

Some Background on What Brought us Here

Stephan Oepen, University of Oslo

HPLT & NLPL Winter School, February 4, 2025



NLPL, HPLT, LUMI, OpenEuroLLM





- 1. Warm-Up: Select Historical Musings (Stephan Oepen)
- 2. Common Crawl vs. Internet Archive (Nikolay Arefev)
- 3. FineWeb-Style Ablation Studies (Farrokh Mehryary, Elaine Zosa)
- 4. LLM Evaluation for Norwegian (Vladislav Mikhailov, David Samuel)





Network of language technology researchers in Northern Europe; six university research groups (Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway); national e-infrastructure providers in Finland and Norway; allocations on Abel and Taito; discipline-specific software & data; funding from NeIC, matching in-kind contributions from all partners.

So, What's in it for me?

Collaboration Infrastructure

- Distributed team of 25 or so (very) part-timers; mostly a self-help initiative;
- cross-border sharing: everyone can get access to same two superclusters;
- HPC best practices: teaching each other, and also the general support staff.



-FEB-10 (oe@ifi.uio.no)

So, What's in it for me?

Collaboration Infrastructure

- Distributed team of 25 or so (very) part-timers; mostly a self-help initiative;
- cross-border sharing: everyone can get access to same two superclusters;
- HPC best practices: teaching each other, and also the general support staff.

Virtual Laboratory

- Community-maintained repository of discipline-specific software and data;
- modularity, interoperability, uniformity, reproducibility: modules setup;
- common (large) data sets: corpora, embeddings, parsing, translation, ...



-FEB-10 (oe@ifi.uio.no)

So, What's in it for me?

Collaboration Infrastructure

- Distributed team of 25 or so (very) part-timers; mostly a self-help initiative;
- cross-border sharing: everyone can get access to same two superclusters;
- HPC best practices: teaching each other, and also the general support staff.

Virtual Laboratory

- Community-maintained repository of discipline-specific software and data;
- modularity, interoperability, uniformity, reproducibility: modules setup;
- common (large) data sets: corpora, embeddings, parsing, translation, ...

Meeting Place

• Kick-off meeting (2017); Annual winter school; maybe NoDaLiDa workshop.



-FEB-10 (oe@ifi.uio.no)

Community Formation: Annual NLPL Winter Schools



Is the end of academic NLP research in sight?

A discussion moderated by Marco Kuhlmann and Joakim Nivre

With contributions from Ivan Vulić, Emily M. Bender, and Oskar Holmström

Scenario 1: Back to the ivory tower

Academic NLP research in 2050 is confined to research topics that are uninteresting to big tech companies. This includes the use of NLP to understand human language – what some people used to call "computational linguistics", as opposed to NLP – as well as practical applications of NLP under commercially non-viable conditions. such as historical language processing and language technology support for endangered languages.



Ivan Vulić



Scenario 2: NLP as a social science

Academic NLP research in 2050 is primarily concerned with understanding the application of large language models (and other AI artifacts invented since 2023) in society, partly from a technological perspective but mostly from sociological, psychological and philosophical perspectives. NLP in academia has become a truly interdisciplinary endeavor and most academic NLP groups are now based in social science faculties.



Emily Bender



Scenario 3: Return of the Jedi

In 2050, the development of new models and algorithms in NLP is dominated by research groups in academia, with big tech companies suffering brain drain as a result. This development was triggered by two important events: the Open AI Act adopted by the United Nations in 2032, requiring all organizations that develop AI models to share both models and training data, and the Universal Turing Machine. the world's largest computer center, sometimes referred to as the CERN of AI. co-founded and iointly owned by all the universities in the world.



Oskar Holmström



LUMI — "The Queen of the North"





https://www.lumi-supercomputer.eu/

Many of us are Members of the LUMI Consortium





LUMI: BERT in an Hour, GPT in a Week

David Samuel and Risto Luukkonen



HPLT Data Sources: Internet Archive vs. Common Crawl

Nikolay Arefyev, Andrey Kutuzov, Stephan Oepen University of Oslo

Volunteers who inspected data

Laurie Marta Proyag Ona David Stephan Erik Barry Sampo Bhavitvya Hanna-Mari Nikita Otto Petter Maryam Mateusz Nikolay Jindra Arnisa Tsz Kin Pavel Risto

HPLT v2 Crawl Sources

4.45 PB of crawls (compressed WARCs):

- years 2012-2023
- 18% from CC, 82% from IA

Compare contributions of different crawls to our monolingual datasets:

- the amount of text extracted
- the quality of these texts

Final goal: select additional crawls for HPLT v3!

