittsburgh end. Eric Nyberg arranged the CD-ROM version of the proceedings. Special thanks to Lauri Grier of USC/ISI for her assistance in successfully navigating the program through a dozen tight deadlines. Lauri Grier, Liz Hall, Fanny Mak, and Kary Lau kept the records straight, helped identify potential reviewer conflicts, got papers to reviewers, and did many other things to give the program committee the maximum possible amount of time to review papers. Thanks to Irene Langkilde Geary for organizing hundreds of e-mail reviews into a coherent booklet for the senior program committee meeting, and for helping with the somewhat stressful final distribution of reviews. Thanks also to Yaser Al-Onaizan, who designed the electronic notification process and coordinated the formatting codes for the authors of the papers. Final thanks to the NAACL executive committee for providing useful suggestions and answering pressing questions.

5 Future Conferences

5.1 ACL-02 local arrangements – Martha Palmer

ACL'02 Local Arrangements update

Martha Palmer and Trisha Yanuzzi

The local arrangements committee is Robin Clark as Local Arrangements chair, with Martha Palmer and Fernando Pereira as co-chairs. Trisha Yannuzzi IRCS Administrative Director as well as other members of the IRCS administrative staff, and student and postdoc volunteers will also be on the committee.

We have assumed a 6-day meeting, with up to 600 people attending the regular 3-day conference, and approximately 200 people attending tutorials (Day 1) and the same number attending workshops (Days 5 and 6). During the regular conference, we have assumed at least two parallel tracks for all sessions except the plenary ones. We have assumed that hotel space will be needed for 250-300 people and dormitory space will be needed for approximately 200 people.

We were able to secure accommodations for the period July 7-12, 2002. We have negotiated a rate of $119 per night single or double at the Inn at Penn, http://www.theinnatpenn.com and $99 per night at the University City Sheraton, http://www.sheraton.com/property.taf?prop=992

The main hotel for the conference will be the Inn at Penn, although this hotel does not have sufficient space to host the main conference, we can certainly host the tutorials and workshops at the Inn at Penn.

The main meeting site for ACL 2002 will be in our newly renovated Houston Hall in the Perelman Quadrangle, for the building layout, please see the url http://www.upenn.edu/perelmanquad/wynnplan.html.

The individual meeting rooms are available at $125 per day plus setup fees determined by room requirements and audio-visual costs. Houston Hall, Irvine Auditorium, and Logan Hall (contiguous sites) have sufficient meeting facilities to accommodate the 2002 meeting.

For the parallel sessions we have reserved Bodek Lounge in Houston Hall, 450 maximum capacity with portable seating, built-in sound system, additional AV Cart Technology, 102'x 40' (4203 sq. ft.) and Logan Hall G-17, 275 maximum capacity, fixed seating, built in AV with video projector, sound system and OH Projector, 3300 sq. ft. If needed there is an additional large room above Bodek Lounge in Houston Hall.

The demo room is across the hallway from G-17, in room G-14 and is called The Terrace Room, it has a maximum seating capacity of 225 with portable seating, 56'6" x 42'6", 2411.16 sq. ft. Portable AV Cart and multiple internet access ports are also available.

The auditorium for the plenary sessions is the Main Hall of Irvine Auditorium, capacity 1260 (800 in orchestra area, remaining is in balcony space), fixed seating with built in AV equipment (same as G-17.)

Although Dormitory accommodation ($45 a night) is available on campus, the

rooms are not private, have shared bathroom facilities, are 3 blocks further than the hotel and most importantly, must be paid in advance and are non-refundable. We are hoping to encourage people to share rooms at the Sheraton instead of using the dormitory rooms.

As part of conference, we are planning a special ''Open House'' event at Penn's Institute for Research in Cognitive Science, with posters, demonstrations and refreshments. Because IRCS supports inter-disciplinary research involving psychology, logic, vision and robotics, as well as linguistics and computer science, ACL 2002 participants would have the opportunity to see related research that might not otherwise be presented at an ACL conference.

We have not identified a particular spot for the ACL banquet: possibilities include the Franklin Institute downtown and the University Museum on the Penn Campus, or of course another hotel. Another possibility is the Hard Rock Cafe. Special bus service would be provided for participants for such an evening special event.

5.2 ACL-03 site selection – John Nerbonne

ACL-03 Site Selection
John Nerbonne

The site selection for ACL 2003 began with intensive discussions in the summer of 2000 between John Nerbonne (responsible for coordinating site selection) then President Wolfgang Wahlster and Vice-President Ed Hovy. Everyone agreed that the three-year rotation between Asia, Europe, and North America needed to continue, and so it was agreed to involve Jun'ichi Tsujii in the call for papers. Secretary-Treasurer Kathy McCoy met with all of the above to discuss the point that this would be done without the support of a local chapter. (ACL had expressed a wish that an Asian chapter might form, like the European and North American Chapters.)

A "Call for Bids to Host ACL 2003" was published widely on internet lists on Dec. 11, 2000. It is enclosed below. The resulting "pre-bids" arrived in April and were the object of careful discussion in the ACL Executive Committee, who took the unusual step of indicating immediately that a bid from Sapporo, Japan was so clearly superior that it discouraged others from working out their "pre-bids" into full-fledged proposals. This bid was made by a consortium of leading Japanese Computational Linguists, led by Kenji Araki of Hokkaido University, not only involves leaders in the CL community, but also an attractive site and surroundings, at a convenient time of year, July 7-12.
The proposal will be available at the ACL archive.

