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Abstract
MultiUN is a multilingual parallel corpus extracted from the official documents of the United Nations. It is available in the six official languages of the UN and a small portion of it is also available in German. This paper presents a major update on the first public version of the corpus released in 2010. This version 2 consists of over 513,091 documents, including around 9% of new documents retrieved from the United Nations official document system. Compared to the first release, we applied several modifications to the corpus preparation method. In this paper, we describe the methods we used for processing the UN documents and aligning the sentences. The most significant improvement compared to the previous release is the newly added multilingual sentence alignment information. The alignment information is encoded together with the text in XML instead of additional files. Our representation of the sentence alignment allows quick construction of aligned texts parallel in arbitrary number of languages, which is essential for building machine translation systems.
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1. Introduction
Parallel corpora have become essential resources for many natural language processing (NLP) applications. The quality of the parallel corpus used as training data is extremely critical for building a high quality statistical machine translation (SMT) system. Many rule-based machine translation (RBMT) systems also consist of components that are constructed based on parallel texts. Apart from machine translation, parallel corpora play an important role in other cross-lingual applications, such as cross-lingual information retrieval.

In recent years a growing number of parallel corpora are constructed for more than two languages at the same time as they are derived from text collections translated to multiple languages (Koehn, 2005; Klyueva and Bojar, 2008; Steinberger et al., 2006; Tiedemann, 2009). Such multilingual corpora not only store pairwise translations more efficiently, but also supply more correspondence information among the languages. Meanwhile, the continuously evolving topics and styles of the written texts have noticeable effects on NLP applications. Besides, the performance of many methods, especially statistical ones, relies on the amount of training materials. Hence, our aim for MultiUN is to construct a multilingual parallel corpus that grows with up-to-date texts continuously.

MultiUN is a multilingual corpus extracted from the official documents of the United Nations (UN) available in 6 official UN languages (Eisele and Chen, 2010). After its first release, the corpus has been included as training data in several evaluation events on machine translation (Callison-Burch et al., 2010; Callison-Burch et al., 2011; Federico et al., 2011). This release of the corpus extends the previous version with additional two years of documents. We refine the cleaning procedure and introduce new annotations to the corpus. The main contribution of this update is that this version includes multilingual sentence alignments that were unavailable in the previous releases. We present the alignments of MultiUN as embedded annotations directly wrapped around the texts. An extraction script is provided together with the corpus for extracting texts sentence-aligned for an arbitrary number of languages.

2. Previous work
Many multilingual corpora have been developed in recent years. A majority of such corpora exists only for a few European languages, such as Europarl (Koehn, 2005), UMC (Klyueva and Bojar, 2008), UN Parallel Text (Graff, 1994) and JRC-Acquis (Steinberger et al., 2006).

Among the existing multilingual parallel corpora, there are several different ways to supply the sentence alignment. One way is to include a sentence alignment tool in the corpus, e.g. EuroParl, so the user can extract sentence aligned texts on demand. Another way is to remove any unaligned sentences and present the aligned sentence pairs, e.g. UMC and OPUS (Tiedemann, 2009). As a result, many sentences need to be duplicated several times in the alignment files. Alternatively, the alignment files in Acquis (Steinberger et al., 2006) only include pointers to the text files. Nevertheless, all the current multilingual corpora only supply bilingual alignments. No multilingual alignments are possible to our knowledge.

3. Corpus collection
This section briefly describes the acquisition procedure of the MultiUN corpus from the Official Document System (ODS) of the United Nations. The documents we collected are in public domain according
Crawling We collected documents from year 2000 up to 2011 from the ODS website of the United Nations. A document could have been released multiple times in the system. Only the latest version is included in the corpus.

Preprocessing The original files are in Microsoft Word format. We first extract only the plain texts from the collected files and remove all the footnotes, figures, graphics, tables, hyper links and many other non-text contents.

The extracted texts are then split into sentences. The Chinese sentences are identified with regular expressions. For the other 6 languages, we apply a language independent unsupervised approach to disambiguate the sentence boundaries from abbreviations (Kiss and Strunk, 2006). During sentence segmentation, paragraph boundaries are preserved.

On top of the segmented texts, we construct structured XML files with information indicating the origins of the files, including the file ID’s, the languages, the publication dates and the so-called “document symbols”. The document symbol is unique for a document regardless of the version or the language of the files. Hence, we consider the symbols as the indicator of the parallel documents.

Selection and cleaning In order to ensure the quality of the texts in corpus, we are fairly strict on document selection.

First, any documents published before 2000 are excluded for further processing due to various types of technical issues. The documents from the last 6 months are again reserved for testing and comparison with the systems built on previous release. The current test set is going to be included in the next update.

Second, we send each individual document to a language identification software mguesser (Barkov, 2008) trained on manually verified documents. If the identification result is inconsistent with the language indicated in the ODS, the document would be discarded.

Finally, a document will be removed from the collection if the ratio of the noisy texts such as illegal characters, foreign words, etc. is too high according to a rule set. The rule set is being updated accumulatively, also based on feedback from the users.