Name	Years	WARCsize,TB	
IA full crawls	2012-2020	3390	
wide5	2012-2012	365	
wide6	2012-2013	204	
wide10	2014-2014	91	
wide11	2014-2014	420	
wide12	2015-2015	449	
wide15	2016-2017	358	
wide16	2017-2018	768 641 94	
wide17	2018-2020		
survey3	2015-2016		
CC full crawls	2014-2022	743	
CC-MAIN-2022-40	2022	83	
CC-MAIN-2022-49	2022	93 567	
10 random CC crawls	2014-2022		
partial crawls	2013-2023	317	
1% of WARCs from the rest 83 CC crawls	2013-2023	46	
7% of items from IA ArchiveBot	2013-2023	271	

Group of crawls

Splitted crawls **by source (ia/cc) and age** (**old/medium/new/recent)**. The Survey crawl and the sample from ArchiveBot – separate groups.

cc_o	CC 2013-2014
cc_m	CC 2015-2016
cc_n	CC 2017-2020
cc_r	CC 2021-2023
ia_o	IA WIDE 2012-2014
ia_m	IA WIDE 2015-2016
ia_n	IA WIDE 2017-2020
ia_survey	survey3
ia_archivebot	archivebot

Manual quality inspection

Inspected documents from the <u>deduplicated&cleaned</u> version.

21 languages, 4 groups: ia_o, ia_n, cc_o, cc_n (pilot study)

- 4 groups cover 52% of the whole dataset
- be careful when generalizing results beyond 4 groups or 21 languages

random samples stratified by language and group

- 50 documents per language and group \Rightarrow 200 documents per language
- for Russian: 150 documents per language and group \Rightarrow 600 document

Annotation task

Show:

- only the extracted text
- 500/500 characters from the beginning of the fist/second half of each text
- annotators didn't know which group each text comes from

We asked to provide 3 binary labels for each example:

- porn? empty/1: if the text looks like porn put 1, otherwise leave empty
- unnatural? empty/1: if the most text looks unnatural (e.g. word lists for SEO, mostly boilerplate) put 1, otherwise leave empty
- lang correct? 0/1: always fill this field (otherwise we will not distinguish labeled and unlabeled examples), put 0 if most of the text is not in the target language, otherwise put 1.

Manual quality inspection

- porn? empty/1: if the text looks like porn put 1, otherwise leave empty
- unnatural? empty/1: if the most text looks unnatural (e.g. word lists for SEO, mostly boilerplate) put 1, otherwise leave empty
- lang correct? 0/1: always fill this field (otherwise we will not distinguish labeled and unlabeled examples), put 0 if most of the text is not in the target language, otherwise put 1.

	Language Name	porn	unnatural	lang correct
1	Arabic	0 ()	9 (5-13)	100 ()
2	Asturian	0 ()	28 (22-35)	69 (62-75)
3	Bengali	1 ()	0 ()	100 ()
4	Catalan	0 ()	14 (9-19)	99 ()
5	Czech	0 ()	9 (4-13)	100 ()
6	Dutch	1 ()	5 ()	100 ()
7	English	1 ()	13 (8-18)	100 ()
8	Finnish	1 ()	4 ()	100 ()
9	German	1 ()	2 ()	98 ()
10	Hindi	2 ()	2 ()	98 ()
11	Iranian Persian	0 ()	25 (18-31)	99 ()
12	Marathi	0 ()	6 ()	97 ()
13	Modern Greek (1453-)	0 ()	3 ()	100 ()
14	Norwegian Bokmål	2 ()	8 (4-11)	99 ()
15	Norwegian Nynorsk	0 ()	3 ()	93 ()
16	Polish	1 ()	7 (3-11)	100 ()
17	Russian	2 (1-3)	18 (15-21)	98 ()
18	Scottish Gaelic	0 ()	3 ()	89 (85-93)
19	Slovak	0 ()	10 (6-14)	100 ()
20	Spanish	1 ()	9 (5-13)	100 ()
21	Turkish	6 ()	10 (5-14)	99 ()

Unnatural?