John Nerbonne,

```
ACL Vice-President, 2001

------------- Begin Forwarded Message -------------

>From rasmusse@cs.rutgers.edu Mon Dec 11 21:32:18 MET 2000
Subject: Re: Call for Bids to Host ACL 2003

> %%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%
>
> CALL for Bids to Host ACL 2003
>
> The Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL) hereby
> invites proposals to host the 41st Annual Meeting of the ACL (ACL'03).
> International ACL conferences are usually held at the end of July.
> In keeping with the ACL policy of rotating conference venues,
> we seek proposals from Asia.
>
> The proposal submission process is in two stages. First, draft proposals are
> sought from prospective proposers. Based on the evaluation of the draft
> proposals, selected proposers will be invited to submit full proposals. The
> intent of a request for draft proposals is to minimize the labor and costs
> associated with the production of full proposals.
>
> Bids for Local Arrangements Chair can include suggestions for General
> Chair, which must be someone other than the Local Arrangements Chair
> but could be at the same institution.
>
> The General Chair will be responsible for overseeing operations of
> the conference, including working with the Executives of the ACL and
> the NAACL and collaborating with the Local Arrangements Chair to develop
> the budget and registration materials; working with the Program and
> Local Arrangements Chairs to develop the schedule and program;
> working with the ACL Executive Board to appoint supporting chairs to
> obtain outside funding, publicize the conference, and organize
> workshops, tutorials, student events, and demonstrations (none of
> these supporting nominations need to be included in the proposal);
> and coordinating the activities of the various chairs and their
> committees.
>
> The Local Arrangements Chair will be responsible for the activities
> such as arranging meeting rooms, equipment, refreshments, housing,
> on-site registration, participant e-mail access, security for
> equipment, the reception, the banquet, and working with the General
> Chair, the ACL, and the NAACL to develop the budget and registration
> materials.
>
> The ACL Executive Board will select the Program Committee Chair, who
> will be responsible for the processes of soliciting, receiving, and
> reviewing submissions; selecting the papers to be presented at the
> conference; notifying authors of acceptance or rejection; and
> developing the conference program.
>
```



```
> Draft proposals are due on 15 April 2001.  Draft proposals are evaluated
> competitively by the ACL Executive Committee. Selected proposers will be
> informed electronically before 15 May 2001. Full proposals are due on 15
> June 2001.
>
> Draft proposals should include:
>
> - Location (accessibility, conference venue, hotels, student dorms)
> - Local CL Community
> - Proposed Date
> - Meeting Space (space for plenary sessions, tutorials, workshops,
>     posters, exhibits, demos and small meetings)
> - A/V equipment
> - Food/Entertainment/Banquet/Receptions
> - Local Arrangements (chairs, committee, volunteer labor, registration
>     handling)
> - Sponsorships
> - Budget estimates
>
> Proposals will be evaluated in relation to a number of site selection
> criteria (unordered):
>
> - Experience of Local Arrangement team.
> - Local CL community support.
> - Local government and industry support.
> - Accessibility and  attractiveness of proposed site.
> - Appropriateness of proposed dates.
> - Adequacy of conference and exhibit facilities for the anticipated
>     number of registrants
> - Adequacy of residence accommodations and food services in a range of
>     price categories and close to the conference facilities.
> - Adequacy of budget projections and expected surplus.
> - Balance with regard to the geographical distribution of previous
>     conferences.
>
> Draft proposals should be sent electronically to the ACL Vice-President,
> with a copy to the executive committee's area coordinator for 2001.
>
> Prof. John Nerbonne                  Prof. Junichi TSUJII
> Alfa Informatica, P.O. Box 716      Department of Information Science
> University of Groningen             Faculty of Science, University of Tokyo
> 9700 AS Groningen, The Netherlands  7-3-1 Hongo Bunkyo-ku Tokyo 113-0033 JAPA
> Tel. +31 (0)50 363 58 15               +81 (0)3-5841-4098
> Fax            363 68 55                        5802-8872
> Email: nerbonne@let.rug.nl          tsujii@is.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp
> http://www.let.rug.nl/~nerbonne     http://www-tsujii.is.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp/
>
> Submission Dates:
>
> Draft proposals are due on 15 April 2001;
> Full proposals are due on 15 June 2001.
```

6 Special Interest Groups

6.1 General – John Nerbonne

Special Interest Groups
John Nerbonne

SIGDAT, the special interest group for linguistic data and corpus-based approaches to NLP, held a Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in NLP and Very Large Corpora (EMNLP/VLC-2000) immediately after ACL-2000 in Hong Kong (Oct.7-8).

