ATLAS: A Flexible and Extensible Architecture for Linguistic Annotation

Steven Bird[*], **David Day**[†], **John Garofolo**[‡],
John Henderson[†], **Christophe Laprun**[‡] **and Mark Liberman**[*]

[*]Linguistic Data Consortium, University of Pennsylvania, 3615 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
[†]MITRE Corporation, 202 Burlington Road, Bedford, MA 01730, USA
[‡]National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, Mailstop 8940, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8940, USA

Abstract

We describe a formal model for annotating linguistic artifacts, from which we derive an application programming interface (API) to a suite of tools for manipulating these annotations. The abstract logical model provides for a range of storage formats and promotes the reuse of tools that interact through this API. We focus first on "Annotation Graphs," a graph model for annotations on linear signals (such as text and speech) indexed by intervals, for which efficient database storage and querying techniques are applicable. We note how a wide range of existing annotated corpora can be mapped to this annotation graph model. This model is then generalized to encompass a wider variety of linguistic "signals," including both naturally occuring phenomena (as recorded in images, video, multi-modal interactions, etc.), as well as the derived resources that are increasingly important to the engineering of natural language processing systems (such as word lists, dictionaries, aligned bilingual corpora, etc.). We conclude with a review of the current efforts towards implementing key pieces of this architecture.

1. Introduction

Annotated corpora are a central component of research in human language technology. As corpora have proliferated across a rapidly expanding set of languages, disciplines and technologies, the lack of agreed standards has become a critical problem. The standardization of tagsets is necessarily an open-ended task, and will always be subject to revision as the underlying domains change and the theories evolve. Yet with no agreed data models and application programming interfaces (APIs), the bazaar of tools and formats continues to expand, and incompatibilities proliferate. Adapting existing annotation tools to new formats often requires non-trivial re-engineering. Seen from this perspective, general-purpose annotation tools and formats are a distant prospect.

In recent work, Bird and Liberman (Bird and Liberman, 1999) have demonstrated commonality across a diverse range of annotation practice. Existing tools generally implement a two-level architecture consisting of an application level (the interface to a user or to external software) and a physical level (the storage format). It is possible to interpose an intermediate, logical level, which is independent of the application and the physical storage (cf. the three-level architecture for relational databases). Once this step is taken, wide-ranging integration of tools and formats becomes possible. The logical level we will propose in this paper is based around the notion of an "annotation graph," which is a labeled, directed acyclic graph with time-stamps on some of its nodes, anchoring the graph to a physical signal. Annotation becomes the fundamental act of associating a symbolic property (the arc's label) to an extent of signal data (the arc's time span).

ATLAS: "Architecture and Tools for Linguistic Analysis Systems" is a recent initiative involving NIST, LDC and MITRE, arising from an array of applications needs spanning corpus construction, evaluation infrastructure, and multi-modal visualization. The principal goal of ATLAS is to provide powerful abstractions over annotation tools and formats in order to maximize flexibility and extensibility. Our approach has been to isolate and abstract over the physical and logical levels of annotation tools and formats, leaving application- and domain-specific issues to the side. The abstract physical level is a persistent XML representation for long-term storage, exchange, and pipelining, and this level is called ATLAS Interchange Format (AIF). The abstract logical representation is the internal representation for broad classes of data. It includes linear signals (text, speech) indexed by intervals (i.e. annotation graphs), images indexed by bounding boxes, and additional generic representations for other data classes (lexicons, tables, aligned corpora).

This paper is structured into three main parts. We begin by describing the problem and our approach, then describe the open architecture. Next, we present the annotation graph model and our generalization of it to higher dimensions, before reporting progress on the implementation. We conclude with a discussion of future plans and an invitation for wider participation.

2. The Bazaar of Tools and Formats

Over the last several years, there has been a veritable bloom in new language technology research projects. Measurable progress is being made in many core language technologies including automated speech recognition, information extraction, information retrieval, machine translation, natural language processing and others. To support the development and evaluation of these technologies, there has also been a boom in the development of language research resources.

