HANDBOOK OF THE

STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME FOR LANGUAGE TECHNOLOGY

CONTAINING THE RULES OF THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME FOR ICELANDIC LANGUAGE TECHNOLOGY

2018

Contents

This is the first edition of the handbook for the Strategic Research and Development Programme for Language Technology (SRDP-LT), relevant to applicants, Expert Panels and external reviewers, and valid for the grant year 2018/2019. The objective of this publication is to increase the transparency of the process for all parties involved, from the advertisement of deadlines for submitting applications to the decisions on funding. The handbook also contains the SRDP-LT rules and other useful information, such as the rights and obligations for grant recipients. For the handbook to serve its purpose, everyone involved with the process is urged to read it in its entirety.

1 GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

1.1 THE ROLE OF THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Strategic Research and Development Programme for Language Technology (is. *Markáætlun í tungu og tækni*) is an open competitive research and development fund that operates according to the Act on Public Support for Scientific Research (no. 3/2003 with later amendments), and the aims for the Programme are determined by the Science and Technology Policy Council. The SRDP-LT is funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, and is administered by the Icelandic Centre for Research – RANNÍS. The Programme supports projects in the field of language technology, and thereby supports the inclusion of Icelandic in digital environments for information technology. The aim of the programme is therefore to protect and support the Icelandic language, as well as facilitate the use of new information technologies in the Icelandic community, for the benefit of the public, institutions and companies. Eligible applicants are institutions and companies, but coordinators are individuals (see eligibility criteria below, section 2.1). For grant year 2018, priority will be given to a) projects that involve the development of Icelandic language technology tools (software or hardware) for general use, and b) applied innovation projects that aim to develop language technology tools of language tool environments for specific uses in Icelandic.

The SRDP-LT awards funding in accordance with the aims of the Programme and based on an expert assessment of the quality of projects, the reach of the project, the need for the deliverables of the project, the capability of the individuals carrying out the proposed research, and their ability to devote time and effort to the project.

For grant year 2018/2019, the annual funding of the Icelandic Language Technology Fund (ILTF) will be combined with the SRDP-LT funding.

1.2 BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Minister of Education, Science and Culture appoints a six-member Board of the SRDP-LT for a period of three years, three members of the Board of Directors of the Icelandic Research Fund and three members of the Board of Directors from the Technology Development Fund. When appointed, the names of the Board members are published on the website of the Icelandic Centre for Research (Rannís). The Board issues rules and guidelines for the SRDP-LT and makes funding decisions based on evaluations by the SRDP-LT Expert Panel and after consultation with the Board of the ILTF. General questions regarding the Fund and applications under review shall be directed to expert staff members of the SRDP-LT at Rannís.

1.3 HANDLING OF APPLICATIONS AND GRANTS

Expert staff of the SRDP-LT at Rannís provide support and advice on grant-related queries between the hours of 9:00 - 16:00, Monday to Friday.

1.4 ETHICS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Members of the SRDP-LT Board, members of the ILTF Board, members of the SRDP-LT Expert Panel, external reviewers, SRDP-LT expert staff and others that administratively handle applications to the SRDP-LT are bound by strict confidentiality. Applications, including all enclosed materials and review sheets are considered confidential information. The confidential information is not to

be used for any other purpose than the review process and may not be disclosed, published or otherwise made available to a third party. No copies of any confidential information shall be made available in any format, except for purposes of review. After completion of the review, a copy of the application and review documents will be stored in the electronic registry of Rannís. SRDP-LT Expert Panel members understand and acknowledge that any disclosure or misappropriation of any of this confidential information may cause the owner considerable harm. The owner of the confidential information has the right to apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for specific performance and/or an order restraining and enjoining any such further disclosure or breach and for such other relief as the owner shall deem appropriate. Such right of ownership is in addition to the remedies otherwise available to registered owners or such parties that derive rights from the actual owner.

1.5 RULES REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In the event of conflict of interest, external reviewers, Expert Panel members and Board members (SRDP-LT and ILTF) must recuse themselves from assessment of an application. External reviewers cannot undertake to assess the relevant application, and Expert Panel members and Board members must recuse themselves from meetings where the relevant application is discussed and a decision is reached regarding funding. Their absence in that case shall be documented in meeting minutes. In addition to grounds for disqualification based on conflict of interest as listed in the Administration Procedure Act (no. 37/1993) [1] the following leads to disqualification of external reviewers, Expert Panel members and Board members of the SRDP-LT and ILTF:

- If an Expert Panel member, Board member or external reviewer is a spouse, close relative or close friend of the applicant.
- Personal conflicts exist between a panel member, Board member or external reviewer and an applicant.

