

MT on and for the Web

Christian Boitet Hervé Blanchon

GETALP, LIG (UJF, UPMF)

BP 53, F-38041 GRENOBLE cedex 9

{Christian.Boitet, Herve.Blanchon}@imag.fr

Mark Seligman

Spoken Translation, Inc.

1100 West View Drive Berkeley, CA94705

Mark.Seligman@spokentranslation.com

Valérie Bellynck

GETALP, LIG

Grenoble, France

Valerie.Bellynck@imag.fr

Abstract

A Systran MT server became available on the minitel network in 1984, and on Internet in 1994. Since then we have come to a better understanding of the nature of MT systems by separately analyzing their *linguistic, computational, and operational architectures*. Also, thanks to the *CxAxQ metatheorem*, the systems' inherent limits have been clarified, and design choices can now be made in an informed manner according to the translation situations. *MT evaluation* has also matured: tools based on reference translations are useful for measuring progress; those based on subjective judgments for estimating future usage quality; and task-related objective measures (such as post-editing distances) for measuring operational quality. Moreover, the same technological advances that have led to "Web 2.0" have brought several futuristic predictions to fruition. Free Web MT services have *democratized assimilation MT* beyond belief. *Speech translation* research has given rise to usable systems for restricted tasks running on PDAs or on mobile phones connected to servers. New man-machine interface techniques have made *interactive disambiguation* usable in large-coverage multimodal MT. Increases in computing power have made *statistical methods* workable, and have led to the possibility of building low-linguistic-quality but still useful MT systems by machine learning from aligned bilingual corpora (SMT, EBMT). In parallel, progress has been made in developing *interlingua-based MT systems*, using *hybrid methods*. Unfortunately, many *misconceptions about MT* have spread among the public, and even among MT researchers, because of ignorance of the past and present of MT R&D. A compensating factor is the *willingness of end users to freely contribute* to building essential parts of the linguistic knowledge needed to construct MT systems, whether corpus-related or lexical. Finally, some developments we anticipated fifteen years ago have not yet materialized, such as online writing tools equipped with interactive disambiguation, and as a corollary the possibility of transforming source documents into *self-explaining documents* (SEDs) and of producing corresponding SEDs fully automatically in several target languages. These visions should now be realized, thanks to the evolution of Web programming and multilingual NLP techniques, leading towards a true Semantic Web, "Web 3.0", which will support *ubilingual* (ubiquitous multilingual) computing.

Keywords: MT, linguistic architecture, computational architecture, operational architecture, task-related evaluation, speech MT, interactive disambiguation, self-explaining documents, Semantic Web MT

Introduction

In this paper, we would like to assess the achievements of Machine Translation (MT) and Machine Assisted Translation (MAT) in the (approximately) fifteen years since 1994, when a Systran MT server was first put on the Internet, and to look ahead toward expectations for R&D in MT and MAT in the next fifteen years. More than four authors would certainly be required to present the last fifteen years of MT completely and faithfully, and doubtless no combination of experts could actually predict what will happen by 2035. We will nevertheless risk some predictions, knowing full well that only about half of our predictions in previous papers [1-7] have already come true. We also know that there have been some altogether unexpected developments, such as the growth of empirical methods (SMT, EBMT), and have participated to some of them without having anticipated them. As in the field of speech recognition, these methods became practical because of continuing increases in computing power and storage capacity. In addition, the Internet and the free, open-source spirit of the Web¹ have given access to very large linguistic resources: users can now help to build them and can improve MT results online, using free Web browsers. In these efforts, users now experience no more delay than when using traditional and often expensive MT and TA (Translation Aid) systems on a PC.

One particular development has been the incredibly rapid progress of speech translation. The first three authors have been involved in this work, and one (Seligman) has in fact built a commercial, large-coverage PC-based system, Converser for Healthcare™, fulfilling a vision which we three developed at ATR in 1992-93: we anticipated that interactive disambiguation, added to a combination of commercially available ASR², MT and TTS modules, could lead to the creation of practical sys-

¹ <http://www.atelier-informatique.org/internet/evolution-web-10-web-20-web-30/358/> gives definitions. "Web 1.0" refers to the time when all pages were static. "Web 2.0" techniques allow for data sharing, dynamic pages, social networks, and collaborative work, and include the exploitation of XML, RSS and AJAX. Users become active participants. "Web 3.0" has just begun (from 2008), the main differences being knowledge processing (*Semantic Web, intelligent Web*), P2P (*peer to peer*) communications and services, and *personalization* (facial recognition, net identity, etc.). As computing becomes pervasive, we propose that multilingual computing should become *ubilingual* (*ubiquitous multilingual*) computing.

² ASR = Automatic Speech Recognition, TTS = Text To Speech.

tems. The fourth author adds a view of the potential of Web 3.0 techniques, having participated in the design of user-centered microworld interfaces (and a *narrative language* for CABRI-géomètre); of online tools eliciting lexical contribution in a learning context (IToIDU); of modern techniques of Web programming; and of Web multilingual access gateways (iMAGs).

In the first section of this paper, rather than recount all of the turns of MT since 1994, we will summarize the progress we observe in understanding MT, TA, and their interrelations since then. In Section 2, we cover aspects of the evolution of the MT field that seem related to the evolution of the Internet. We start with 1994, because it is the first time MT appeared on the Internet, and because the prior period has largely been covered elsewhere: see in particular [6, 10, 11]. That limitation provides a reason to limit our lookahead in Section 3, where we describe the MT evolution we expect in the next fifteen (rather than twenty-five) years, in the context of the Semantic Web (Web 3.0).

1. Progress in understanding MT, TA, and their interrelations

1.1 Dimensions of analysis of MT systems

MT systems were first classified according to the technological approach used: in 1976, one spoke already of “nG” (n-th generation) systems. 1G systems (e.g., GAT, Systran) were *direct* (word-for-word) and *directly* programmed; 2G systems used *intermediate linguistic structures* and were programmed in *metalanguages*; and futuristic 3G systems would translate by *understanding*, using world (*gnostic* or *encyclopedic*) knowledge, and would to some degree mimic translators’ brain processes.




Figure 1: linguistic architectures of MT systems

After 1980, MT systems began to be classified according to their immediate users: *MT for watchers*, *MT for revisors*, *MT for translators*, and (around 1989) *MT for authors*. Since 2000 or so, one reads about the opposition between *rule-based MT* (RBMT) and *statistical MT* (SMT), though these terms really distinguish between *handcrafted MT* (HCMT) and *Machine-Learned MT* (MLMT).