Not only are more of these projects being formed, they typically adopt a shorter development cycle than has been customary in the past. While much of this acceleration is due to the availability of greatly increased processor speeds and storage capacities, these projects are also benefiting from the creation of spin-off projects focusing on integrated

Figure 1: The Two-Level Architecture

multi-component applications. The result is that many researchers are beginning to develop toolkit approaches to language technology development.

Unfortunately, to date, these efforts have almost always been intra-domain. Likewise, the research corpora that have been developed for these projects have been created and deployed with minimal consideration toward re-use and extensibility. We therefore live in a world with an increasing variety of technology capabilities and a corresponding wealth of research corpora, yet these capabilities and corpora are domain-specific, task-specific, and often even site-specific (see Figure 1).

Task	Formats	Tools
Hub-4 ASR	UTF (SGML) STM, CTM	Hub-4 Transcription tools SCLITE
IE-ER	UTF+	Alembic Workbench NE99NS
TDT	Raw text, RDB Eval indexes TDT lists	TDT Event annotation tools TDTEval
SDR	raw text, SRT SGML lists TREC qrels	TREC tools TREC_EVAL
ACE	Raw text + ASR + OCR text APF ATLAS AIF?	Alembic Workbench EDT_REF_COMPARE

Table 1: Broadcast News Tasks, Formats and Tools

For example, for several years, NIST has been organizing and implementing language technology evaluations for several research domains using recordings and transcriptions of radio and television news broadcasts (Table 1). Although all of these evaluations have used basically the same source data, each required the development of customized formats and tools. Two years ago, NIST made an attempt to unify its transcription formats with the SGML-based Universal Transcription (UTF) format (NIST, 1998) for the DARPA Hub-4 ASR evaluations (Pallett et al., 1999). But,

in 1999, when the Hub-4 evaluation was expanded to include an entity recognition evaluation (Przybocki et al., 1999), NIST found that the UTF format could not accommodate the different tokenization schemes required by the ASR and extraction communities. It was at this point that NIST realized the need for a more abstract, open-ended transcription format that could accommodate such unforeseen changes. Such a format would have to been domain-independent and permit any conceivable extension.

NIST believed that the best solution to the formats dilemma could be achieved via a multi-site effort initially including NIST, the LDC, and MITRE. NIST would contribute its expertise in language technology evaluation and infrastructure; the LDC would contribute its expertise in corpus development including its recent research in abstract annotation representations using annotation graphs, and its involvement with the new ISLE and TalkBank projects (ISLE, 2000; TalkBank, 2000), and MITRE would contribute its expertise in language technology development and annotation and visualization using the Alembic Workbench (Day et al., 1997). Thus, the ATLAS working group was formed.

The group's mission was to develop a general architecture for annotation including a logical data format, an API and tool-set, and a persistent data representation. The architecture would, by definition, need to be modular, flexible and extensible. First, this architecture would facilitate the exchange and reuse of existing language resources. Such resources would be moved in and out of the ATLAS framework via conversion routines. As such, ATLAS could also act as an interlingua for language corpora. Further, the architecture would provide a platform for the extension of such corpora and the development of new ATLAS-native resources. The ATLAS philosophy would eschew the tradition of imposing monolithic applications or formats on the language research community. Rather, ATLAS would serve as a conduit to enable the greater flow of language resources throughout the language research community.

3. The ATLAS Architecture

ATLAS consists of three levels: application, logical, and physical. The overall structure is depicted in Figure 2. We discuss each of these layers in turn, beginning with the middle, logical level.


Figure 2: ATLAS Layered Solution

3.1. The logical level

The logical layer consists of a linguistic formalism and an API. The formalism is the annotation graph model and its generalization to higher-dimensional cases. The formalism is a generalization of the annotation graph model, called annotation sets. The API defines a set of procedures for creating, modifying, searching and storing well-formed annotation sets.

3.2. The physical level

The API specification will allow for a multiplicity of physical storage implementations that applications are free to access in various ways – via networked client-server models, or via libraries linked directly into application binaries, or via scripting languages. The two dominant storage strategies that we are implementing are: ATLAS Interchange Format (AIF), an XML interchange format; and an RDBMS accessible from ODBC-compliant calls.