- If an external reviewer, Expert Panel member or Board member is in professional competition with the applicant.
- Panel members can neither be project coordinators nor co-applicants of an application to the SRDP-LT .
- External reviewers cannot be party to an SRDP-LT application in the same year that they serve as external reviewers
- If a Board member is a participant in an application, the Board member must resign from his/her role in discussing the allocation of grants in the relevant grant year and a deputy board member will take his/her place.

If the relevant party is an employee of an institution or company, and an application from other employees of the same institution or company is under discussion, the closeness of the relationship with employees that are involved with the project and with the directors of the relevant institution or company must be assessed. This type of relationship does not automatically lead to disqualification due to conflict of interest.

Board members, Expert Panel members and external reviewers are responsible for identifying circumstances that might create a conflict of interest that would influence their judgment of applications submitted to the SRDP-LT.

1.6 CODE OF CONDUCT FOR APPLICANTS AND PROCUREMENT OF REQUIRED PERMITS/APPROVALS

The applicant should always detail in the application if questions of ethical conduct are likely to arise over the course of the project. If the applicant believes that questions of ethical conduct are likely to arise during the course of the project, the ethical issues in question and the way they will be handled shall be explicitly described in the application. In particular, applicants should note how personal data protection laws and regulations will be adhered to. Relevant permits/approvals must be obtained[2]. If an application for permit/approval is still being processed when the deadline for submitting applications to the SRDP-LT expires, this shall be

---

[1] http://www.althingi.is/lagas/nuna/1993037.html

[2] The National Bioethics Committee (visindasidanefnd.is), The Data Protection Authority (personuvernd.is), Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority (mast.is)

noted in the application and the permit/approval shall be submitted to Rannís as soon as it is obtained. If the permit/approval is not obtained, it shall be reported to SRDP-LT experts. The SRDP-LT will not sign contracts for funded proposals until all required permits/approvals and authorizations have been secured.

Where appropriate, the applicant must observe international agreements and contracts regulating intellectual property rights.

1.7 MISCONDUCT

Should suspicion of misconduct, fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or misappropriation in connection with an application or a funded project arise during the application process, during the funding period, or after the funding period of the project, the relevant party's institution or company and the SRDP-LT Board will be notified, without exception.

Suspicion of misconduct during the review phase will result in withdrawal of an application from the review process while the project coordinator's institution or company is given opportunity to conduct an investigation. Should allegations of misconduct be found to be baseless, the application will be reviewed following standard review procedures. If evidence of misconduct is found, the application will be rejected without a review and the applicant's institute or company will be held responsible for taking appropriate actions.

The SRDP-LT Board is authorized to initiate an independent investigation into cases of misconduct.

Misconduct discovered during the application phase, or during or after the funding period, may result in the Board of the SRDP-LT imposing a specific penalty, such as a partial or full repayment of the grant or that the applicant will be barred from submitting future applications to the Fund.

1.8 OPEN ACCESS TO RESULTS, OPEN SOURCE PUBLICATION, AND CLARIN STANDARDS

According to the Act on Public Support for Scientific Research no. 3/2003 with later amendments, results of research funded by public funds shall be published through open access. Grantees who receive funding from the SRDP-LT must guarantee that any research findings will be available through open access by either publishing them in open access journals, or in open searchable, digital repositories along with publication in a traditional subscription journal. The final peer reviewed manuscript shall be returned to the repository immediately after the article has been accepted for publication. If the journal requires a waiting period prior to open access, the article shall be made available for public access automatically when the waiting period expires. Please familiarize yourself with the rules of Rannís regarding repositories. (https://en.rannis.is/activities/open-access/). Opinvisindi.is provides repositories for Icelandic universities. The rules on open access currently only apply to peer-reviewed texts published in scientific journals.

Grantees are to explicitly reference the grant number and state that the project was funded by SRDP-LT in any publications of findings. Grantees are also to prominently cite SRDP-LT funding in the user interface of any deliverables that are derived from SRDP-LT funding. This includes, but is not limited to, applications ('apps'), databases, web-sites or other digital tools for which development and/or operation are funded, in part or whole, by SRDP-LT funding.

Applicants should detail in their applications the degree to which any deliverables that are derived from SRDP-LT funding will be open source, and the degree to which CLARIN standards are adhered to, when applicable[3].

---

[3]https://www.clarin.eu/content/standards-and-formats#formats

2 INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICANTS

2.1 TYPES OF PROJECTS

The Programme supports projects in the field of language technology [4], and thereby supports the inclusion of Icelandic in digital environments for information technology. For grant year 2019, priority will be given to a) projects that involve the development of Icelandic language technology tools (software or hardware) for general use, and b) applied innovation projects that aim to develop language technology tools of language tool environments for specific uses in Icelandic. The SRDP-LT is designed to be the first stage of funding for larger projects, with further funding calls to be announced in mid-2019.