For most individual languages (among annotated) cc_n seems to give much lower prop. of unnatural texts ... but within the 95% CI \Rightarrow no reliable conclusions for individual languages. But if we merge all annotated data together \Rightarrow the difference is stat. sign.

 \Rightarrow given a random language (among 21 annotated) the prob. of a random document from cc_n to be unnatural (from the naive human point of view) is lower compared to the other 3 groups.

TOTAL



ara Arab

ast_Latn ben_Beng cat Latn

ces Latn

deu_Latn

Proportions of data from different crawls

CC contribution is much higher:

~20% of source crawls give ~60% of final texts (measure in chars or docs)



Yields of different crawls

Yields from the new and recent CC crawls (2017 and later) are

- 2-3x larger than the old CC crawls,
- 4-8x larger than most IA crawls
- 32x larger than the IA ArchiveBot crawl



Chars / docs per 1 GB of raw compressed web crawls (WARC files)

Looks like IA gives much fewer texts with a higher proportion of unnatural texts than the new CC crawls.

<u>Ideally</u>: take all CC and all IA, improve filtering⇒extract only clean data from everything

Limited budget: just throw IA away and use more CC crawls? Or maybe IA still contributes a lot for some of our languages?

Smallest (left), largest (right bottom), intermediate (right top) langs









0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 Chars proportion

0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 Chars proportion

15 languages with the largest contribution of IA

Deduplication&cleaning shift the proportions in favour of CC.

E.g.: langs with >70% of texts from IA:

- 49 langs before dedup&cleaning
- 7 langs after



Conclusions

Quality vs. source crawls.

For the 21 inspected language:

- 1. New CC crawls (2017-2020) give ~2x lower proportion of unnatural texts compared to old CC crawls (2012-2014) and both old and new IA crawls.
- Low proportion of LID errors for most inspected languages (except for Norwegian Nynorsk, Auturian, Scottish Gaelic). For Low proportion of porn. Couldn't observe consistent dependencies from the source crawls.

Quantity vs. source crawls.

- 1. Yields from new CC crawls are 2-3x larger than old CC crawls, 4-8x larger than most IA crawls (32x larger than the IA ArchiveBot crawl).
- 2. For some languages IA contributes a lot of texts.

Correct language?