The AIF XML format will provide a simple, wide-coverage interchange format for which conversion programs to and from other annotation formats are being developed. The AIF XML annotations are "stand-off" in the sense that they reference the signal being annotated (whether text or speech, or some other modality). This considerably simplifies the encoding of multiple layers of annotation, especially those that would involve crossing brackets if they were embedded in the signal data. Given the generality of the annotation graph formalism, we believe that AIF could serve as an interlingua for sharing annotated linguistic corpora among language processing applications, reducing the number of conversion tools that need to be written.

The RDBMS implementation will provide efficient access to large, heterogeneous linguistic databases, and open the door to analysis of a nature and scale that was hitherto impractical or impossible.

3.3. The application level

This level contains a rich diversity of components. The annotation set formalism, as implemented in ATLAS, will reduce the burden on language engineering applications development. To demonstrate this claim, we are developing a range of initial applications, as described below. The modularity provided by the API works for applications as well: distinct components will communicate their operations on annotations via the API, greatly enhancing the re-usability of application-level components.

4. The Annotation Graph Model

Annotation graphs were presented by Bird and Liberman (Bird and Liberman, 1999) as follows.

Definition 1 An **annotation graph** G over a label set L and timelines $\langle T_i, \leq \rangle$ is a 3-tuple $\langle N, A, \tau \rangle$ consisting of a node set N, a collection of arcs A labeled with elements of L, and a time function τ, which satisfies the following conditions:

1. $\langle N, A \rangle$ is a labeled acyclic digraph containing no nodes of degree zero;


```
train/dr1/fjsp0/sa1.wrd:    train/dr1/fjsp0/sa1.phn:
2360 5200 she               0 2360 h#
5200 9680 had               2360 3720 sh
9680 11077 your             3720 5200 iy
11077 16626 dark            5200 6160 hv
16626 22179 suit            6160 8720 ae
22179 24400 in              8720 9680 dcl
24400 30161 greasy          9680 10173 y
30161 36150 wash            10173 11077 axr
36720 41839 water           11077 12019 dcl
41839 44680 all             12019 12257 d
44680 49066 year            ...
```

Figure 3: TIMIT Annotation Data and Graph Structure

2. $\tau : N \rightharpoonup \bigcup T_i$, such that, for any path from node n_1 to n_2 in A, if $\tau(n_1)$ and $\tau(n_2)$ are defined, then $\tau(n_1) \leq \tau(n_2)$;

Note that annotation graphs may be disconnected or empty, and that they must not have orphan nodes.

The formalism can be illustrated with an application to a simple speech database, the TIMIT corpus of read speech (Garofolo et al., 1986). This was the first speech database to be widely distributed. It contains broadband recordings of 630 speakers of 8 major dialects of American English, each reading 10 phonetically rich sentences [www.ldc.upenn.edu/Catalog/LDC93S1.html]. Figure 3 shows part of the annotation of one of the sentences. The file on the left contains word transcription, and the file on the right contains phonetic transcription. Part of the corresponding annotation graph is shown underneath.

In Figure 3, each node displays the node identifier and the time offset (in 16kHz sample numbers). The arcs are decorated with type and label information. The type W is for words and the type P is for phonetic transcriptions.

A simplified chart showing the primary objects and their relationships is shown in Figure 4. A graph object is a collection of zero or more arc objects, where these specify an identifier, two nodes, a type, and the content. A node specifies an identifier, a timeline, and an offset into that timeline. A timeline simply denotes a set of signals that share the same abstract notion of time (Bird and Liberman, 1999). For example, multichannel audio signals, or aligned video and audio data are signal sets which have a


Figure 4: The Annotation Graph Object Model

single time-base, and which would be grouped together by a common timeline. The content object consists of a set of feature-value pairs. The object identifiers are intended to support incoming references from external resources, and cross-references within a particular annotation graph. For example, the value of some feature of a arc could be the identifier of another arc.