Eligible applicants are research institutions and companies, but coordinators are individuals (experts, researchers, etc.). Responsibility for project accounting resides in the relevant applicant institution or company. The application must also specify a person (director or head of relevant unit) that can verify the commitments of the institution or company that are outlined in the application. International collaboration and industrial partners are welcomed in applications. Grants can, however, only be paid to bank accounts of Icelandic institutions or companies.

The maximum grant amount for a project grant is ISK 40 million for a 12-month project. The grant from the SRDP-LT may fund up to 85% of the total cost of the project for universities and research organisations/institutions, and 15% (í. *mótframlag*) must come from other funding sources. In terms of percentage of funding from other sources in cases where grantees are employed in companies, the rules of the Technology Development Fund [5] apply for the SRDP-LT.

Applications must meet all stated eligibility criteria in order to be reviewed. If it becomes clear during the application process that one or more of the eligibility criteria have not been met, the application is declared ineligible and is withdrawn from any further examination.

2.2 APPROVED EXPENSES

2.2.1 SALARIES

Grants can be used to fund salaries of researchers/project co-ordinators, graduate students and technical staff. Participating parties may be unidentified at time of application, but work assignments for all persons involved in the project must be detailed in the budget if the application includes funding for their salaries. The SRDP-LT does not fund payments of overtime worked in research or payment of salaries to parties who are also receiving full pay for other work (including pensioners).

2.2.2 OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

Applicants can apply for funding for expenses due to necessary resources for the project, excluding items concerning overhead expenses and facilities, for example general office equipment such as computers. All operational expenses and expenses due to purchase of equipment shall be itemized in the correct field in the table. Note that all unexplained cost will be rejected.

Equipment for up to ISK 2 million can be included in each application as operational expenses. Price quotes from sellers in connection with equipment purchases shall accompany the application.

2.2.3 TRAVEL EXPENSES

This item consists of the total sum of travel necessary for the progress of the project. All travel expenses must be justified and their relation to the project goal(s) clearly explained.

2.2.4 CONTRACTED SERVICES

This item consists of work not carried out by the participants in the project, which is necessary for the project's progress. All expenses due to contracted services shall be itemized in the correct field in the electronic application form. Tenders for contracted services shall accompany the application.

---

[4] https://brunnur.stjr.is/mrn/utgafuskra/utgafa.nsf/SearchResult.xsp?documentId=2A151FC388F8322C002581440035DF4E&action=openDocument

[5] https://en.rannis.is/funding/research/technology-development-fund/

It is not possible to apply for financing of overhead expenses and facilities in relation to contracted services.

2.2.5 OVERHEAD EXPENSES AND FACILITIES

Applicants can apply for funding for financing overhead and facilities for up to 25% on top of total cost of the project, excluding contracted services. Overhead expenses include costs related to, for example, office and research facilities, rent, utilities, support and auxiliary functions, purchases of literature, and purchases and maintenance of IT equipment and infrastructure such as computers. This amount is included in the grant amount applied for, accordingly the maximum grant amount of 40 million includes the overhead.

2.3 WHAT TO INCLUDE IN THE APPLICATION

An application must include the following sections:

• A Project Description in the format of the 2019 template, available in the online application system.

• Applicant CV(s)

The following should be included, where appropriate:

• A letter of intent from other participants (if applicable)

• Quotes for equipment purchases and/or contracted services (if applicable)

The review of the application will solely be based on the information supplied in the application and relevant accompanying appendices. **No documents are accepted after the closing of the application deadline. Applications with incorrect templates for the Project Description will be rejected from the review process.** Incomplete applications will be rejected at any time in the review process.

All applications must be submitted through the electronic application system of Rannís before the stated deadline. Rannís has published a Privacy Policy for online submissions[6].

---

6 https://en.rannis.is/activities/privacy-policy/

Attachment A. Detailed project description

A template for this attachment is available on the electronic application system of Rannís.

The template is set by default to Times/Times New Roman 12 point font, 1,5 line spacing, and 2,5 cm. margins. These settings should not be altered.

The form is divided into the following predefined sections, which should not be altered.

a) Objectives of the project and originality
b) State of the art and proficiency
c) Methodology/project plan, work plan and timescale (including open source specifications and adherence to CLARIN standards)
d) Milestones and deliverables
e) Co-operation (domestic/foreign)
f) Contribution of doctoral and master's degree students to the project, if applicable
g) Impact
h) Proposed publication of results (including open access publishing plans), if applicable
i) Plans for project continuation and further development of deliverables after the end of the funding period.