4. Multilingual sentence alignment

The multilingual sentence alignment of MultiUN starts with pairwise alignments. The sentences in a pair of parallel documents are first aligned based on their lengths (Gale and Church, 1991). Based on a dictionary generated from this alignment, the sentences are aligned again to form the final alignment. We align the texts bilingually in this way for all 21 language pairs using humanalign (Varga et al., 2005). We do not try to detect or handle reordering of sentences between the translations. All pairwise alignments are computed for each group of corresponding documents. There are at least two straightforward methods to construct multilingual alignments from pairwise alignment results. One way is to union a minimum number of pairwise alignments that covers all languages, which usually leads to larger alignment units, higher alignment coverage, but also most likely lower precisions. Another way is to intersect all given pairwise alignments. In this case, many alignment links are removed from the pairwise alignments.

Figure 1 illustrates the pairwise alignments between the 10 sentences in 5 languages. The sentences are identified by their language (En, Fr, Es, Ru or Zh) and index (1 or 2) in a document. As the sentence Zh1 and Ru2 are aligned, all the other sentences are connected through this link. Thus, the union method takes the whole set of sentences as an alignment group, while the intersect method discards all the links.

Both methods rely on the assumption of transitivity of sentence alignments, that is, if sentence a corresponds to sentence b, and if b itself corresponds to a third sentence c, then a also corresponds to c. In practice, this assumption does not always hold for multilingual documents as the segments of translations are not necessarily consistent with the sentence boundaries. However, it is still clear that indirect alignments through other languages are able to imply the possible direct alignments between two languages. That is, the more languages in which common translations exist for the two sentences, the higher the chance of the two sentences being translations of each other.

Our approach aims at improving the alignment accuracy while preserving the information generated during the pairwise alignments. The method is fairly simple, given a complete graph of pairwise alignments. For each (pairwise) alignment link, we first examine whether the two sentences are connected through a sentence in any other language. If not, we check whether both sentences are aligned to some sentences in the same third language. If the two sentences are aligned to different sentences in the same language, the...
alignment between these two sentences are considered inconsistent with the other alignments. We delete such inconsistent alignments from the graph. The alignment connecting \( Zh_1 \) and \( Ru_2 \) in Figure 1 should be removed.

After this validation step, the sentences are grouped by the alignments remaining in the graph. A set of maximally fully connected sentences is marked as one group. No sentence outside a group should be aligned to all sentences in that group, but one sentence may belong to multiple groups. We can extract multilingual alignments of an arbitrary number of languages simply by traversing the groups. There are 5 groups in the example discussed above. Each node in the graph is marked with the groups it belongs to.

5. Property of the corpus

The current version of the corpus consists of documents from January 2000 to June 2010. The documents from later on are included as testing material. We describe the format of MultiUN and present a few statistics of this corpus in this section.

5.1. Corpus format

We introduce the sentence alignment information as an additional attribute in the XML documents. The upper part of Figure 2 shows a few segments of an English document in MultiUN v2. It was published in 2009 and the document symbol is “SAICM/ICCM.2/6”. The original file ID was “K0950702” and it was last updated in February 2009. This document is available for all six official languages, but not German.

Apart from the paragraph and sentence index \((n)\), each sentence is assigned with an alignment list (aligned). The list includes all the alignment points that are related to the corresponding sentences. In other words, any sentences that are linked to the same alignment points are aligned as a group of parallel sentences. The corresponding lines in the other version of the same document are given in the lower part of Figure 2. The indices start with ‘1’. ‘0’ in the aligned field indicates this sentence was not aligned to any sentences in other languages.

5.2. Statistics

The basic characteristics of this version of the corpus are listed in Table 1 for each language. Although the filtering rules are more strict for selecting the documents, the current version still consists of 9% new documents that do not exist in the previous release. These new documents added around 5% new sentences to the corpus as we have filtered out more noisy sentences than before. Table 2 shows the number of aligned documents and sentence pairs for each language pair. The addition to the bilingual alignments is consistent with the overall increase.

We measured the coverage of the multilingual sentence alignment using the average ratio of the number of aligned sentence to the overall number of sentences. Table 3 lists the coverage of the multilingual alignments for different numbers of languages involved.

### Table 3: Sentence coverage of multilingual alignments

| Languages | Coverage (aligned sentences/all sentences) |
|-----------|------------------------------------------|
| 2         | 0.98479                                  |
| 3         | 0.65838                                  |
| 4         | 0.53123                                  |
| 5         | 0.44057                                  |
| 6         | 0.37330                                  |

6. Availability of the corpus

This version is available to the research community through the web site of the EuroMatrixPlus project\(^1\) in the same manner as the previous releases. We hope that free access to this parallel corpus, especially the addition of multilingual sentence alignments, will not only be beneficial for research of machine translations between the seven languages in this corpus but also serve as a connection for the previously existing parallel corpora to facilitate development of MT systems of many language pairs for which no direct parallel corpus is available.

7. Conclusion

We presented the latest release of MultiUN corpus that provides multilingual sentence alignments along with around 10% recently collected documents. The multilingual sentence alignments are constructed based on all possible pairwise alignments. We applied simple heuristics to identify the possible errors in pairwise alignment without sacrificing the overall coverage of multilingual sentence alignments. As a result, nearly 40% of the sentences in documents that are parallel in all 6 languages are aligned.

We only consider the bilingual alignments with high confidence scores for multilingual alignments. It should be useful to also take the bilingual alignment scores into account. Besides, we could benefit more from the indirect alignments that we used for validation by searching for missing alignment links. Furthermore, it is no doubt necessary in the future to verify the effects of multilingual alignments on machine translation systems.
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