The API for this model includes such functions as `Arc::insertArc(n1,n2,t,l)` to insert an arc from node `n1` to node `n2` with type `t` and label `l`, and `Arc::splitArc(a)` to replace a single arc with a path of two arcs spanning the same nodes.

5. Generalizing the Model

Annotation graphs are useful for annotating linear data types, including intervals found in any particular dimension of a variety of sequentially-arranged signals. However, there are more signal types which we can envision annotating, using the same basic philosophy of indication and characterization. Below we give a generalization of annotation graphs to encompass a class of signal types which correspond to n-dimensional vector spaces.

5.1. Higher-dimensional cases

There are many signals having dimension greater than one, that we acquire in our computers, and that are amenable to linguistic modeling techniques. The input signal to optical character recognition (OCR) is one example of a signal that loses (or at least obfuscates) its temporal dimension prior to acquisition by computer. When annotating the communicative content in a sign language video, one may want to highlight the portion of each of a sequence of images that is involved in the signing, and the same should be done in a lip-reading experiment where the input stream is television broadcast or movie, for example. ATLAS strives to model the annotations required in both reference and hypothesis data for an OCR system, a sign language recognition system, lip-reading system, as well as all well-formed combinations of these.

Annotation graphs, however, do not provide a natural framework for identifying regions of a signal having more than one dimension. Intuitively, we want to be able to specify bounding boxes, or other kinds of bounding areas, as a target for further characterization in the two dimensions of OCR (x, y). The analogy carries for higher dimensions such as video (x, y, t) where we want bounding volumes. The generalization of annotation graphs that facilitates this is Cartesian Annotation Sets. The name is chosen thus because we want to select a region of a vector space, rather than just an interval. For brevity we will usually refer to these simply as "annotation sets." Full details are given below.

There are further generalizations of annotation being explored, as one can imagine targeting signals which inhabit spaces that are not results of repeated Cartesian products (e.g. trees, partially ordered sets, relational or semistructured data). The annotation sets cover a very large set of signals that are captured by current digitizing equipment, however, and they are a primary target for development in ATLAS.

5.2. Annotation sets

In the terminology of annotation graphs, a labeled arc relates symbolic label data to an extent of signal, and this extent is specified using a pair of nodes. The arc serves a dual purpose: as an ordered pair of nodes specifying an extent; and as an entity which can accommodate label data. We separate these functions by replacing nodes and labeled arcs with some new constructs which reduce to nodes and labeled arcs in the linear case.

We begin by adopting "region" as a term for any extent of signal, regardless of dimensionality. In the one-dimensional case, regions are simply intervals, and there are various ways to specify these (endpoints, start-point plus offset, midpoint plus radius). The endpoint method is convenient since the boundaries are typically shared by several regions, and changing an endpoint value does not then require any further propagation of information. In the two-dimensional case we may specify regions using points or line segments; we select "anchor" as the cover term. Again, the choice of the anchoring method is based on the need to share boundaries between regions. The terminology extends to the three dimensional case, and is neutral as to whether the dimensions are spatial or temporal. We define an ATLAS "annotation" to be a relation between such regions and (structured) labels.

In the one-dimensional case, a collection of arcs is formed into a graph, representing a set of annotations on a particular signal. In the generalized model, we refer to a set of annotations as an "annotation set". A corpus is then a set of annotation sets, and a collection of corpora (such as LDC-Online) is a set of sets of annotation sets. If the provenance of any particular annotation is stored in its label, and if the signal information resides in the region structure, then there is no harm in flattening this nested set structure. Therefore we view "annotation set" as a top-level construct.

6. ATLAS Design and Implementations

ATLAS is an open architecture that provides a flexible and extensible framework for linguistic applications (Figure 5). Significant efforts have been put in the design to try to ensure that the architecture will evolve gracefully as new domains and tasks arise. The general philosophy behind ATLAS design consists in trying to provide a component framework on which new applications can be built and in which new components can be integrated with ease.

