Minutes Tuesday, Dec. 11, 2012 (Morning Session)

Note Taker: Chris Schmidmer, Opticom

# QART (Quality Assessment Recognition Tasks)

* Introduction to QART and what it is about (-> for details see slides from Mikolaj)
	+ First task (quantification of video sequences) almost finished
	+ Quantified are target size, lighting level, motion level
	+ Open: QART model development (NR type, semi-automatic, user has to define the target, output shall be the recognition rate).
	+ Subjective database is being built up
* A group driving this is VQIPS (Video Quality in Public Safety) http://www.pscr.gov/projects/video\_quality/vqips/vqips.php
	+ The main goal of that group seems to be video analytics, not video quality
* Next steps: Complete subjective database (1860 PVSs!), then start modeling.

# Questions from (Rahul Gaurav) via Telephone:

Which databases can be recommended for the development of an FR model?

The group pointed him to:

* VQEG HD experiments
* Stefan Winkler’s web site
* Qualinet COST Database (www.Qualinet.eu)

# 3DTV

## Discussion of test plan on viewing environments (COSPAD)

A series of subjective experiments shall be conducted in order to determine factors that influence the result of subjective tests. Extensive screening of the subjects is proposed. The test consists of 110 PVSs, 24 subjects should be used per experiment.

* For details see the test plan document.
* People who copied the sequences at the Rennes meeting should check 3DTV web site for updated sequences!
* One important factor which is not related to the environment, but needs to be tested is also the amount of training required for the subjects since the experience of subjects with watching 3D content may differ significantly.
* Section on Acreo’s experiment needs updating
* NTT will not conduct the experiment

## Presentation on Acreo COSPAD experiment by Kjell Brunnström

* See slides
* Two groups of PVSs (set A and B) with a common set
* Two viewing distances (3H, 5H)
* Two groups of viewers seeing some sequences at 3H and some at 5H distance
* Questions: quality, comfort, presence

Clarification on who saw what:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 3H | 5H |
| Group 1 | Video Set A | Video Set B |
| Group 2 | Video Set B | Video Set A |
|  |  |  |

Summary of Results:

* Correlation with experiments conducted in France, Korea, Sweden is close to 0.98
* No significant difference between 3H and 5H quality scoring results, but the majority of the subjects (57%) preferred 5H. Lucjan commented that this majority is probably not significant.
* Quality vs. discomfort has a correlation of 0.87 @ 3H and 0.95 @ 5H
* Quality vs. presence has a correlation of 0.86 @ 3H and 0.93 @ 5H
* Significant difference in discomfort between Group 1 and Group 2