Since the Cranfield conference in 1994 (“MT Ten Years On”), the first author has tried to propose a more exact classification. First, a distinction was made [12] between two aspects of the analysis of MT systems: their *linguistic architecture* and their *computational*

architecture. The need to consider a third aspect, their *operational architecture*, was also recognized.




Figure 2: hierarchy of computational architectures of phases of MT systems

The *linguistic architecture* may be defined by the succession of intermediate representations (IR) used to process a translation unit (the path in Vauquois’ triangle, see Figure 2), as well as their precise nature and scope (only sentences, or paragraphs, or even full texts).

The *computational architecture* is defined by the technology used to build the *phases* transforming one IR into the next. A phase may be hand-crafted (using classical programming languages, or rule-based languages, of various types³), or it may be (semi-)automatically learned from bilingual examples such as pairs of strings, of trees, of <string, tree> pairs, or of <string, abstract representation> pairs. The terms *expert* and *empirical* have been proposed recently for expressing this hand-crafted vs. machine-learned distinction, and we will use them here. A detailed study of current and past MT systems shows that *the linguistic and computational architectures of MT systems are independent* of each other [12].

By *operational architecture*, we mean the precise conditions of the use and development of a system:

- *Tasks and users*: (1) help bilinguals produce good translations; (2) help people understand an unknown or little-known language; (3) help people communicate (chat, spoken translation...).
- *Language pairs / volumes / kinds*: graph of translation paths or directions (1→1 as in ALT/JE; 1↔1 as in Converser for Healthcare; 1→N as in MedSLT; 1↔N as in Phraselator (for the US Army); or N↔N (for debates, multilingual chat, or peace forces).
- *Possible involvement of humans*: (1) authors (controlled language, rewriting, interactive disambiguation); (2) professional/occasional translators (post-editing); and (3) readers (guessing from multi-result factorized output).
- *Available resources*: data (in particular, the huge parallel corpora necessary for SMT), and humans (computational linguists, lexicographers needed for “expert” MT).

1.2 The CxAxQ MT (meta)theorem

Theorem Statement: *The product of language Coverage, Automation rate, and linguistic Quality of MT systems is always well below 100%, but two of these factors can approach 100% if one compromises on the third.* As a formula,

$$\text{Coverage} \times \text{Automaticity} \times \text{Quality} \ll 100\%.$$

That limitation is *in the nature of the problem*.

This statement is experimentally but not formally provable, exactly like Church’s Thesis. Thanks to it, the

³ Rules may be *non-procedural rules* of well-formedness (as in formal grammars like CFGs, TAGs, or HPSGs), or *procedural rules* (rewriting rules on strings, trees or graphs, and transitions of automata such as FSTs).

inherent limits of translation automation have been clarified, and design choices can be made in an informed manner according to the translation situation. For example, when large coverage and high quality are needed, as for helping English-speaking health personnel to converse about virtually anything with Spanish-speaking patients and their families, automation must be far less than 100%: we have to let users disambiguate and give them considerable control – as in Converter for Healthcare, which supports reverse translation and optional user-initiated lexical disambiguation.

Similarly, if we aim at very high quality and full automation, we can only build MT systems tailored to a restricted sublanguage, such as weather bulletins [13] or stock market flash reports [14]. In the case of Web translations, $C \times A \approx 100\%$, so quality simply cannot be 100%; but $C \times Q \approx 100\%$ in the case of DBMT systems such as KANT/CATALYST [15] or LIDIA [16]. *Quality* usually means linguistic quality, as judged by translators. We propose to define it relative to the post-edition time, expressed in minutes per page, so that $Q \leq 0$ if more than 50 minutes⁴ are needed to post-edit the result of one standard source page (250 words): $Q = (100 - 2 \times T(\text{post-edition_MT}))\%$.

Table 1. MT quality as a function of post-editing time

Post-edition T (minute/page)	0mn	5mn	10mn	15mn	20mn	25mn	30mn
MT quality (%)	100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%	40%
Post-edition T (minute/page)	35mn	40mn	45mn	50mn	55mn	60mn	65mn
MT quality (%)	30%	20%	10%	0%	-10%	-20%	-30%

To define *automaticity*, we propose the formula **Erreur !** which takes into account all kinds of human intervention in the translation process, rather than only post-edition time. For example, $A = 83.3\%$ if one needs only ten minutes of human interaction with an MT system to produce the draft translation of a page, normally produced in one hour of human work. In [17], we give a method of computing the *coverage* of an MT system. It is not presented here for lack of space⁵.

1.3 What to evaluate in MT and how ?

MT evaluation methods can be *internal* (used while viewing a system's inner mechanisms in order to develop or technically assess the system) or *external* (viewing the system as a black box). Internal measures have received much less attention from researchers than external measures, probably because they must be at least partly system-specific. Nevertheless, all MT developers and editors have their own test suites of sentences and documents.

With respect to MT evaluation, the most important development since 1994 is the introduction in

⁴ (Linguistic) quality will be 0% if the MT result is so bad that post-editors reject it and restart from scratch, even if they can gain ten min/page by using it. Linguistic quality is different from usage quality (i. e., utility, or cost-effectiveness).

⁵ Briefly, we prepare a table with rows for the types of linguistic phenomena (words/compounds, terms, collocations, grammatical constructions), and columns for frequency and importance (FI) relative to the translation situation, and coverage of general meanings (GM) and specific meanings (SM). Hence, coverage should depend on the identified task.

2001-2002 of *objective external measures* such as BLEU, NIST, ORANGE, WER, mWER, etc., based on automatic comparisons of MT results with *reference translations*. (Most such measures use only easily computable n-grams counts.) Competitive MT evaluation campaigns have been organized based upon these measures, comparable to those for speech recognition, information retrieval, Q&A, etc. These campaigns have certainly been worthwhile. However, the expectation that these n-gram-based measures would correlate well with human judgments of linguistic quality has not been met [18]. Moreover, to evaluate systems currently in use, reference-based measures require human intervention: by definition, there are no reference translations of previously untranslated segments. In order to use these measures, one should modify the operational context and architecture so that humans can post-edit MT results, producing reference translations of a fraction of the input, as in Google Translate. But even in such a favorable case⁶, the measure is certainly biased, because the sample of segments selected by Web surfers for contributive post-edition is not at all random.

Our understanding of MT evaluation techniques has now matured. In [19, 20], we conclude that it is best to evaluate operational quality by using *task-related measures* which compare (a) the effort to perform a certain task with the MT system, integrated in its operational environment, and (b) the effort without that system. One should limit the use of tools like BLEU to measure progress during MT system development.