To ensure equal treatment of applications, the SRDP-LT reserves the right to reject all applications that are not completed using the correct and most up-to-date form and template.

The project description itself shall not be more than 15 pages. The project description file also includes two pages: a title page and an instructions page. The maximum page number that the online application system will accept for the project description files (excluding bibliography but including title page and instructions page) is therefore 17 pages.

In order to facilitate the expert review of the application, it is important that the project description be of good quality. The factors that are used for reference in the assessment can be viewed in the instructions for external reviewers (Section 5). The following points should be kept in mind:

- It is imperative that the project has well defined objectives, and has been divided into well-defined work packages. Project milestones should be specified in the description.
- Each work package of the project should be described individually, their respective connections explained, and the time necessary for each work package estimated.
- Research/development methods shall be described in detail, and the reasons for choosing the specific methods stated. within the project should be explained, and whether there is an active co-operation between universities, departments, institutions, and/or companies. International collaboration, if any, should be detailed separately.
- Information, if applicable, on which parts of the project are executed by doctoral or master's students should be included, as well as information on the department in which the students conduct their studies, and what the students' contribution to the project entails.
- Explanations and justifications should be given for the expected benefit and utilization of the results of the project. The deliverables of the projects should be measurable "units" resulting from the project.
- It should be explained in the application how the results/deliverables of the project would be promoted, as well as their publication in expert journals, reports, conferences, etc. The manner in which laws regarding open access to findings will be respected shall be detailed.
- Applicants should detail open source specifications of any deliverables, and adherence to CLARIN standards where applicable. Applicants should describe whether, and then how, the proprietary rights to the results would be protected.
- Possible ethical considerations in carrying out the project should be addressed, as well as adherence to personal data protection laws and regulations.

Attachment B. Curriculum vitae

The CV shall include information on current employment status; education and training; prior positions; awards and other recognition; and a list of relevant publications, sofware, patents, etc. The CV should ideally be succinct, and not detail information that is irrelevant to the evaluation of the application.

Attachment C. Letter of intent

A signed letter of intent from "other participants" in the application, where it is specified what their role in the project will entail. A letter of intent is not needed from co-proposers as their CV is attached to the application and they are notified upon submission of application.

Attachment D. Price quote

If equipment costs and/or cost of contracted services are applied for, price quotes must accompany the proposal.

2.4 TIMELINE

The call for grant applications to the SRDP-LT is announced at least 6 weeks before the deadline.

Applicants are advised to carefully read Sections 3-5: *Review process for new applications*, *Expert Panel guidelines*, and *External reviewer guidelines*, where the evaluation criteria used by the Expert Panel and external reviewers are described.

2.5 SRDP-LT EXPERT PANEL

The SRDP-LT Expert Panel will review applications for the grant year 2019. Three active experts in language technology make up the Expert Panel. See Section 4: *Expert Panel guidelines*, for additional information on the work of Expert Panel members. Applicants may under no circumstances be in contact with Expert Panel members during the review process.

3 REVIEW PROCESS FOR NEW APPLICATIONS

3.1 APPOINTMENTS TO EXPERT PANELS

Expert Panel members are appointed by the Board of the SRDP-LT in consultation with the ILTF Board. At least one of the three members of the Expert Panel shall be predominantly active professionally outside of Iceland. When appointing Expert Panel members, it should be endeavored to ensure as equal a gender distribution of members as possible.

The SRDP-LT Board appoints one person to serve as chair of the Expert Panel, in consultation with the

ILTF Board. The chair is responsible, with the help of the expert staff member from Rannís, for coordinating the work of the Expert Panel and ensuring that the Panel works in accordance with the SRDP-LT mandate and role, and in conformity with general rules regarding ethical conduct. When appointed, the panel is made public on the website of Rannís.

3.2 PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS

3.2.1 INITIAL SCREENING

All applications are screened by the expert staff members from Rannís assigned to the SRDP-LT. Incomplete applications where SRDP-LT rules have not been followed are rejected without further review, and the applicant is notified of that outcome.

3.2.2 EXPERT ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATIONS

All applications are assessed by the Expert Panel, which seeks the opinions of two external reviewers for each application. The Expert Panel evaluates each application and provides a reasoned, written review report. The Panel ranks applications based on the external expert assessment, and an independent reading by the Expert Panel members of each application (see Section 4: *Expert Panel guidelines*).