We base our design approach on the object paradigm. With respect to this approach, we have tried to clearly identify the concepts that are needed to solve the annotation problem, building on Bird and Liberman's survey (see [`www.ldc.upenn.edu/annotation/`]). We designed program entities (objects) by assigning them clear responsibilities and by separating the interface from the implementation. This approach has several well-known benefits; here we mention just three, and describe their significance in the present context.

First, this approach allows us to define APIs to ATLAS components that are secure and controlled entry points to the whole architecture. Second, we can vary the implementations of components, offering customization and

Figure 5: ATLAS Architecture

"plug'n'play" capabilities to developers. Third, language-independent interface definitions will permit ATLAS components to be written using a variety of languages.

6.1. ATLAS APIs

The ATLAS APIs are defined to leverage the architecture in an efficient way. They provide entry points to the functionality offered by the framework and ensure encapsulation of ATLAS internals, allowing enhancements to be made to the core functionality without impacting backwards compatibility.

ATLAS will provide a collection of APIs that address a variety of issues, built around the core annotation set API. This core API provides means to create, edit and delete annotations. It enables users and ATLAS developers to manipulate annotation components at the lowest level of abstraction.

Another set of components will support the core API and provide persistent storage capabilities for the architecture. These components will allow ATLAS-compliant tools to abstract the specifics of physical storage and transparently interact with flat files or databases. A complete set of input/output components will be provided for the ATLAS Interchange Format (see below).

Components will be also developed which provide higher-level services to ATLAS-compliant tools, easing the task of creating those tools. These components will also facilitate visualization and editing of annotations and will support a query interface. They will allow third-parties to easily and rapidly develop new ATLAS-compliant tools.

Finally, we are investigating the feasibility of creating components that will ease inter-component communication, transparent access to remote databases, and collaborative annotation.


Figure 6: ATLAS Object Model

6.2. The core object model and API

A simplified chart showing the primary objects and their relationships is shown in Figure 6. As in the annotation graph object model (Figure 4), annotations specify an identifier, a type, and content. The key difference is that we have abstracted away from one-dimensional annotation by providing the region object. The region object references two or more anchors, where these can define an interval in 1-space or a bounding box or polygon in 2-space. An anchor carries an identifier (so that it may be shared by more than one region), and it specifies a set of signals (generalizing the notion of timeline).

```
Anchor::setOffset(Offset)
    Set an anchor's offset to the specified value
Anchor::getIncoming()
    Get the incoming annotations to the specified anchor
Annotation::setStart(Anchor)
    Set the start anchor of an annotation to the specified
    anchor
Annotation::getStart()
    Access the start anchor of an annotation
Annotation::setFeature(feature, value)
    Set the specified feature of the annotation to this
    value
AnnotationSet::add(Annotation)
    Add a new annotation to the collection
AnnotationSet::split(Annotation)
    Split an annotation, creating a sequence of adjacent
    annotations
AnnotationSet::remove(Annotation)
    Remove the annotation from the collection
AnnotationSet::getAnchorSetByOffset(Offset)
    Get anchors with the specified offset
AnnotationSet::getByType(type)
    Get the annotations of type t
AnnotationSet::getByFeature(feature, value)
    Get the annotations with feature = value
AnnotationSet::getByTimeline(timeline)
    Get annotations of this timeline
```

Figure 7: A Fragment of the ATLAS API

The API for the ATLAS object model is outlined in Figure 7, in simplified form. For each method the object, method name and arguments are specified. Up-to-date information about the API is available from the ATLAS website.