However, contrary to an all-too-common belief, these tools are not inherently limited to empirical (auto-learned) systems (SMT and EBMT). It is true that, in the case of expert (handmade) MT systems, reference translations given from outside are mostly inadequate, because they are too far from actual MT results (in the set of all possible target sentences): in general, much nearer reference translations may be found, given the immense number of acceptable translations of a segment. Thus, for expert MT systems, the solution is to *post-edit the MT results on test suites and then to use the corrections as reference translations*. In summary, (1) tools based on reference translations are useful for measuring progress; (2) those based on subjective judgments are useful for estimating future usage quality; and (3) task-related objective measures (such as post-editing distance) are useful for measuring operational quality.

1.4 Good surprises

Web translation. The same technological advances that have led to Web 2.0 have brought several futuristic predictions to fruition. Free Web MT services have *democratized assimilation MT* beyond belief.

Speech translation. Research has led to creation of fully automatic but usable systems for restricted tasks, running on PDAs or on mobile phones connected to servers. Back in 1993, many thought this effort could never succeed because ASR and MT errors would multiply. But tremendous progress has been made on the ASR side – recognition is now possible under noisy conditions without sophisticated microphones – and new man-machine interface techniques (on PCs, PDAs, or even

⁶ That has become possible only since the introduction of the contributive Web (Web 2.0).

mobile phones) allow user control and participation, in particular by correction of ASR outputs and interactive disambiguation in the source language [21, 22]. Broad-coverage multimodal MT is emerging.

Empirical and notably statistical methods. Increases in computing power have made *statistical methods* workable, and have made possible the construction of low-linguistic-quality but still useful MT systems by machine learning from aligned bilingual corpora (SMT, EBMT).

Hybridization. The MSR-MT system developed by Microsoft Research around 1998-2002 [23] used hand-crafted analysis and generation, but learned the transfer component totally automatically by compiling a MindNet from a large number of corresponding English and Spanish trees. Combination of empirical methods with interlingua-based linguistic architectures has been demonstrated, notably by the IBM MASTOR hand-held English-Mandarin speech translation system [24, 25]. All of this work demonstrates the possibility of developing *interlingua-based MT systems* using *hybrid methods*. Another aspect of hybridization is the use of corpus-crunching methods to prepare data for expert (handmade) MT systems. For example, the size of the Fujitsu ATLAS-II dictionaries has grown from 586 K entries in 2001 (at that year's MT Summit) to more than 5.57 M in 2008 (v.14). No doubt this increase was achieved not only through manual creation or adaptation of existing dictionaries, but also by using parallel or comparable corpus processing techniques. Very large increases in dictionary size can also be observed in The Honyaku (Toshiba), Systran, etc. Likewise, most TA tools (Trados, XMS, Similis...) now include good or excellent terminology extractors.

1.5 Increase of misconceptions about MT

MT has always been a somewhat mythical field, with many misconceptions, apocryphal examples, etc. However, this tendency has increased rather than lessened in the past twenty-five years. In particular, many MT researchers are ignorant about the history of MT, the nature of MT, and the existing operational MT systems. Here are examples of such misconceptions.

The majority of operational systems use the SMT design. No. Google Translate and LanguageWeaver (which offers no free Web server) are indeed SMT-based systems, but Systran, LMT, METAL, ProMT, Reverso, WordMagic, ATLAS, The Honyaku, ALT/JE, ALTFLASH, Neon, etc. are totally or essentially hand-crafted. However, it is true that some of these latter systems (like Systran) are beginning to insert a statistical (or rather, probabilistic) phase into their computational architecture.

Pivot implies Rule-Based. No, as demonstrated by the MASTOR system (2003), and previously by a part of the multilingual, CSTAR-II spoken dialogue MT system (1999) based upon the IF pivot standard.

Pivot implies Interlingua. No: a pivot can be a structure based upon some representational level of a particular natural language, e.g. analysis results in multitarget MT. That is the case in the MedSLT systems, and also in the LIDIA prototype mentioned above.

MT with interlingual (IL) pivot cannot work and scale up. No. ATLAS-II (Fujitsu) has been the best system for Japanese to and from English for twenty years. ATLAS-II v.14 has more than 5.7 M dictionary entries.

Transfer MT with N languages implies N(N-1) transfers. No. One can use the analysis representations of some language as intermediate structures and can then combine two transfers to obtain translations for (N-1)(N-2) language pairs. Only 2(N-1) transfer components are needed in this case, a linear rather than quadratic number.

Statistical MT implies low development cost. Not if one takes into consideration the cost of producing the bilingual corpora. For example, one parallel corpus of 50 M words (200 K pages) has required between 150 K and 200 K hours of human translators (about 100 person-years) for its production. While it is true that an SMT system can be produced virtually overnight once suitable corpora are in place, LanguageWeaver produced only four systems between 2001 and 2005, most probably because of the scarcity of clients having large enough previously translated corpora. It should also be noted that large corpora cannot easily be borrowed: an SMT system developed for one kind of corpus will produce far worse results on another kind of corpus.

Rule-Based MT implies high development cost. No – or rather, it depends. True, specialists are needed to design and implement the expert lingware components (grammars, automata, and dictionaries), and their work does cost more than outsourced manual translation. However, the development of systems aiming at sublanguage, such as METEO or ALTFLASH, has been very cheap (3-5 persons for 6-10 months). For large-coverage systems, Fujitsu reported a cost of 300 man-years to market the first versions of ATLAS-II (around 1982), with 70,000 entries in each dictionary. By way of comparison, if a parallel corpus of 200 M words is needed to obtain comparable output quality, as suggested by P. Koehn at a meeting of the UE in 2006, the cost would be from 600 to 800 man-years.

MT quality has increased with SMT. No. On the contrary, the very design of SMT systems lowers the asymptotic (best possible) quality. In 2004-05, the RALI (Université de Montréal) built an SMT system from an aligned corpus of 40 M words of weather bulletins translated by METEO and revised by experts [26]. They obtained 77% acceptable translations, so at least 23% corrections would have to be made, while only 3% were actually made on the METEO results.

BLEU measures the quality of translations. No (see above). Many researchers are aware that BLEU scores do not correlate well with human judgments of translation quality, but still use this tool as a quality measure in research papers because it is available and simple to use. That is a major flaw in current MT evaluations.

Adequacy should be measured by a positive number. No. In fact, information conveyed by a translation can be misleading: a "contresens" (mistranslation) can lead to false assumptions and erroneous decisions. We saw many such cases while participating in the subjective evaluation of IWSLT campaigns. Thus, adequacy should rather be computed using kappa coefficients, which measure agreement or disagreement between the original message and a candidate translation, and adequacy scores should be between -1 and +1.