SIGDIAL sponsored several meetings:
- AAAI Spring Symposium, My Dinner with R2D2: Natural Dialogues with Practical Robotic Devices (March 20-22, Stanford, California)
- Workshop on Conversational Systems, NAACL/ANLP (May 4, Seattle, Washington, USA)
- From spoken dialogue to full natural interactive dialogue: Theory, empirical analysis and evaluation. (May 29, LREC 2000) (Athens, Greece)
- Gtalog 2000: 4th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue (June 15-17, Gteborg University, Sweden)
- Third Workshop on Human-Computer Conversation (July 3-5, Bellagio, Italy)
- ACL 2000: 1st SigDial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue with theme session on Principles For Dialogue System Evaluation (October 7-8, Hong Kong)
- AAAI Fall Symposium, Building Dialogue Systems for Tutorial Applications (November 3-5, North Falmouth, MA, USA)

SIGGEN sponsored "Impacts in Language Generation: NLG Between Technology and Applications" 24-28 July, Schloss Dagstuhl, Saarland, Germany; and "International Natural Language Generation Conference 13-16 June, Mitzpe Ramon, Israel.

SIGLEX was involved in the following events:
- SIMPLE: From Monolingual to Multilingual Resources LREC2000, Athens, Greece, June 3, 2000.
- The second Chinese Language Processing Workshop ACL-2000, Hong Kong, Oct. 7-8.
- Word Senses and Multi-Linguality, ACL-2000, Hong Kong, Oct. 7-8.
- Semantic Annotation and Intelligent Content, Coling00, Luxembourg, Aug 5/6.

SIGNLL organized CoNLL-2000, The Fourth Computational Natural Language Learning Workshop, Sept. 14, Lisbon, Portugal (held in conjunction with ICGI-2000, the Fifth International Colloquium on Grammatical Inference, Sept. 11-13, Lisbon, and with a workshop on Learning Language in Logic.

SIGPARSE held IWPT 2000, the INternational Workshop on Parsing Technology, on Feb. 23-25 in Trento, Italy.

SIGPHON held SIGPHON 5 in conjunction with COLING 2000 in Luxemburg.

SIGSEM held the Second Workshop on Inference in Computational Semantics Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany July 29-30. There was active preparation for IWCS-4, The Fourth International Workshop on Computational Semantics held in Tilburg, Netherlands, January 10-12, 2001.

Martha Palmer and Richard Sproat discussed the formation of a special interest group for Chinese Language Processing. They will submit a proposal, including a constitution, in 2001.

6.2 SIGDAT – Kenneth W. Church, David Yarowsky

SIGDAT
Ken Church, David Yarowsky

SIGDAT is ACL's special interest group for linguistic data and corpus-based approaches to NLP.

In 2001, SIGDAT organized the 2-day Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-2001). The meeting was held immediately prior to NAACL-2001 at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on June 3 and 4.

Lillian Lee served as conference chair and Donna Harman served as conference co-chair. 21 papers were accepted for presentation out of 65 submissions, consistent with the typical 25-32% acceptance rate of SIGDAT conferences and workshops.

Approximately 200 people attended EMNLP-2001, and the conference yielded a $6000 surplus based on preliminary post-conference accounting.

The theme of the conference was "What Works and What Doesn't: Successes and Challenges". Eric Brill of Microsoft Research gave an invited talk on the subject "Paucity Shmaucity -- What Can We Do With A Trillion Words?". Two panels were held, one on the topic of "When Does EM Work?" (with Eugene Charniak, Kevin Knight, Ted Pedersen, and Stefan Riezler) and one on "What Works and What Doesn't: Industrial Perspectives" (with Adam Berger, David Evans, Joshua Goodman, and Lynette Hirschman).

Generous sponsorship was provided by the Intelligent Information Systems Institute (a joint Cornell University/Air Force Research Laboratory organization).

6.3 SIGDIAL – Laila Dybkjaer

SIGDIAL
Laila Dybkj?r

SIGdial is the ACL and ISCA Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue which was formed in November 1997. This report covers the period from July 2000 to June 2001.

PEOPLE:

SIGdial is for the moment being run by the following team: President: Laila Dybkjr; Vice President: David Traum; Secretary: Barbara di Eugenio; Science Advisory Committee: Jennifer Chu-Carroll, Morena Danieli, Diane Litman, Akira Shimazu, Michael Strube, Jan van Kuppevelt; Information Officer: Pamela Jordan with contributions from Kristiina Jokinen; AAAI Liaison: Diane Litman, ACL Student Liaison: Weiqun Xu; CHI Liaison: Nils Dahlbck; ICSLP/ISCA Liaison: Julia Hirschberg; Mailing list maintenance: Laurent Romary.

SIGdial has more than 200 members registered on its membership web page. Since September 2000 almost 100 members have registered on the web.

Elections are held every second year and the next elections will take place this summer/autumn.

WORKSHOP ENDORSEMENT

During the past year several workshops with strong relations to the SIGdial field of interest have been endorsed by SIGdial. The workshops endorsed by SIGdial which have taken place within the reported period include:

July 3-5, 2000: Third Workshop on Human-Computer Conversation (Bellagio, Italy).

October 7-8, 2000: ACL2000: 1st SigDial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue with theme session on Principles For Dialogue System Evaluation (Hong Kong).

November 3-5, 2000: AAAI Fall Symposium, Building Dialogue Systems for Tutorial Applications (North Falmouth, MA, USA).

June 4 2001: NAACL: Workshop on Adaptation in Dialogue Systems (Pittsburgh, USA).

June 14-16 2001: BI-DIALOG 2001 (Fifth Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue) (Bielefeld, Germany).

Workshops which have been endorsed by SIGdial but havent been held yet include:

July 6-7 2001: ACL-EACL Workshop on Evaluation for Language and Dialogue Systems (Toulouse, France).