6.3. ATLAS Interchange Format

An example of the current instantiation of the ATLAS Interchange Format is shown in Figure 8. This example shows two signals that exist outside this annotation file, one a video of someone called Bill speaking in sign language, and the other an ASCII file consisting of a transcription of Bill's utterances. One arc (A1) identifies a portion of the video signal as containing Bill's signing of the ASL letter "e". Another arc (A2) identifies a portion of the text signal as containing a word whose part of speech is "VBD". Finally, a third arc (A3) identifies a larger portion of the video signal as being transcribed into the word (or, more literally, the portion of the text signal) identified by the already defined A2 arc. Notice that the "content" of an arc may contain either a set of attribute/value fields (arc A1), a literal string or symbol (arc A2), or even a reference to another arc by its unique identifier (arc A3). The exact syntax of the ATLAS Interchange Format is still being refined, but this example and the one following it indicate some of the general components that will be supported.

```
<AnnotationGraph>
<AG_Signal SignalID="S1"
  Format="video:mpeg-1" ArcTypes="ASL"
  Location="file:bill.signing.mpeg"/>
<AG_Signal SignalID="S2"
  Format="text:ascii" ArcTypes="NAR"
  Location="file:bill.signing.narrative.cc"/>
<AG_Node NodeId="V0" Signal="S1"
  Offset="382.520" units="Seconds"/>
<AG_Node NodeId="V1" Signal="S1"
  Offset="383.922" units="Seconds"/>
<AG_Node NodeId="V2" Signal="S1"
  Offset="384.731" units="Seconds"/>
<AG_Node NodeId="V3" Signal="S2"
  Offset="78" units="Characters"/>
<AG_Node NodeId="V4" Signal="S2"
  Offset="85" units="Characters"/>
<AG_Arc ID="A1" StartNode="V0"
  EndNode="V1" Type="ASL">
  <Content>
   <Field> <!-- This is ASL sign "e" -->
     <Feature>sign</Feature>
     <Value>e</Value>
   </Field></Content>
</AG_Arc>
<AG_Arc ID="A2" StartNode="V3"
  EndNode="V4" Type="Part-of-Speech">
  <Content>VBD</Content>
</AG_Arc>
<AG_Arc ID="A3" StartNode="V0"
  EndNode="V2" Type="Transcription">
  <Content>
   <Field>
     <Feature>AG_Arc</Feature>
     <Value><AG_xref AG_Arc="A2"/></Value>
   </Field>
  </Content>
</AG_Arc>
</AnnotationGraph>
```

Figure 8: AIF: An XML Interchange Format for ATLAS Annotation Graphs

An example of an interchange format for structured lexicons is shown in Figure 9, in this case using a German to English dictionary as an example. This example presents only the most generic type of structure for defining a lexicon "signal," consisting of an entry for each unique meaning of a lexical item, and, as in the annotation graph example before, using a general purpose set of Feature/Value pairs to associate various features with an item. As noted in section 5. on generalizing the model, ATLAS will enable more special-purpose XML elements and structure to be derived and used for particular communities of interest, while retaining the mapping from these back to a core representation so that all relevant ATLAS-compliant tools can operate on the data.

6.4. Implementation – current status

At LDC, Michelle Minnick Fox developed the first implementation of the annotation graph API, in Perl/tk. Subsequently, Steven Bird developed a C++ implementation (for both the graph and set APIs). A team consisting of LDC researchers and programmers Steven Bird, David Graff, Xiaoyi Ma, Kevin Walker, Jonathan Wright and Zhibiao Wu has developed Perl and Tcl interfaces, parsers for a wide variety of existing corpus formats, and input/output to AIF. At NIST, Christophe Laprun has developed a Java implementation of the annotation graph API.

```
<AtlasSignal>
 <Signal SignalID="LEX" Class="AtlasLexicon"
    Format="AtlasLexicon:XML" Encoding="XML"
    Comment="German-to-English Dictionary">
  <Entry ID="E1034">
   <Lexeme>reichen</Lexeme>
   <Content>
    <Field>
     <Feature>PartOfSpeech</Feature>
     <!-- Transitive Verb -->
     <Value>VA</Value></Field>
    <Field>
     <Feature>Synonym</Feature>
     <Value>give</Value></Field>
    <Field>
     <Feature>Synonym</Feature>
     <Value>present</Value></Field>
    ...
    <Field>
     <Feature>Idiom</Feature>
     <Value>
      <Field>
       <Feature>Source</Feature>
       <Value>einem die Hand reichen</Value></Field>
      <Field>
       <Feature>Target</Feature>
       <Value>hold out one's hand to someone</Value>
      </Field>
      ...
     </Value></Field></Content>
  </Entry>
  <Entry ID="E1035">
   <Lexeme>reichen</Lexeme>
   <Content>
    <Field>
     <Feature>PartOfSpeech</Feature>
     <!-- Intransitive verb -->
     <Value>VN</Value></Field>
    <Field>
     <Feature>Synonym</Feature>
     <Value>extend to</Value></Field>
    <Field>
     <Feature>Synonym</Feature>
     <Value>suffice</Value></Field>
    ...
   </Entry></Content>
 </Signal>
</AtlasSignal>
```