1.6 Emergence of theoretical arguments in favour of example-based approaches

The empirical approach – the idea of working with examples rather than full-blown theories – has been defended mainly through practical rather than theoretical arguments. In the past, a similar situation obtained in the area of speech recognition: back in 1975, CMU had developed a knowledge- and theory-based system (Hearsay), and in parallel the empirical HHM-based Harpy system. Harpy won, by a large margin. Later, Jelinek famously said that whenever he fired a linguist his ASR recognition rate would jump up 1%. The same argument has more recently been used in relation to SMT: it works, so what's the problem?

The general problem is that SMT does not in fact work better than expertly built systems. Among other more specific problems, new kinds of very annoying errors appear: parts of the input message are left out; parts appear that don't correspond to anything in the source; and a study by Dong Zheng Dong shows that overall reliability is considerably lower. Accordingly, we remain dissatisfied with the argument that decent results can justify the SMT approach without further ado. At the other extreme, we would be equally dissatisfied with the claim that SMT cannot work because it is not based on explicit deep knowledge. The fact is that empirical methods can perform to a surprising degree, but sometimes fail in the ways just mentioned and others; so theoretically oriented researchers should try to explain both the successes and failures.

Ed Hovy [27] has argued quite generally that, rather than develop a maximally complete and consistent theory, it would be more efficient to accumulate an enormous number of *factoids*, and to produce translations from them (or find answers from them in information retrieval). We can only agree, as these areas are in effect *scientific technologies* [28] and not sciences. However, we think it is possible to go one step further.

Incompleteness and inconsistency metatheorem. Our claim: **there can be no satisfactory formal theory (axiomatization by axioms and rules) for an NL** (though there can be such a formal theory for a restricted enough controlled language, or for a restricted sublanguage which arises naturally).

Any axiomatization will undergenerate (exhibit incompleteness) and *overgenerate* (exhibit inconsistency). Moreover, there seem to be standard ways to derive counterexamples from each proposed axiomatization. This is a game linguists like to play, and it justifies the never-ending quest for an adequate formal theory of NL. Our proposal, then, is that such a *formal* theory cannot exist, but a valid *semantic* theory can – as a set of valid sentences in a given language. That metatheorem is an analog of Gödel's incompleteness theorem: while there can be no axiomatic system (a *formal theory*, in mathematics) that generates all and only true statements about integers, the set of true statements about integers certainly exists (it is called the *semantic theory* of integers).

As a consequence, we are justified in abandoning the Holy Grail of building a perfect grammar and lexicon for a language, and in concentrating instead on known instances of the indescribable semantic theory – that is, on examples. That is exactly what happened

with Vauquois & Chappuy's formalism for static grammars [29]: the formalism was used as a semi-formal specification level, up to the point where it became possible to automatically produce draft analyzers and generators using it [30]. From that point, however, it proved more efficient to build tools for empirically developing instances of the string-tree correspondences described by that type of grammar, the SSTCs [31], to align or *synchronize* them (obtaining a collection of synchronized SSTCs, or S-SSTCs), and to build an EBMT system from the aligned results [32].

Similarly, USM's EBMT system Banterjah has been obtained empirically, but its knowledge-base was produced in a hybrid way. The quality is said to be superior of that of an SMT built with the same size of initial bilingual corpus, but Banterjah uses a database of about 10 K S-SSTCs, corresponding to about 600 pages of text in one language, semi-automatically prepared at a rate of about 1/2 hour per S-SSTC.

2. MT evolution since 1994, linked to the Web (1.0 and 2.0)

This section is short, as there are not many disagreements here.

2.1 Democratization of access to Web translators

In 1994 (our starting date here), Systran was the first MT system to be made available on the Web, after having been on France's Minitel for ten years or more. Twenty-five years later, almost all MT vendors offer free Web page translators, and provide MT gateways like Voilà, Babelfish, etc. to large customers. Millions of Web pages are translated on the fly every day, in more than fifty language pairs. This progress would of course have been unthinkable before the Web.

2.2 Building heterogeneous MT systems collaboratively through the Web

The examples of UNL and CSTAR-II show that collaborative development via the Web is indeed possible. Intermediate structures encoded in XML or in HTML-like specific formats (as in `.unl` files, which contain interlingual representations in the format originated by H. Uchida [33]) are exchanged almost instantly between modules of MT systems running in various locations. These various structures are developed with very different tools and theoretical backgrounds. The availability and diffusion of XML, Unicode, and associated tools since 1998 has solved many difficult problems linked with the computer representation of texts in various languages.

2.3 Emergence of the application to MT of collaborative resource building

With the advent of Web 2.0 – the participative Web – the age of collaborative construction of resources in general, and of MT resources more specifically, is upon us. The idea of exchanging translation dictionaries, in particular, was pioneered by A. Melby before 1984, as soon as microcomputers became available [34, 35], with later developments towards the exchange of lexical and

terminological data (via Micro-MATER [36]). More recently, collaborative human translation has become very active, with Web sites dedicated to the translation of documents related to causes (PaxHumana), or centers of interest (Wikipedia), or open source software (the W3C and Mozilla localization projects). Existing parallel high quality corpora like EuroParl and JR-acquis have become available on the Web in GPL⁷, and more corpora are being created by volunteer translation communities. Cooperative development has begun more recently on (pre-terminological) dictionaries, especially in instructional contexts [37, 38].

2.4 Possibility of building reactive and contributive translation gateways

Due to Ajax techniques, which enable the programming of more dynamic Web pages providing richer and more participatory user experiences, it is now possible to browse a Web site in one's own language, modify a mistranslated segment on the fly, and continue reading. Behind the scenes, post-edited segments are stored in translation memories, and reused later if an exact match is found.

2.5 Possibility of quickly building MT systems for under-resourced languages or pairs

Even in the lucky case where a large enough parallel corpus is available for an under-resourced language pair (such as French-Thai or French-Vietnamese), these pairs pose special problems for empirical techniques, so that direct use of an SMT-building toolkit like Moses [39] is unsatisfactory. Language-specific preprocessing is needed, e.g. for segmentation in writing systems without word separators, lemmatization for languages with complex inflectional morphology, and word decomposition in languages with complex compositional morphology, as in Dravidian languages. As Martin Kay recently observed, many of the wordforms found in the source text will never have been seen before. In addition, translation into languages with complex inflectional morphology often fails because of the lack of an underlying syntactic structure to guide generation. However, techniques have been designed to build these additional components by adapting components already available for other languages presenting similar problems. Such cloning techniques have been quite successful in producing ASR systems for Vietnamese, Khmer, Thai, etc. It also becomes possible to regenerate an MT system as time goes on, automatically adapting to changing elements like named entities and their translations. For example, a Vietnamese-French MT system for written news was built in 2009 from a Web site of translated news items [40]. A program first identifies translated pages using date proximity and proportion of recurring Vietnamese-French pairs (a dictionary or a phrase table may help) and thus produces a V-F corpus. It then extracts from it a parallel corpus of bi-segments, and finally generates an MT system using Moses. The quality of the results on similar untranslated news items seems to be better than that of Google Translate (which performs two-step translation through English).