August 5 2001: 2nd IJCAI Workshop on Knowledge And Reasoning In Practical Dialogue Systems (Seattle, USA).

August 20-24 2001: ESSLLI Workshop: Information Stucture, Discourse Structure and Discourse Semantics (Helsinki Finland).

October 22-24 2001: ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop on: Prosody in Speech Recognition and Understanding (Red Bank, USA).

June 17-21, 2002: ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop on Spoken Dialogue in Mobile Environments (Kloster Irsee, Germany).

SIGDIAL WORKSHOP SERIES

To strengthen collaboration and bring members from the SIGdial community together the first SIGdial workshop on Discourse and Dialogue was held on 7-8 October 2000 in Hong Kong in conjunction with ACL2000. The workshop was a successful event with about 35 participants, 18 paper presentations, and lively discussions after each presentation. The online workshop proceedings are available at http://www.sigdial.org/sigdialworkshop/proceedings/. Hardcopies can be bought via ACL.

At the first workshop there was strong support for organising a second SIGdial workshop already in 2001. This is now happening. The second SIGdial workshop will take place on 1-2 September in Aalborg, Denmark, right before Eurospeech2001. Information on SIGdial workshops can be found at http://www.sigdial.org/workshops.html

WEB

SIGdial has a web site at http://www.sigdial.org. The web site is hosted by NISLab. Some pages are maintained by a particular person, such as the information officer, while other pages are intended to be maintained by the membership collectively. For instance, the web site enables members to easily update their personal information in the membership database. Also a resource page has been established which members are encouraged to collectively maintain by adding references to resources they are aware of and which may be of interest to the SIGdial community. This page includes references to e.g. coding schemes, language resources, spoken dialogue systems, and tools.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Since autumn 2000 SIGdial has a collaboration with Elsnet, the European Language and Speech Network. Elsnet has a newsletter, Elsnews, and Elsnet has generously offered one page in each issue of Elsnews for SIGdial purposes. SIGdial contributions in Elsnews can be found in issue 9.3 and onwards. Elsnews can be freely downloaded in pdf format from http://www.elsnet.org/elsnews.html.

Since May 2001 SIGdial has had two parent organisations, i.e. ACL (the Association for Computational Linguistics) and ISCA (the International Speech Communication Association). People from the two communities of ACL and ISCA have often been working on discourse and dialogue from different perspectives and with different purposes. Bringing those people together in SIGdial is hoped to foster fruitful discussions and new activities.

SIGdial is also actively involved in promoting outreach to other groups with overlapping interest. For example the Bi-Dialog workshop on semantics and pragmatics of dialogue was endorsed by both SIGdial and SigSem, and the upcoming workshop on spoken dialogue in mobile environments is endorsed by both SIGdial and SIGMedia.

6.4 SIGGEN – Ehud Reiter

SIGGEN Report
Ehud Reiter

CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS: SIGGEN solicited bids for INLG-02. One bid was received, from Kathy McKeown to hold INLG in Arden House in New York State. The committee of previous INLG chairs accepted this bid, after passing on some comments and suggestions to Kathy. SIGGEN also offered "support in name" to the 2001 European NLG workshop (which is associated with ACL'01) and to the International workshop on Computational Models of Natural Language Argument (associated with ICCS'01). We also decided we would like to keep statistical data (papers, attendees, finances) on INLG conferences, and managed to retrospectively gather such data for several past INLGs.

MAILING LIST: We had some perhaps inappropriate postings on the SIGGEN mailing list (and some people shortly afterwards removed themselves from the list), so we decided to make it moderated. The moderators are two board members (Maria Milosavljevic and Ehud Reiter). After moderation, the SIGGEN mailing list is low-frequency (less than 10 messages per month) but high quality, and very few people have unsubscribed from the list subsequently.

WEB SITE: Our Web site continues to be an up-to-date list of conferences, announcements, jobs, books, and other information useful to the NLG community.

ELECTION: As agreed in INLG-00, we are holding an election for two (of the four) non-student board members, plus the student member; two of the existing non-student members will stay on. A call for candidates was sent out on 1 May 2001, and the election itself will happen over the summer.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES: We discussed the new ACL Guidelines for SIG's, but felt that any changes to SIGGEN's structure should

be discussed and approved at an INLG business meeting, it would be inappropriate for the current board to act on its own.

6.5 SIGLEX – Adam Kilgarriff

SIGLEX Report
Adam Kilgarriff

SENSEVAL
========

The second SENSEVAL - WSD evaluation exercise - is currently underway, and culminates with a two-day workshop in Toulouse, 5-6 July. (Particular thanks to Patrick St Dizier for his help with local arrangments). Like the first SENSEVAL, this proceeds under an ACL-SIGLEX banner, while receiving support, either in name, financial, or both, from a number of other sources: EURALEX, ELSNET, Pearson Education, ELRA, UK EPSRC and other national Governments. This time we had tasks for 13 languages, which involved co-ordinating 13 task-organising groups. (This role was taken by Phil Edmonds, at Sharp, and Scott Cotton, managing data uploads/downloads, at UPenn.) There are around sixty participating WSD systems, and around 90 people registered for the workshop. As last time the exercise has generated a high level of interest and excitement.

