Minutes from TRECVid 2008 Event Detection Planning Telecon
January 23, 2008

Attendees:
Jon Fiscus, NIST
John Garofolo, NIST
Paul Over, NIST
Travis Rose, NIST
Francois Bremond, INRIA
Mert Dikmen, UIUC
David Eichman, U. of Iowa
Daniel Gatica-Perez, IDIAP
Sadiye Guler, IntuVision
Vasant Manohar, U. Southern Florida
Djamel Mostefa, QMUL
Michael Nechyba, Pittsburg Pattern Recognition
Noel Oconnor, Dublin City University
Heather Simpson, LDC
Stephanie Strassel, LDC
Todd Stephenson, Naval Research Lab
Larry Willis, Department of Homeland Security
Lexing Xie, IBM

Jon Fiscus opened the discussion with a question and answer session, followed by a briefing on the proposed evaluation protocol, and further questions/comments.

Questions and anwers:

In the earlier slides (20080110-trecvid-event-plan.pdf) discussing the online vs. retrospective task, you discuss run-time conditions. Will there be a real-time condition?
No. We ask that training time and run times be reported for each system.

Regarding the annotations, will there be contextual information such as the location of doors, walkways, etc.?
This relates to the training conditions (i.e., human-in-loop vs. automatic systems). While this "side" information won't be provided as part of the training annotation, teams can create the manual labeling if needed for those systems that require this information to be encoded. We ask that the training conditions be reported for each system.

In the annotation of events that involve more than one object, will there be any link between objects?
For example, baggage exchange: person1, person2, and bag?
Events are not based on a pre-defined ontology, but are based on human observation. Our goal is to allow multiple approaches to the event detection problem, including ontological approaches.

Are there overlapping views?
Yes, but they are mostly disjoint to provide a wide area of coverage.

What is the purpose of the "surrogate application"?
Developers need to have an unambiguous measure of a good system so that developers can optimize their system
However, it should be relevant to surveillance, e.g., low false alarm and low missed detection system.

Isn't the target application mostly dependent on the event definitions themselves?
Yes, this is essentially correct. We are studying more naturally occuring events. Sometimes we want to engineer the data, using live actors, but we want to solve the general problem of event detection.

Some target events may be easier than others, e.g., putting down a bag, although a simple event, is not a completely solved problem. We want to have a diverse set of events that have a range of difficulty if possible.

Define a decision score.
For an event observation, it is the measure of the evidence suggesting that the event occurred (similar to a likelihood ratio).

Since you are using confidence/decision scores, for a given confidence score, does it have the same meaning for separate observations?
Yes, it can be understood as the likelihood that an event has occurred.

Will the community have input into the required event definitions?
Yes. We encourage you to look at the microcorpus, which we will make available online.

Next telecon:
The next telecon is scheduled for January 30, 2008 at 11 am (Eastern Time).