⁷ GNU Public License

3. MT evolution in Web 3.0 ?

3.1 DBMT MT systems and Self-Explaining Documents (SED)

Back in 1994, we had just completed an experiment on a small DBMT (Dialogue-Based MT) prototype, LIDIA, translating from French into Russian, German and English. In the course of our experimentation, we observed once again that translation may introduce ambiguities which are not present in the source text. It also may happen that all of the disambiguated analyses of a sentence produce the same translation, which turns out to be as ambiguous as the original. One example was the translation from French into Russian of the famous sentence *The man sees the girl in the park with a telescope*.

In that case (we may well ask), what is the use of disambiguating the source text if ambiguities only reappear in the translation(s), or – even worse – if new ones are created? Would it not be better to try to produce translations which preserve the ambiguities, thus dispensing with interactive disambiguation altogether? Unfortunately, experience with human translation shows that ambiguities can be *exactly* preserved only in some cases, and that to preserve them purposefully is quite difficult and often leads to unnatural expressions in the translation. It is also quite clear that the transferable ambiguities vary with the target language. Finally, although some texts may be intentionally ambiguous, especially in poetry and politics, most ambiguities are not intentional, but are due to the intrinsic nature of natural languages. Some people write more clearly than others, but everybody writes ambiguously in all natural languages, which are ambiguous by nature (though unambiguously in all programming languages, which are unambiguous by construction).

Such considerations have led us to the idea of *self-explaining documents*: if the target documents are accompanied by their (unambiguous) linguistic structure, with indications of potentially ambiguous parts, and if the reader in the target language may obtain a clarification of unclear parts in a user-friendly way, the ambiguity issues are largely resolved. As human users are notably insensitive to ambiguities, however, we should find a way to warn the reader that the target text is ambiguous. In a multilingual DBMT setting, such warnings are possible. The system analyzes the target text with the analyzer of the target language, and produces a structure factorizing the multiple possible analyses, or *mmc-structure*⁸. It then automatically runs a simulated (and mute) disambiguation dialogue on the target side, automatically answering each disambiguation question so that the generated disambiguated structure, or *umc-structure*, is contained among the remaining candidate analyses as each question is answered. The system memorizes the disambiguation questions and the answers (Figure 3). It is then possible to show the ambiguities in the user interface by any convenient means, e.g. by creating buttons on which the reader may click to obtain the clarifications furnished by questions and answers – clarifications which *would have been given by the author, had the text been written in the target language*. In the Web 2.0 context, an SED is

⁸ *mmc* = multiple (all analyses), multilevel (from surface to abstract levels), concrete (direct correspondence with text).
umc = unique (disambiguated), multilevel and concrete.

obtained by adding to an XML document and its folder of satellite files a *companion explanatory document*, also in XML. In [41, 42], we report on a prototype implementation of a *SED viewer and editor*, based on the Amaya XHTML editor of the W3C.




Figure 3: production of self-explaining documents, interactively in the source language, and then automatically in the target languages

Since 1994, we have been unable to obtain funding to develop a full prototype of this concept. Also turned down were even less ambitious project proposals to the EU concerning the introduction of writing tools linked to a DBMT system, although the potential of the approach for producing low cost, high quality translation into multiple languages had been amply demonstrated, in particular by the IBM JETS system. These concepts were simply too far ahead of their time.

With the advent of the Semantic Web, we hope they will no longer be seen as futuristic, but as quite feasible. It is now possible to develop such multilingual systems through the Internet. If a pivot-oriented approach is chosen, a team can be responsible for each language. Teams can share resources in a practical manner since, for example, sharing a common lexical database in real time no longer poses problems.

3.2 Interactive disambiguation in target language

Some expert MT systems have been built to produce an ordered list of translations for each segment. The first translations are used to compose the output text, and the user interface allows an editor to see and select other translations further down the list. But post-editing the first version is almost always quicker than going down the list, often without finding any better preliminary translation. The situation is now far worse with SMT systems, which can produce very long scored lists (sometimes factorized in lattices of candidate translations): according to experiments performed at Xerox/XRCE, for 90% of all input sentences, there is no good translation to "rerank" in the first top 100 or even 1000 candidates.

The idea arises, then, of offering the editor a better structure to search through. Rather than a list, some sort of graph seems indicated, in the manner of a confusion network, offering readers a convenient interface to quickly search the network for a translation meeting

their expectations. In addition to facilitating navigation through numerous candidate translations produced by a single MT system, such an approach could also enable the easy combination of parts of candidates from several MT systems. Note that, in this scenario, which might motivate a new workflow design (operational architecture), users are expected to know the domain and the target language very well, and the source language minimally or not at all. The approach can be implemented via a standard Web browser, as demonstrated by [43]. In this implementation, the text of the translation's current version appears in the interface's central frame. It looks like normal text, and is composed of the currently selected trajectory in the factorizing graph. The text is clickable where there are alternations in the graph. The interface's left pane is used to manipulate the graph (e.g. to change a selection or edge priority, or to indicate crossings or additions). This new concept of interactive translation exploiting target-language graphs may become possible and useful in the Web 3.0.

3.3 Knowledge-Based MT

The idea of connecting an MT system to a knowledge base through an expert system was first studied and prototyped by R. Gerber in his 1984 PhD research [44]. The purpose was to solve certain lexical ambiguities and to correct errors in parse trees, in particular attachment errors. Later, immediately after MT research resumed in the US after eighteen years in disrepute, CMU [45] proposed to build an MT system around a full-blown domain ontology, ultimately producing the KBMT-89 prototype. The KANT system was then developed for Caterpillar and deployed there with four target languages under the name of CATALYST. After 2000, it appears that a TA system, *Déjà Vu*, was put into operation at Caterpillar. We could not determine whether MT continues there, perhaps integrated with TA; however, it would not be surprising if it has been discontinued: it is often too costly to maintain MT dictionaries in synch with those for a translators' assistant, which are continuously enriched by translators. Highly specialized linguists must in this case follow the evolution of the input sublanguage, and must develop and maintain more target languages. In the end, MT usage becomes less and less attractive and is finally discontinued.