NAACL workshop
==============

The NAACL workshop on WordNet and Other Lexical Resources: Applications, Extensions and Customizations was organised with a modest level of SIGLEX involvement. (It isn't clear whether this is properly classified as a SIGLEX event.)

Future events
=============

SIGLEX is involved in a first Global WordNet Association conference, being planned for Mysore, India, January 2002. There is also a joint meeting with SIGSEM planned for January 2003.

Other activity
==============

In the short year since last ACL, when the current officials were elected, SENSEVAL has been a major activity for SIGLEX, leaving little time for anything else. The senseval-discuss list has taken a role that might otherwise have been taken by a separate SIGLEX list. The domain name siglex.org has recently been acquired and the SIGLEX site will be moved to it and further developed over the coming months.

6.6 SIGMEDIA – Elisabeth Andre

SIGMEDIA (Multimedia Language Processing)
Elisabeth Andre

MAILING ADDRESS: sigmedia@dfki.de
URL: http://www.sigmedia.org

SPONSORED WORKSHOPS:
Together with MITRE, SIGMedia has been serving as a co-sponsor of the ACL Workshop on Temporal and Spatial Information Processing which will take place in Toulouse on July 7th 2001. The organizers of the workshop are: Lisa Harper, MITRE, USA, Inderjeet Mani, MITRE and Georgetown University, USA and Beth Sundheim, SPAWAR Systems Center, USA.

SIGMedia is also involved in a joint activity with the ACL Special Interest Group SIGDial. Both of them support the International Speech Communication Association with the preparation of a the ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop on Spoken Dialogue in Mobile Environments. The workshop will take place at Kloster Irsee, Germany from June 17-21, 2002. The organizers of the workshop are: Paul Heisterkamp and Wolfgang Minker, both DaimlerChrysler AG, Germany, Laila Dybkjaer, University of Southern Denmark and Elisabeth Andre, University of Augsburg, Germany. The URL of the workshop is: http://www.sigmedia.org/ids02/

WEBSITE:
SIGMedia got its own domain which is: http://www.sigmedia.org. As in the previous years, there is a cooperation with the Electronic Transactions of Artificial Intelligence Area User Interfaces which maintains a website with relevant conferences together with SIGMedia. Peter Rist from DFKI volunteered to create a new logo and a new layout for the SIGMedia webpages.

MAILING LIST:
Since SIGMEDIA got a variety of undesired emails in the past, it was decided to maintain a moderated list. The moderator is Elisabeth Andre. For the future, we consider to send out a regular newsletter in cooperation with ETAI due a high overlap in people on the SIGMedia and the ETAI-lists.

MEMBERSHIP:
Even though the SIGMedia membership is generally increasing, we also feel that the area of multimedia language processing has to be promoted to a stronger extent within the ACL community. While there is high interest in specialized workshops that address NLP in a multimedia context, the number of multimedia papers at general NLP conferences, such as ACL or COLING is rather low.

6.7 SIGMOL – Larry Moss

SIGMOL Report
Larry Moss

The main activity this year of MOL has been to organize our biannual meeting. This time, the meeting will be held

with the Formal Grammars meeting. It will be just before ESSLLI, in Helsinki. The conference received 48 submissions, primarily from Europe. We accepted 24. The papers will appear in a volume of the Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, and authors will be invited to submit final versions to a special issue of the Journal of Language and Computation. The meeting is organized by Geert-Jan Kruijff, Larry Moss, and Dick Oehrle.

In addition, MOL this year sponsored a symposium at the American Association for the Advancement of Science in San Francisco. The topic was Statistics in Linguistics and NLP. The speakers were Mitch Marcus, Chris Manning, Mark Johnson, Andras Kornai, and Fernando Pereira. The point of organizing the meeting was to showcase an area that we feel enthusiastic about, and to do this in as public a way as possible. We mentioned the fact that MOL is a special interest group of the ACL. In addition, we plan to organize another session at the next AAAS meeting, this time on finite-state methods. We feel that the ACL might consider similar public events, and we’re happy to share our experiences.

As in the past, MOL is an unstructured organization which does not collect dues and exists primarily to hold its biannual meeting. The president currently is Larry Moss, and in August the current vice president, Dick Oehrle, succeeds him.

6.8 SIGNLL – Walter Daelemans

SIGNLL (Natural Language Learning)
Walter Daelemans

In 2000 SIGNLL has an estimated 240 members (judging from the on-line information, and controlled for inactive email addresses). The SIGNLL home page is located at URL http://www.aclweb.org/signll/.

The goals of the SIG (promoting of and informing about research on computational language learning) are served by the following two activities: (i) the maintenance of an informative and up-to-date website, and (ii) the organization of at least one yearly event (CoNLL), and support of other related activities.

The web-pages, maintained by Antal van den Bosch, remain an important source of information, complemented by an email list for conference announcements. On the web-site, links can be found to relevant assocations, networks, research cooperations, research departments, groups, institutes, individuals, mailing lists, archives, journals, bulletins, conference reports, online papers, online courses and slides, bibliographies, software, corpora, companies, meta-information sources etc.

The main event in 2000 was the fourth CoNLL (SIGNLL Conference on Natural Language Learning), organized with the 5th ICGI (International Colloquium on Grammar Inference) and the second LLL (Learning Language in Logic) in Lisbon, Portugal. Because of joint registration for the three events, and fusion of the latter two, we are unsure about the exact partipation numbers. Overall, 100 participants from 22 countries were attracted by the program. 37 of the CoNLL submissions were incorporated in lecture sessions, a poster session, and a successful shared task session in which systems were submitted and evaluated for the task of chunking.