3.2.3 FUNDING DECISION

When the Expert Panel has finalized its review and ranking of applications, the chair of the panel meets jointly with the SRDP-LT and ILTF Boards and gives an overview of the Expert Panel's deliberations and whether problems arose in the assessment of applications. Decisions on funding are taken by the SRDP-LT Board following presentations from the Expert Panel, and after consultation with the Board of the ILTF. In addition to the Expert Panel review, the SRDP-LT Board must take into consideration the policy of the Science and Technology Policy Council 2017-2019, and the annual budget of the fund. When allocations have been decided, applicants receive a decision by e-mail containing the final assessment of the Expert Panel.

The Board's decisions on funding from the SRDP-LT are final. Under Art. 9 of Act No. 3/2003, the funding decisions of the SRDP-LT Board are not subject to administrative complaints.

3.3 AFTER RECEIVING FUNDS

3.3.1 GRANTS AWARDED

Information on grants awarded is published on the Rannís website.

3.3.2 DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL PAYMENTS FOR FUNDED PROJECTS

- First payment (40%) upon signing the grant agreement
- Second payment (40%) to be paid 8 months after signing the grant
- Final payment (20%) upon approval of the progress/final report

3.3.3 PROGRESS REPORTS

The project coordinator is responsible for submitting a final report within one year of the end of the final grant year. The reports are reviewed by the staff of Rannís, who makes recommendations on continued funding to the SRDP-LT Board. The staff members of Rannís have the authority to request further information and explanatory notes from grantees and consult the Expert Panel if deemed necessary. The final payment, 20% of the annual sum, is paid upon approval of the report. If the report is not approved, the Board can withdraw the grant and request that the grantee repay the sum already paid to the project. The final report should detail the work completed as part of the project, its final results, and deliverables. A detailed summary of costs (itemized table and list of transactions) shall accompany the report and state any deviations from the original budget.

4 EXPERT PANEL GUIDELINES

The role of the SRDP-LT Expert Panels is to independently review applications to the SRDP-LT in light of external reviews and based on the match of the projects with the aims and priorities of the SRDP-LT; The Expert Panel establishes a ranking list for applications, and finalizes each application review with a written review report.

4.1 THE REVIEW PROCESS

Expert Panel members receive a list of applications, along with abstracts and names of applicants. The Expert Panel members then indicate which applications they are willing to review, and which applications they cannot review due to conflict of interest. All members review all applications where they don't have conflict of interest. The Expert Panel identifies two external reviewers to assess each application. External reviewers shall be professionally active outside of Iceland. The selection of external reviewers is based on their area of expertise. The Expert Panel must make sure that there is no conflict of interest between the external reviewer and the applicants. External reviewers must then confirm that there is no conflict of interest.

When an external reviewer has agreed to review an application, Rannís provides external experts with access to the application, an evaluation checklist, and other necessary information regarding the assessment process. The external review involves an in-depth reading of applications. When external reviewers have submitted their reviews and the Expert Panel drafted its review report, the Expert Panel meets at the premises of Rannís to discuss all applications and deliberate on rankings.

5 EXTERNAL REVIEWER GUIDELINES

5.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

Applications are ranked based on external evaluations and discussions within the Expert Panel.

The ranking list is presented to the SRDP-LT Board for a final decision on awards.

All reviewers engaged in reviewing applications for the SRDP-LT are required to read Section 1: *General information about the Strategic Research and Development Programme,* and Section 3: *Review process for new applications* in this handbook.

5.1.1 REVIEWERS' ANONYMITY

According to the Information Act (no. 140/2012), Rannís may not refuse to provide applicants with the names of reviewers but such information is only provided if specifically requested. External reviewers will be informed if an applicant requests their anonymity to be lifted.

5.1.2 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

External reviewers are responsible for identifying any circumstances which constitute a conflict of interest for them when it comes to reviewing applications to the SRDP-LT. External reviewers must confirm the absence of conflict of interest prior to being granted access to the application.

5.2 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS – GUIDELINES

The external reviewer review sheet is included as an annex to this handbook.

Introduction

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

PREREQUISITES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

1. RELEVANCE TO THE ICELANDIC LANGUAGE

How central is the Icelandic language in the proposed work?

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

-   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

2. REACH / GENERALITY

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

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

-   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

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

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

-   Explanation / supporting argument(s):

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

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

- Explanation / supporting argument(s):

3. NEED

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

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

- Explanation / supporting argument(s):

4. LIKELIHOOD OF PROJECT MEETING ITS PROPOSED TARGET

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

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

   - Explanation / supporting argument(s):

4-B. In light of the stated goals and objectives, is the team adequately put together and adequately described? (1 = lowest, 5 = highest)

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

   - Explanation / supporting argument(s):

6. OTHER COMMENTS