The old concept of KBMT is now bound to revive, we believe. As *domain ontologies* are becoming popular, they will not have to be built for the sake of MT. (By contrast, ontology construction more than doubled the cost of the lexical knowledge in KBMT-89.) Rather, ontologies will be employed as they are, using new sorts of expert system interfaces, comparable to those R. Gerber used in 1981-84. For these purposes, it will be possible to use a new technique we are developing (in the context of the French ANR OMNIA project in order to access large databases of images with companion texts). Descriptors relative to a domain ontology Ω are extracted by image processing and textual content extraction, then merged and stored in the facts, or *A-box*, of ontology Ω . We *multilingualize* context extraction in two steps: first, we annotate the texts by interlingual lexemes (such as the UWs of UNL), using a language-specific module; next, we run a language-independent content extraction algo-

rithm on the interlingual annotations, guided by an automatically built correspondence between the interlingua and the concepts, attributes, and rules, or *T-box*, of ontology Ω .

Conclusion

MT has changed considerably since 1984, when Systran was put on the French Minitel, and the pace has quickened since 1994, when it was put on Internet, to be followed by many others. We will not repeat here the summary given in the abstract above. Rather, we will conclude by saying that *the most important factors for success or failure of MT systems in the future will probably be the adequacy of their operational architecture* (workflow design, users, contributors and scenarios of use) to support the new uses which will appear with the Semantic Web, Web 3.0. In particular, the development of high quality MT for a very large number of naturally arising sublanguages will necessitate the extensive involvement of users, both as volunteer co-developers of resources and as improvers (post-editors) of rough or raw MT results.

Widespread high-quality MT development will also require good methods for extending text-based and spoken MT to under-resourced languages and language pairs. Three promising aspects of the future of MT are (1) the *automatic learning*, from sets of examples, of converters to and deconverters from appropriate *interlingua* representations; (2) the development of authoring tools enabling users to interactively create *self-explaining documents* (SEDs), and to automatically translate these into many other languages; and (3) the *connection of domain ontologies* to MT systems of all types through expert system interfaces. *Ubilingual* (ubiquitous multilingual) computing is already on its way, and progress towards *intelligent* ubilingual computing is anticipated.

References

- [1] C. Boitet, "PROs and CONs of the pivot and transfer approaches in multilingual Machine Translation," presented at Int. Conf. on "New directions in Machine Translation", 18–19 August 1988, 1988.
- [2] C. Boitet, "Towards Personal MT: general design, dialogue structure, potential role of speech, text encoding," presented at ROCLing-III, Aug. 1990, 1990.
- [3] C. Boitet, "Crucial Open Problems in Machine Translation and Interpretation.," presented at Symposium on Natural Language Processing in Thailand, 17–21 March 1993, 1993.
- [4] C. Boitet, "Perspectives of Machine-Aided Human Translation," presented at ICLA-94, 26–28 July 1994, 1994.
- [5] C. Boitet, "Dialogue-Based MT and self-explaining documents as an alternative to MAHT and MT of controlled languages," presented at Machine Translation 10 Years On, 11–14 Nov. 1994, 1994.
- [6] C. Boitet, "Factors for success (and failure) in Machine Translation — some lessons of the first 50 years of R&D," presented at MTS-V (Fifth Machine Translation Summit), 11–13 July 1995, 1995.
- [7] C. Boitet, "Towards high-quality interpersonal multilingual written communication using the DBMT approach: the LIDIA prototype & the UNL-F project," presented at OOPCON-97, Bangkok, 7–14 December 1997, 1997.
- [8] H. Blanchon and C. Boitet, "Annotating Documents by Their Intended Meaning to Make Them Self Explaining: An Essential Progress for the Semantic Web," presented at FQAS-06 (Flexible Query Answering Systems), Milan, 2006.
- [9] C. Boitet, "Four technical and organizational keys for handling more languages and improving quality (on demand) in MT," presented at MTS2001 Workshop on "MT2010 — Towards a Road Map for MT", Santiago de Compostela, 2001.
- [10] W. J. Hutchins and H. L. Somers, *An Introduction to Machine Translation*: Academic Press, 1992.
- [11] W. J. Hutchins, *Machine Translation : Past, Present, Future*. Chichester, England: Ellis Horwood, John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- [12] C. Boitet, "Les architectures linguistiques et computationnelles en traduction automatique sont indépendantes," presented at TALN-08, Avignon, 2008.
- [13] J. Chandiooux and M.-F. Guérard, "METEO: un système à l'épreuve du temps," *META (Journal des Traducteurs)*, pp. 17–22, 1981.
- [14] H. Uchino, S. Shirai, A. Yokoo, Y. Oyama, and O. Furuse, "ALTFLASH: A Japanese-English Machine Translation System for Market Flash Reports," *EICE Transactions on Information and Systems, Pt.2 (Japanese Edition)*, vol. VOL.J84-D-2, pp. 1167–1174, 2001.
- [15] E. Nyberg, C. Kamprath, and T. Mitamura, "The KANT Translation System From R&D to Large-Scale Deployment," *Localization Industry Standards Association (LISA) Newsletter*, vol. 2, pp. 1–8, 1998.
- [16] H. Blanchon, "Perspectives of DBMT for monolingual authors on the basis of LIDIA-1, an implemented mockup," presented at 15th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING-94, 5–9 Aug. 1994, 1994.
- [17] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 1: Linguistic, computational and operational architectures of MT systems," in *NII lecture series*. Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [18] C. Callison-Burch, M. Osborne, and P. Koehn, "Re-evaluating the Role of BLEU in Machine Translation Research," presented at EACL-06, Trento, 2006.
- [19] H. Blanchon, C. Boitet, and L. Besacier, "Evaluation of Spoken Dialogue Translation Systems: Trends, Results, Problems and Proposals," presented at COLING-04, Genève, 2004.
- [20] H. Blanchon and C. Boitet, "Pour l'évaluation externe des systèmes de TA par des méthodes fondées sur la tâche," *Numéro spécial de TAL sur l'évaluation*, pp. 1–33, 2008.
- [21] M. Seligman and C. Boitet, "A "Whiteboard" Architecture for Machine Interpretation," presented at International Symposium on Spoken Dialogue, 10–12 November 1993, 1993.
- [22] M. Seligman and M. Dillinger, "Rapid Portability among Domains in an Interactive Spoken Language Translation System," presented at COLING-2008 workshop on Speech Processing for Safety Critical Translation and Pervasive Applications, Manchester, UK, 2008.
- [23] W. B. Dolan, J. Pinkham, and S. D. Richardson, "The Microsoft Research Machine Translation System," in *Machine Translation: From Research to Real Users*, vol. Volume, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2499/2002*: Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 237–239.
- [24] B. Zhou, Y. Gao, J. Sorensen, D. Déchelotte, and M. Picheny, "A Hand-Held Speech-To-Speech Translation