Figure 9: An XML Interchange Format for Lexicons

6.5. Ongoing Activities

Work is ongoing in several areas at the three sites. NIST is working with MITRE to implement an ATLAS architecture for the Automatic Content Extraction (ACE) program Entity Detection and Tracking (EDT) evaluation, in which Person, Organization, Geographical-Political, Location, and Facility entities are to be detected, classified, and clustered (ACE, 2000). The ACE-EDT program will evaluate the application of EDT technology to text source, audio source, and image source data. This multi-domain program will be an important initial testbed for ATLAS.

NIST is using the ATLAS Interchange Format to implement a new portion of the NIST Text REtrieval Conference (TREC) Spoken Document Retrieval Track in which automatic speech recognition systems will be permitted to output non-lexical information such speaker changes, noise changes, pauses, etc. in addition to word transcriptions. These speech-recognizer-produced files will be exchanged among the research sites to examine the utility of multiple recognizers and non-lexical information in performing information retrieval from speech sources (TREC, 2000).

The ATLAS architecture will also be used to provide an information *aqueduct* between components within the DARPA Translingual Information Detection Extraction

and Summarization program (TIDES, 2000). The TIDES program will examine issues in integrating multiple language technologies in creating complex multi-media, multi-lingual information systems.

MITRE has developed two tools that are being ported to use the ATLAS annotation infrastructure: ALEMBIC WORKBENCH, a text annotation tool that provides mechanisms for annotating lexemes, multi-word phrases, co-reference relationships and discourse-level structured entities; and the MULTI-MODAL LOGGER, which enables multiple distinct signals (speech, text, application widget events, etc.) to be aligned and displayed along a common dimension (usually time) and annotated. MITRE is also developing a tool to support the declaration of new "signal" classes in ATLAS, enabling customized XML DTDs to be derived in a principled way such that ATLAS-compliant applications could operate on these data.

At LDC, development of new annotation tools has been switched over to follow the ATLAS model, and we envisage a day in the not-too-distant future when corpora will be released with a variety of cross-platform tools for accessing and enriching the corpus content. We are exploring links with developers of other tools, including Transcriber (Barras et al., 2000), Emu (Cassidy and Harrington, 1996), and GATE (Cunningham et al., 2000), which have data models that are conceptually close to the annotation graph model. A diverse range of new domains for annotated corpora is being addressed in the context of the CMU/Penn TalkBank project (TalkBank, 2000), including annotated recordings of animal calls, and annotated video of sign language. Relational database schemas for annotation data are being explored, and a special purpose query language is being developed (Cassidy and Bird, 2000; Bird et al., 2000).

All of the code developed within the ATLAS initiative will be distributed under open source licensing agreements.

7. Future

The envisioned ATLAS architecture will support a wide variety of uses and data types. First and foremost, AT-LAS will continue to fulfill its primary goal of enabling the prodigious exchange of language resources. However, in addition to providing support for the internal and external data representations, it will include integrated access to useful external resources such as database management systems, network and security systems, and parsers (Figure 5).

As the ATLAS architecture is realized, it will enable the rapid development of new corpora and the exchange and extension of existing corpora. It will facilitate the definition of consistent logical and physical formats for meta data. It will enable previously-impractical annotation endeavors requiring multi-domain, multi-layered, multi-linked annotation. It will become a focal point for the development and sharing of modular reusable annotation components and tools, thus permitting faster application prototyping and development. These components will provide powerful visualization, manipulation, and search capabilities over a variety of corpora.