The fifth CoNLL will be held in Toulouse in conjunction with ACL/EACL. We received more than 60 submissions (comparable to ECML) of which 20 were accepted (not counting the shared task, which is about clause segmentation this year), and there will be invited talks by Eric Brill and John Nerbonne. At the time of writing (May, 2000) already more than 60 people registered for the workshop.

Current president is Walter Daelemans, secretary Claire Cardie, and the advisory board consists of Thorsten Brants, Michael Brent, James Cussens, Raymond Mooney, John Nerbonne, Miles Osborne, David Powers, Dan Roth, and Ronan Reilly. Our SIGDAT Liaison Representative remains David Yarowsky, and our Information Officer Antal van den Bosch. The offices of president and secretary are up for election again in 2001. These elections will be organized after the summer of 2001.

We think SIGNLL is still unique in its multiple focus (computational models of language learning both for language engineering and for testing psycholinguistic and linguistic theories; formal and empirical aspects of learning of both artificial and natural languages). We think we have successfully strived for complementarity with related SIGDAT events such as EMNLP and WVLC, and have contributed to interdisciplinary communication by our conference co-location policy.

6.9 SIGPARSE – Harry Bunt

SIGPARSE
Harry Bunt

Over the period June 2000 - June 2001, the activities of SIGPARSE have, as usual, focussed on matters concerning the biennial 'International Workshop on Parsing Technologies' (IWPT) series.

In addition, SIGPARSE gives its sponsorship to appropriate workshops and conferences; this happened last year for the workshop on Chinese Language Processing that took place in conjunction with ACL-2000 in Hong Kong.

The biennial rhythm of the IWPT workshop series (1989-91-93-95-97) was slightly disturbed in 1999/2000, when it was decided to move the workshop, originally scheduled for late 1999, to 2000 for fear of logistic problems relating to the millenium change. The 6th International Workshop on Parsing Technologies thus became IWPT 2000 rather then IWPT'99; it took place at the Institute for Research in Science and Technology (IRST) in Trento, Italy. The organisation was in the hands of John Carroll as program chair, Alberto Lavelli as local arrangements chair, and Harry Bunt as general chair. The workshop had approximately the same number of participants as the previous IWPT (between 60 and 70), and enjoyed a satisfactory number of submitted papers from which a high-quality selection of 23 papers was made that were presented at the workshop, supplemented with 17 posters. Invited talks were given by Martin Kay, Eric Brill and Giorgio Satta. The proceedings, containing the 23 accepted papers, summary versions of the invited talks, and abstracts of the posters were available at the workshop. The local arrangements were organised in an excellent fashion, and the workshop may be considered quite successful.

Shortly afterwards, the preparations started for the 7th International Workshop on Parsing Technologies, with the idea to return to the original rhythm and have it in 2001, for the first time in Asia. IWPT'01 will take place in Beijing, China, on 17-19 October this year. The organization is in the hands of a local arrangements committee co-chaired by Fuliang Weng and Shiwen Yu, program committee chair Giorgio Satta, and Harry Bunt as general chair.

An edited and revised collection of selected papers from the 5th International Workshop on Parsing Technologies (IWPT'97) has been published as the book "Advances in Probabilistic and Other Parsing Technologies", Harry Bunt and Anton Nijholt, editors; Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht 2000 (series Text, Speech and Language Technology). This book is a sequel to the two volumes based on workshops in the IWPT series that were published earlier: "Current Issues in Parsing Technology" (Masaru Tomita, ed.; Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston/Dordrecht 1991), based on IWPT'89, and "Recent Advances in Parsing Technology" (Harry Bunt and Masaru Tomita, eds.; Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston/Dordrecht 1996), based on IWPT'93.

During the period reported here, Harry Bunt (Tilburg University) has continued as SIGPARSE officer. Alon Lavie at CMU has been most helpful in continuing to maintain the active SIGPARSE email list ('sigparse-project@cs.cmu.edu'). John Carroll has on several occasions advised on sigparse matters. A SIGPARSE website is maintained at the Department of Computer Science at the University of Twente in Enschede, the Netherlands. This site can be found at 'http://parlevink.cs.utwente.nl/sigparse/'.

SIGPARSE has always been a very loosely organized SIG without any formalized structure. During IWPT 2000 the question was discussed whether this should change. It was generally felt that the informal organization works well and should remain that way.

6.10 SIGPHON – Jason Eisner

SIGPHON (Computational Phonology)
Jason Eisner

As SIGPHON mostly has biannual workshops, this has been an in-between year. The proceedings of last summer's "Finite-State Phonology" workshop was revised by authors and went online (http://arXiv.org/abs/cs.CL/0102022).

We are currently planning some initiatives to increase crosstalk with the pure linguistics community. The phonologist John Goldsmith has joined the SIGPHON executive committee, and we aim to sponsor a satellite event, such as a tutorial + workshop, at a major linguistics conference during the coming academic year. We also hope to increase communication via the usual electronic channels.