- System," presented at HLT-NAACL, Edmonton, Canada, 2003.
- [25] Y. Gao, L. Gu, B. Zhou, R. Sarikaya, M. Afify, H.-K. Kuo, W.-z. Zhu, Y. Deng, C. Prosser, W. Zhang, and L. Besacier, "IBM MASTOR System: Multilingual Automatic Speech-to-speech Translator," presented at HLT-NAACL 2006, 2006.
- [26] P. Langlais, S. G. Thomas Leplus, and G. Lapalme, "From the RealWorld to Real Words: the METEO case," presented at EAMT-05, Budapest, 2005.
- [27] E. Hovy, M. King, and A. Popescu-Belis, "Principles of Context-Based Machine Translation Evaluation," *Machine Translation*, vol. 17, pp. 43-75, 2002.
- [28] C. Boitet, "La TAO comme technologie scientifique : le cas de la TA fondée sur le dialogue," in *La traduction*, A. Clas and P. Bouillon, Eds. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1993, pp. 109–148.
- [29] B. Vauquois and S. Chappuy, "Static grammars: a formalism for the description of linguistic models," presented at TMI-85 (Conf. on theoretical and methodological issues in the Machine Translation of natural languages), Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N.Y., Aug. 1985, 1985.
- [30] Y. Zaharin and E. K. Tang, "String-Tree Correspondence Grammars as a base for the automatic generation of analysis programs in machine translation. Proceedings of the," presented at International Conference on Current Issues in Computational Linguistics, Penang, 1991.
- [31] Y. Zaharin, "Generation of Synthesis Programs in ROBRA (ARIANE) from String-Tree Correspondence Grammars," presented at COLING-90, Helsinki, 18–25 Aug. 1990, 1990.
- [32] M. H. Al-Adhaileh, E. K. Tang, and Y. Zaharin, "A synchronization structure of SSTC and its applications in machine translation," presented at International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING-02) Workshop on Machine translation in Asia, Taiwan, 2002.
- [33] H. Uchida, "The Universal Networking Language (UNL) Specifications Version 3 Edition 3," UNL Center, UNDL Foundation December 2004 2004.
- [34] A. K. Melby, "Multi-Level Translation Aids in a Distributed System," presented at COLING-82, 5-10 July 1982, 1982.
- [35] A. K. Melby, "Translators and Machines - Can they cooperate ?," vol. 26, pp. 23-34, 1981.
- [36] A. K. Melby, "MicroMATER. A Proposed Standard Format for Exchanging Lexical / Terminological Data Files," *Meta : journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 36, pp. 135-160, 1991.
- [37] V. Belynyck, C. Boitet, and J. Kenwright, "Bilingual Lexical Data Contributed by Language Teachers Via a Web Service: Quality vs. Quantity," presented at CICLING-2007 (Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing), 2007.
- [38] V. B. Belynyck, Christian; Kenwright, John, "ITOLDU, a Web Service to Pool Technical Lexical Terms in a Learning Environment and Contribute to Multilingual Lexical Databases," presented at Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing (Proc. CICLING-2005), Mexico, Mexique, 2005.
- [39] H. H. Philipp Koehn, Alexandra Birch, Chris Callison-Burch, Marcello Federico, Nicola Bertoldi, Brooke Cowan, Wade Shen, Christine Moran, Richard Zens, Chris Dyer, Ondrej Bojar, Alexandra Constantin, Evan Herbst, "Moses: Open Source Toolkit for Statistical Machine Translation.," presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), demonstration session, Prague, Czech Republic, 2007.
- [40] T.-N.-D. Do, V.-B. Le, B. Bigi, L. Besacier, and E. Castelli, "Exploitation d'un corpus bilingue comparable pour la création d'un système de traduction probabiliste vietnamien-français," presented at TALN-09, Senlis, 2009.
- [41] H. Blanchon, C. Boitet, and A. Choumane, "Traduction Automatisée Fondée sur le Dialogue et Documents Auto-Explicatifs : bilan du projet LIDIA," *TAL*, pp. 1-25, 2008.
- [42] A. Choumane, "Accès à des services de traduction interactive fondée sur le dialogue à travers un éditeur XML." Grenoble: UJF, 2005.
- [43] V. Satayamas, C. Boitet, and A. Kawtrakul, "Specialized editor for annotating word boundaries collaboratively," presented at IJCNLP-08 workshop on NLP of Indian languages, Hyderabad, 2008.
- [44] R. Gerber and C. Boitet, "On the design of expert systems grafted on MT systems," presented at TMI-85 (Conf. on Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Machine Translation of natural language), Aug. 1985, 1985.
- [45] S. Nirenburg and al., "KBMT-89 Project Report," Center for Machine Translation, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburg April 1989 1989.
- [46] J.-Y. Antoine and D. Genthial, "Actes du colloque Méthodes hybrides TALN/TALP pour le traitement robuste de la langue," D. Genthial and J.-Y. Antoine, Eds. Cargèse, France, 1999.
- [47] V. Belynyck, "Multimodal Visualization of Geometrical Constructions," presented at CVIR'1998, workshop on Content Vizualisation and Intermedia Representations, Montreal, Québec, Canada, 1998.
- [48] V. Belynyck, C. Boitet, and J. Kenwright, "Contribute to learn: a proof of concept with ITOLDU," in *Japio 2006 Year Book: JAPIO (Japan Patent Information Organization)*, Tokyo, 2006.
- [49] L. Besacier, V.-B. Le, and C. Boitet, "ASR and Translation for Under-Resourced Languages," presented at ICASSP-06, Toulouse, 2006.
- [50] Y. Bey, K. Kageura, and C. Boitet, "BEYTrans: A Free Online Collaborative Wiki-Based CAT Environment Designed for Online Translation Communities," presented at PACLIC-21 (Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation), Seoul, 2007.
- [51] H. Blanchon and C. Boitet, "Two Steps Towards Self-Explaining Documents," presented at Convergences-2003, Alexandrie, 2003.
- [52] H. Blanchon and C. Boitet, "Les Documents Auto-Explicatifs : une voie pour offrir l'accès au sens aux lecteurs," presented at CIDE-7 (Approches Sémantiques du Document Numérique), La Rochelle, 2004.
- [53] C. Boitet, "Un essai de réponse à quelques questions théoriques et pratiques liées à la traduction automatique. Définition d'un système prototype," Université de Grenoble (USTMG), 1976.
- [54] C. Boitet, "Software and lingware engineering in modern M(A)T systems," in *Handbook for Machine Translation*, Batori, Ed.: Niemeyer, 1988.
- [55] C. Boitet, "Bernard VAUQUOIS' Contribution to the Theory and Practice of building MT Systems : a historical perspective," presented at Second International Conference on Theoretical and Methodological Issues in the Machine Translation of Natural Languages, June 1988, 1988.
- [56] C. Boitet, "Towards Personal MT : general design, dialogue structure, potential role of speech," presented at COLING-90, 20-25 août 1990, 1990.
- [57] C. Boitet, "Multilingual Machine Translation does not have to be saved by Interlingua," presented at MMT'90, Tokyo, 1990.