ATLAS will provide a built-in data infrastructure for evaluation by minimizing the custom-tooling necessary in

instrumenting systems for performance measurement. The ATLAS Interchange Format will facilitate the creation of pipelined applications with multiple language technology components. If desired, however, language technology applications and components will be able to eliminate pipelining altogether by using the ATLAS internal representation as a annotation data exchange bus.

Once the initial instantiation of ATLAS is stabilized, it will be made into an open-source entity that will benefit from the contribution of tools and corpora from the world-wide language research community. While the initial focus is on the annotation of text and speech corpora, we can envision much broader applications of the architecture to images, video, non-textual annotation, etc. Given the open nature of the project, it is highly likely that it will evolve in ways that we can't currently predict. In order to gauge the utility of our approach and to acquire input on possible uses, the ATLAS working group has created a public website at: [`http://www.nist.gov/speech/atlas`].

Before the first public release of ATLAS is made in the Fall of 2000, the ATLAS working group will be seeking comment from potential users and developers. We invite you to peruse the website and send us your input and ideas.

8.   References

ACE, 2000. Automatic Content Extraction. [www.nist.gov/speech/tests/ace].

Barras, Claude, Edouard Geoffrois, Zhibiao Wu, and Mark Liberman, 2000. Transcriber: development and use of a tool for assisting speech corpora production. *Speech Communication*. To appear.

Bird, Steven, Peter Buneman, and Wang-Chiew Tan, 2000. Towards a query language for annotation graphs. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*.

Bird, Steven and Mark Liberman, 1999. A formal framework for linguistic annotation. Technical Report MS-CIS-99-01, Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania. [xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cs.CL/9903003], expanded from version presented at ICSLP-98, Sydney, revised version to appear in *Speech Communication*.

Cassidy, Steve and Steven Bird, 2000. Querying databases of annotated speech. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Australasian Database Conference*.

Cassidy, Steve and Jonathan Harrington, 1996. Emu: An enhanced hierarchical speech data management system. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Australian International Conference on Speech Science and Technology*. [www.shlrc.mq.edu.au/emu/].

Cunningham, H., K. Bontcheva, V. Tablan, and Y. Wilks, 2000. Software infrastructure for language resources: a taxonomy of previous work and a requirements analysis. In *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Gate.ac.uk.

Day, David, John Aberdeen, Lynette Hirschman, Robyn Kozierok, Patricia Robinson, and Marc Vilain, 1997. Mixed-initiative development of language processing systems. In *Fifth Conference on Applied Natural Language Processing*. Somerset NJ: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Garofolo, John S., Lori F. Lamel, William M. Fisher, Jonathon G. Fiscus, David S. Pallett, and Nancy L. Dahlgren, 1986. *The DARPA TIMIT Acoustic-Phonetic Continuous Speech Corpus CDROM*. NIST. [www.ldc.upenn.edu/lol/docs/TIMIT.html].

ISLE, 2000. NSF/EC ISLE Project. [www.mpi.nl/world/ISLE/].

NIST, 1998. A universal transcription format (UTF) annotation specification for evaluation of spoken language technology corpora. [www.nist.gov/speech/hub4_98/utf-1.0-v2.ps].

Pallett, David S., Jonathan G. Fiscus, John S. Garofolo, Alvin Martin, and Mark A. Przybocki, 1999. 1998 broadcast news benchmark test results: English and non-english word error rate performance measures. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Broadcast News Workshop*. Morgan Kaufmann. [www.itl.nist.gov/iaui/894.01/proc/darpa99/].

Przybocki, Mark A., Jonathan G. Fiscus, John S. Garofolo, and David S. Pallett, 1999. 1998 hub-4 information extraction evaluation. In *Proceedings of the DARPA Broadcast News Workshop*. Morgan Kaufmann. [www.itl.nist.gov/iaui/894.01/proc/darpa99/].

TalkBank, 2000. NSF TalkBank Project. [www.talkbank.org].

TIDES, 2000. DARPA Program in Translingual Information Detection, Extraction and Summarization. [www.arpa.mil/ito/research/tides].

TREC, 2000. TREC-9 Spoken Document Retrieval Track. [www.nist.gov/speech/sdr2000/sdr2000.htm].