Labeling interface

File Edit View Insert Format Styles Sheet Data Tools Window Help						
▆▾◧▾▧▾!◧ 骨 ◙∣ᆇ ▯ ╡ ᇦ ◪, ጛ▾ё▾!♀ А. ▩▾▦▾! ё ё ♀ ♀ ▯ ш ഈ Ω▾▫◦ ♀ ♀ □ ▯ ■▾ ▤।Х						
Lib	Liberation Sans 🗸 🛛 v 🖪 🖌 🖳 v 🖪 v 🔄 🐺 🗐 T 💠 上 🖏 🕮 🕮 🕮 💿 v % 00 👼 🖓 🖓 👼 🔄 🗖 v 👼 v					
A6	A6 \checkmark f _x $\Sigma \star =$					
	Α	в с	D			
1	porn?	unnatural lan				
	empty/1	empty/1 0/1	цехт эпом На рисунке пояхвана схема простого звукового сигнала. На D1 выполнен мультивибоватор не симметоичных импульсев. Эти импульсы открывают тиристор, а тот в свою очередь пропускает ток через клаксон F1. F1 — лучше всего подойдет от автомобиля BA32108, он самый T			
2						
			1 или матичного шунтирования, применение магазинов активных сопротивлении и реостатов. К недостаткам такой Мобильная СВ-радиостанция - Технические характеристики: Биходная мощность передатика при напряжении питания 128 на нагрузке 75 Ом - 38			
3			Пильки за изверативно изверати изверативно изверативно изверативно изверативного развити изверативносторомала с селовни плитании, заннои тусклеет. Диниа тела досторомала с селовни плитании, заннои тусклеет. Диниа тела досторомала с селовна плитании. Заннои в колке за			
			1ервого оленёнка в 2—3 года. Обычно рождается один детёныш, иногда два. Разведение[править править вики-текст] В Приморье, на Алтае, на Кавказе в окрестностях Нальчика и в Казбековском районе Дагестана, его разводят на фермах ради пантов. Обычно длина рогов не			
			Содержание - Слайд 1 Витамины Презентацию подготовили Ученики 11 А класса ОШ № 67 Василенко Екатерина, Кодак Ольга, Моисеева Екатерина, Чуйко Виталий, Лыжина Ксения Слайд 2 Классификация витаминов : - Жирорастворимые - Водорастворимые - А:D;E;K - В1,			
4						
			Перточинают судов и полнати и полнат			
5						
	1	1	1ежден об увольнении. Это условие не будет выполненным, если предупреждение было осуществлено, к примеру, на общем собрании. Предупреждение должно быть подтверждено личной росписью сотрудника. При этом, согласно п. 2 ст. 25 ФЗ от 19 апреля 1991 г. № 1032-1			
6			Что можно ввозить и что нельзя вывозить из Египта в Россию 2014 Египет оыл и остается по сеи день одним из самых популярных у туристов мест отдыха. Каждое путешествие в эту теплую гостеприимную страну, пронизанную атмосферои таинственности, становится поист			
			Безлимитный интернет. Очень многие пользователи мобильных телефонов в последнее время ни только не могут прожить без своих гаджетов, но и еле выживают, еле дышат без Интернета в телефоне. При этом чтобы не переплачивать за Интернет, хочется найти недорогой			
7						
			Притерите а и так, чтока подопочтво сезпанит периот на контактор и или портода, и то сели контактор и или портода, приобрет и контактор и или портода, приобрет и контактор и или портода, приобрет и или портода, приобрет и контактор и или портода, приобрет и или портода, и портода и периобрет и или портода и периобрет и или портода, и портод Плавная Алексан Изава портоди и или портода и портоди и портоди и портоди и портоди и или портоди и или портоди			
8						
	-		1вка режима самодианостики ПОРЯДОК ВЫПОЛНЕНИЯ 1. Снимите крышку блока предохранителей, в котором находителей, в котором находителей в котором находителей в котором находителей в котором находителей само блока управления порядок выполнения 1. Снедините перемычкой выводы IGN и СНК диаг			
9			B.M. Травинка. Тропинка к здоровью почему о нас оеспокоится мария алексеевна Страниць: јвсеј от 1/2 то 1/0 о 0/1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1/0 1			
		1	латало здесь дела. Она принималась скрести свои добела ухоженные полы, стирала чуть поблекшее белье, готовила Ленке кушанья из нескольких блюд, какое понравится. Казалось, она бегала по скошенной опушке и все боялась, что вотвот брызнут из набежавшей тучи круп			
10			1 Исжкомнатная дверь Венера Отделка: Натуральный шпон. Двери укомплектованы авторским стеклом выполненным в технике "Тиффани". Цвет:Беленый дуб Полнотелые двери состоящие из массива сращенной бессучковой сосны по периметру (с расчетом врезки замка) и на			
			Сегодня 31 Октября Пятница Красавица Шарлиз Терон почему-то убеждена, что ее сногсшибательная внешность совершенно ни при чем, коль скоро речь заходит об ее успехе в Голливуде. Правда, история доказывает, что не из всех фотомоделей получаются приличные акт			
11						
12			ариса сружу			
	1					

Ablation study for HPLT English data



Farrokh Merhyary, Ville Komulainen, Sampo Pyysalo: TurkuNLP, University of Turku, Finland



Elaine Zosa AMD Silo AI (Silo AI) About TurkuNLP group (<u>https://turkunlp.org/</u>)

About AMD Silo AI (https://www.silo.ai/)

TurkuNLP + AMD Silo AI collaboration:

- FinBERT (TurkuNLP)
- FinGPT (TurkuNLP)
- GPT 3.5 technical report release → TurkuNLP + Silo AI (extreme scale call - CSC Lumi)





GPT-NeoX framework on 8 nodes on the LUMI cluster, where each node has 4 MI250X GPUs.