- [58] C. Boitet, "Twelve Problems for Machine Translation," presented at CICL-91 (International Conference on Current Issues in Computational Linguistics), USM, Penang, 1991.
- [59] C. Boitet, "TA et TAO à Grenoble... 32 ans déjà !," vol. 33, pp. 45–84, 1993.
- [60] C. Boitet, "Méthodes d'acquisition lexicale en TAO : des dictionnaires spécialisés propriétaires aux bases lexicales généralistes et ouvertes," presented at Conférence associée à TALN-2001 "TAO et applications de grande taille", Tours, 2001.
- [61] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation," in *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*. London: Nature Publishing Group, 2001.
- [62] C. Boitet, "A rationale for using UNL as an interlingua and more in various domains," presented at LREC-02 First International Workshop on UNL, other Interlinguas, and their Applications, Las Palmas, 2002.
- [63] C. Boitet, "Automated Translation / Traduction Automatique," *Revue française de linguistique appliquée*, pp. 99-121, 2003.
- [64] C. Boitet, "New architectures for "democratic" tunable quality MT systems," presented at Pacific Association for Computational Linguistics (Proc. PACLING-2005), Meisei daigaku, Hino campus, 2005.
- [65] C. Boitet, "Gradable quality translations through mutualization of human translation and revision, and UNL-based MT and coedition," in *Universal Networking Language, advances in theory and applications*, vol. 12, *Research in Computing Science*, J. Cardeñosa, A. Gelbukh, and E. Tovar, Eds. Mexico, 2005, pp. 393–410.
- [66] C. Boitet, "Linguistic & computational MT architectures are orthogonal: elements for choice," presented at SNLP-07, Pattaya, 2007.
- [67] C. Boitet, "Corpus pour la TA : types, tailles, et problèmes associés, selon leur usage et le type de système," *RFLA (Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée)*, vol. 1, pp. 25-38, 2007.
- [68] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 4: Engineering of MT and CAT systems (CAT = MT + TA, TA = translation aids)," in *NII lecture series*. Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [69] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 6: Corpora for hybrid MT/CAT systems." Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [70] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 5: Evaluation of MT and CAT systems for various operational architectures," in *NII lecture series*. Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [71] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 3: Computational architectures of MT systems," in *NII lecture series*. Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [72] C. Boitet, "Machine Translation (MT) and Computer-Aided Translation (CAT) -- Lecture 2: Linguistic architectures of MT systems," in *NII lecture series*. Tokyo: NII, 2009.
- [73] C. Boitet, Y. Bey, and K. Kageura, "Main research issues in building web services for mutualized, non-commercial translation," presented at SNLP-05, Bangkok, 2005.
- [74] C. Boitet, Y. Bey, M. Tomokiyo, W. Cao, and H. Blanchon, "IWSLT-06: Experiments with Commercial MT Systems and Lessons from Subjective Evaluations," presented at IWSLT-06 (International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation), Kyoto, 2006.
- [75] C. Boitet and H. Blanchon, "Multilingual Dialogue-Based MT for Monolingual Authors: the LIDIA Project and a First Mockup," *Machine Translation*, vol. 9, pp. 99–132, 1994.
- [76] C. Boitet, I. Boguslavskij, and J. Cardeñosa, "An Evaluation of UNL Usability for High Quality Multilingualization and Projections for a Future UNL++ Language," in *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing (Proc. CICLING-2007)*, A. Gelbukh, Ed.: Springer (LNCS 4394), 2007, pp. 361-373.
- [77] C. Boitet and R. Gerber, "Expert Systems and other new techniques in MT," in *Neue Ansätze in maschineller Sprachübersetzung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1986, pp. 103–119.
- [78] C. Boitet, C.-P. Huynh, H. Blanchon, and H.-T. Nguyen, "A Web-oriented System to Manage the Translation of an Online Encyclopedia Using Classical MT and Deconversion from UNL," presented at RIVF 2009, Da Nang, 2009.
- [79] C. Boitet and N. Nédojkine, "Toward integrated dictionaries for M(a)T: motivations and linguistic organization," presented at COLING-86, Aug. 1986, 1986.
- [80] C. Boitet and M. Seligman, "The "Whiteboard" Architecture: a way to integrate heterogeneous components of NLP systems," presented at COLING-94, 5–9 August 1994, 1994.
- [81] F. Brunet-Manquat, "Syntactic parser combination for improved dependency analysis," presented at ROMAND-2004, Workshop COLING 2004, 2004.
- [82] G. Fafiotte, C. Boitet, M. Seligman, and C. Zong, "Collecting Bilingual Dialogues using a Web-Based Platform for the Study of Interpretation," presented at LREC-04 (Language Resources and Evaluation Conference), Lisbonne, 2004.
- [83] S. Gallup, "Caterpillar Technical English and Automatic Machine Translation," presented at 40th Annual Conference of the Society for Technical Communication (STC-93), Dallas, 1993.
- [84] N. Hajlaoui and C. Boitet, "TA statistique à petits corpus pour de petits sous-langages," presented at TOTh-08, Avignon, 2008.
- [85] X. M. Huang, "A Machine Translation System for the Target Language Inexpert," presented at COLING-90, 20-25 Aug. 1990, 1990.
- [86] C.-P. Huynh, C. Boitet, and H. Blanchon, "SECTra_w : an Online Collaborative System for Evaluating, Post-editing and Presenting MT Translation Corpora," presented at LREC-08, Marrakech, 2008.
- [87] D. E. Johnson and H. Watanabe, "Relational-grammar-based generation in the JETS Japanese-English machine translation system," *Machine Translation*, vol. 6, pp. 1-20, 1991.
- [88] M. Lafourcade and C. Boitet, "UNL Lexical selection with conceptual vectors," presented at LREC-02 (International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation), Las Palmas, 2002.
- [89] A. K. Melby, M. R. Smith, and J. Peterson, "ITS : An Interactive Translation System," presented at COLING-80, Tokyo, 30/9-4/10/80, 1980.
- [90] H.-T. Nguyen, C. Boitet, and G. Sèrasset, "PIVAX, an online contributive lexical database for heterogeneous MT systems using a lexical pivot," presented at SNLP-07, Pattaya, 2007.
- [91] S. Nirenburg, "Knowledge-based Machine Translation," pp. 5-24, 1989.