SIGPHON continues to serve the community by maintaining a mailing list and online bibliographies at its web site, www.cogsci.ed.ac.uk/sigphon/. Membership is a bit up, at 190, with 39 members declaring computational phonology as their "primary" interest.

6.11 SIGSEM – Patrick Blackburn

SIGSEM
Patrick Blackburn and Harry Bunt

It has been an exciting year for SIGSEM. Last year's report contained the following words:

> It was anticipated that membership would plateau at about 90. In fact, in the first two weeks since the site was made public we have signed up 110 members. We will be continuing our membership drive in the coming weeks. It now seems plausible that we will attract over 150 members by the end of the year.

This turned out to be a gross underestimate. The results of our membership drive greatly exceeded our expectations: at the end of last year (31 December 2000) our membership was 435, and our current membership (24 May 2001) is 532.

This is an extremely pleasant development, and one that suggests that there is untapped interest in computational semantics. Of course, our task is now to ensure that this interest is not dissipated. We have been attempting to do this in the following ways:

(1) Newsletter. SIGSEM is now emailing a newsletter to its membership every four months. The first two newsletters have already

been sent out. Copies of these can be found on the SIGSEM website, www.sigsem.org (click on ARCHIVE).

(2) Website. The center of SIGSEM is its webpage, and we have been slowly developing it, adding links of interest to members, and so on. Our long term goal is to make this site a key resource for anyone interested in computational approaches to natural language semantics.

(3) Business meeting. A SIGSEM business meeting was held during IWCS-4 (the Fourth International Workshop in Computational Semantics) in Tilburg, from 16.45 - 17.45, on 11 January 2001. The meeting was well attended and a number of interesting ideas were raised concerning both general themes (such as possible future directions for SIGSEM) and specific issues (such as possible changes to the website). There is a report on the SIGSEM business meeting on the SIGSEM webpage.

(4) Endorsing courses. SIGSEM has endorsed four courses at ESSLLI-XIII, which will be held on 13-24 August 2001 in Helsinki, Finland. ESSLLI stands for "European Summer Schools in Logic Language and Information". At some stage, it is likely that SIGSEM will try to host its own schools, focussed entirely on computational semantics. In the meantime, ESSLLI endorsements seem a good way of raising the field profile, and attracting young researchers.

Two SIGSEM endorsed computational semantics workshops were held (or will be held) in 2001: IWCS-4 and ICoS-3.

The Fourth International Workshop in Computational Semantics (IWCS-4), hosted by the Computational Linguistics and Artificial Intelligence Group at Tilburg University, was held in Tilburg, the Netherlands, from 10-12 January 2001. The IWCS is the leading workshop in computational semantics. The IWCS-4 program, consisting of 3 invited talks (by James Allen, Jan van Eijck and Alex Lascarides), 22 submitted talks, and a number of shorter presentations, continued the tradition in fine form and was much enjoyed by participants. There is a report on IWCS-4 on the SIGSEM webpage.

The Third Inference in Computational Semantics workshop (ICoS-3). will be co-located with IJCAR in June 2001 in Siena, Italy. IJCAR, the International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning, is a one-off event made up of the three main automated reasoning conferences (CADE, FTP, and TABLEAUX). Co-locating ICoS-3 with IJCAR should encourage further links between the automated reasoning and NLP communities. The last SIGSEM newsletter asked for volunteers to write a report on ICoS-3, and we hope this will be made available sometime later this year.

Summing up: a good year for SIGSEM. But not a time to sit back and relax. While the numbers are impressive, it is clear that much remains to be done to increase awareness among students and researchers of what computational semantics is about, and to forge links with neighboring disciplines. These are the tasks that SIGSEM has set for itself in the coming years.

7 Organizations/Initiatives

7.1 ACL Website – Dragomir Radev

The ACL Internet site (http://www.aclweb.org)
Dragomir R. Radev

INTRODUCTION

o The ACL Web site is getting significantly more popular. From September 20, 2000 to June 24, 2001, the top-level page has been accessed 190,606 times. That is an average of 686 hits (accesses) per day (or an increase of 107.2% over the previous year).

NEW ACTIVITIES

o NAACL registration was held electronically (Robert Frederking) http://www.naacl.org

o A new online election will be held at ACL'2001.

CONTINUING FEATURES

o The ACL NLP/CL Universe, the catalog of Web-based NLP/CL resources, has grown at a steady rate. Since last year there has been an 3.3% increase in the number of pointers, bringing their total from 2206 to 2279. There are now 323 personal pages, 524 pointers to various resources (corpora, software, etc.), 327 academic or industrial labs, departments, and institutes, 65 professional organizations, etc.

o The mailing list acl-news is used to announce new additions to the NLP/CL Universe. Currently, the list includes 527 subscribers. The list is posted automatically to the only NLP-related newsgroup on Usenet - comp.ai.nat-lang.

o The unofficial Natural Language Processing FAQ (list of Frequently Asked Questions and Answers) is still available through the ACL page. Volunteers are sought to contribute to the list.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

o ACL members should make an attempt to announce all events, resources, or personal and lab pages to the aclweb.org site using the on-line URL submission mechanism.

Please feel free to send me mail with suggestions or comments (radev@umich.edu)

7.2 ACL Archives – Richard Sproat

2001 Report on the ACL Archives
Richard Sproat (ACL Archivist, archivist@aclweb.org)

During 2000 and early 2001, I continued to add and update information in the ACL archives.