For evaluation, we use the HuggingFace LightEval in a zero-shot setting with the tasks ARC (Easy and Challenge), Hellaswag, PICA, and OpenbookQA.



Megatron framework on 16 nodes on the LUMI cluster, where each node has 4 MI250X GPUs.

For evaluation, we use the HuggingFace LightEval in a zero-shot setting with the tasks ARC (Easy and Challenge), Hellaswag, PICA, and OpenbookQA. About LLMs:

- Poro Model
- Viking Models
- Europa Models

Ablation studies on NorEval Preliminary results for Norwegian

David Samuel and Vladislav Mikhailov Language Technology Group (LTG) University of Oslo

Background Benchmarks for Norwegian

Text embedding evaluation

Scandinavian Embedding Benchmark (SEB)

10 tasks for Norwegian Bokmål & Nynorsk

NLG evaluation

NLEBench

9 tasks mostly for Norwegian Bokmål

NLU evaluation

NorBench / ScandEval

8 / 4 tasks mostly for Norwegian Bokmål

Background Benchmarks for Norwegian

Text embedding evaluation

Scandinavian Embedding Benchmark (SEB)

10 tasks for Norwegian Bokmål & Nynorsk

NLG evaluation

NLEBench

9 tasks mostly for Norwegian Bokmål

NLU evaluation

NorBench / ScandEval

8 / 4 tasks mostly for Norwegian Bokmål

Limitations

(no) coverage of Norwegian Nynorsk standard NLP tasks, with a high overlap machine-translated data 🙀

NorEval A Norwegian language understanding and generation evaluation suite

Large-scale multi-task evaluation

Zero- and few-shot evaluation on 24 tasks across 10 categories, ranging from Norwegian-specific knowledge to rewriting

Diverse evaluation design

17 novel tasks, higher coverage of Norwegian Nynorsk, and a pool of 100+ prompts

Reliable data quality

Only human-annotated, -translated, and -localized examples

Fully open & public leaderboard

Benchmarking 20+ Norwegian language models against one another and human baselines

Ablation studies Experimental setup

Norwegian-specific tokenizer

- We train a new tokenizer for Norwegian
 - realistic fertility, higher efficiency, no "dead" embedding vectors
- A single shared tokenizer trained on equal number of random samples from the evaluated corpora
- Byte-level BPE with 50K tokens

LM pretraining

- Separate training runs for 5 evaluated corpora:
 - HPLT v1.2
 - HPLT v2.0
 - FineWeb 2.0
 - CulturaX
 - mC4
- 1.8B Llama-like models trained on 30B tokens (a corpus is repeated if necessary)

Ablation studies Experimental setup

Zero-shot evaluation of 150 LM checkpoints on 12 tasks using a single prompt

- Ranking sentence pairs (knowledge of the Norwegian language)
- Sentence completion (knowledge of the Norwegian language)
- Multiple-choice QA (Norwegian-specific & world) knowledge, commonsense reasoning, truthfulness)
- Generative QA (machine reading comprehension)

NorCommonsenseQA (Bokmål)

Spørsmål: {{question}}\n\nSvar:

Hvis statsministeren ønsket å forby slanger, hvor ville han foreslått lovforslaget?

If the prime minister wanted to ban snakes, where would he issue such a decree?

- A. *På gata (In the street)*
- B. I en tropisk skog (In a tropical rainforest)
- I Edens hage (In the garden of Eden)
- D. På Eidsvoll (At Eidsvoll)
- E. I Stortinget (At the parliament)



Ablation studies Preliminary results



Training steps

Ablation studies Other considerations

- Prompt sensitivity "noise"
 - There is no single best prompt for LN composition but of different size
- Task selection sensitivity
 - What happens if we add or discard ' choices?
- Rank aggregation methods
 - There are various aggregation methods aggregation procedures

• There is no single best prompt for LMs, even of the same pretraining corpus

• What happens if we add or discard "fine" tasks, which do not pass stricter criteria

• There are various aggregation methods besides Borda and multi-stage rank