A top-level category that was added at the suggestion of the Exec was "Previous and Current Bids for ACL Meetings" (http://www.aclweb.org/archive/bids.html). This currently contains bid proposals for EACL-1999, ACL/EACL-2001, NAACL 2001 and ACL 2002.

The new constitution (http://www.aclweb.org/archive/10-5-2000-ratified-constitution.html) has been added to the Official Documents category.

Also added were the NAACL 2000 program chair's report, excerpts from the April 2000 Exec meeting and (in the private area) the minutes of the October 2000 and January 2001 exec meetings. Updates were also made to the current list of ACL Officers.

The archives currently consist of about 40 documents, and I am continuing to work with the ACL Exec in keeping the collection up to date.

Any material that people would like to see preserved in the archives should be submitted to me at archivist@aclweb.org.

8 Other Reports

8.1 ACL/COLING – Wolfgang Wahlster

ACL/COLING
Wolfgang Wahlster

After a successful meeting between representatives of ICCL and ACL at COLING 2000, an opinion column by Yorick Wilks in ELSNews 9.3 caused some resentment in ACL. In this editorial, he attacked various ACL policies and tried to deepen the ACL/COLING divisions. After consultation with the ICCL president, it was decided that an official ACL response is not appropriate, since Yorick's criticism of ACL policies was never endorsed by ICCL, but expressed a personal opinion. Another ICCL/ACL meeting is scheduled for ACL-2001 in Toulouse. Topics of the meeting include: Synchronization of future conference plans, status of the next ACL and COLING conferences, potential for a joint ACL/COLING conference, and increased collaboration.

8.2 NLSR – Thierry Declerck

ACL Natural Language Software Registry
Thierry Declerck (registry@dfki.de)

The fourth edition of the ACL Natural Language Registry (NLSR) was released last year (see http://registry.dfki.de/), and this was reported at the ACL2000 executive meeting.

Since then the NLSR team has been looking for extending the domain of application of the NLSR and for closer cooperation and interlinking with organizations and initiatives concerned with the listing and organization of NLP/CL resources.

In this context there have been among other discussions with ELRA, LDC, Elsnet, ISCA, NIST and the University of Tokyo. The NLSR has also been present at workshops organized by the EU project ISLE (International Standard for Language Engineering): one concerned with tools and resources for natural interaction and multimodality (NIMM), and one concerned with metadata description (IMDI: Isle Metadata Initiative).

The NLSR has been invited by the Open Language Archives Community (OLAC) initiative to participate as a data provider. For this, the NLSR made its data comform to an OAI data provider. Furthermore, an XML output is currently being developed, in order to improve the communication between NLP tools and language data repositories and catalogues. The NLSR team will be engaged in more details into the discussion on suitable metadata for language resources.

The NLSR is participating as a data provider in the recently launched German Project "COLLATE" (Computational Linguistics and Language Technology), hosted in Saarbruecken at both DFKI and the University of the Saarland, and will specially contribute to the Virtual Information Center.

Thierry Declerck is co-organiser (with Mike Rosner and Steven Krauwer) of the ACL/EACL workshop on "Sharing Tools and Resources for Research and Education", to be held in Toulouse the 7th of July 2001.

8.3 OLAC – Steven Bird

OLAC - Open Language Archives Community - www.language-archives.org
Steven Bird & Gary Simons

Linguists and language technologists depend on a vast array of language resources, including texts, recordings, lexicons, annotations, software, protocols, models, and formats. As resources proliferate we need a systematic way to find them.

OLAC, the Open Language Archives Community, is an international partnership of institutions and individuals who are creating a worldwide virtual library of language resources by: (i) developing consensus on best current practice for the digital archiving of language resources, and (ii) developing a network of interoperating repositories and services for housing and accessing such resources.

OLAC builds on the Open Archives Initiative and the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, and is sponsored by the NSF/EC project "International Standards in Language Engineering" (ISLE).

The OLAC homepage, at www.language-archives.org, hosts many documents providing full technical details of OLAC, including the OLAC Metadata Set, the Metadata Schema, the OLAC Process document, information for implementers, and the OLAC-General Mailing list.

** OLAC seeks the participation of the computational linguistics
** community in helping to define controlled vocabularies for language
** resources.

Coordinators: Steven Bird (UPenn) & Gary Simons (SIL International)

Advisory Board: Helen Aristar Dry (LINGUIST), Susan Hockey (UCL), Chu-Ren Huang (Academia Sinica), Mark Liberman (UPenn), Brian MacWhinney (CMU), Michael Nelson (NASA), Nicholas Ostler (FEL), Henry Thompson (Edinburgh), Hans Uszkoreit (DFKI), Antonio Zampolli (ILC).

Participating Archives and Services: LDC, ELRA, DFKI (ACL-NLSR), LACITO, SIL, Alaska Native Language Center, Comparative Bantu Online Dictionary, Perseus Project, American Philosophical Society, Utrecht Typological Research Centre.

Intending Participants: Aboriginal Studies Electronic Data Archive, American Indian Studies Research Institute, Institut National de la Langue Franaise, Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry, LINGUIST List, Max Planck Institute, Smithsonian National Anthropological Archives, Oxford Text Archive, Rosetta Project, Tibetan and Himalayan Digital Library.