

## Minutes from TRECVID 2008 Event Detection Planning Telecon

March 19, 2008

Jon Fiscus, NIST  
John Garofolo, NIST  
Martial Michel, NIST  
Paul Over, NIST  
Travis Rose, NIST  
David Eichmann, U. Iowa  
Dennis Lin, UIUC  
Ciarán Ó Conaire, DCU  
Heather Simpson, LDC  
Stephanie Strassel, LDC

-----  
TRECVID Event Detection 3/19 telecon agenda

- Role call
  - Old business
    - Discussion of previous calls / items
  - New business
    - Discussion of required vs. optional events
    - Others, TBD
  - Schedule next telecon
- 

### Review old business.

The development data is now online.  
Evaluation data will be available online soon.  
A new draft of the evaluation plan has been posted.

### New business.

#### Development data and evaluation data.

The requirement to process the full corpus (100 hours of data) has changed. Participants will only be required to submit system output for the evalset (50 hours). A portion of the development set will be used for a dry run later this year.

#### Discussion of required vs. optional events

Murtaza:

People meet vs. embrace have similar definitions; can we clarify the rules to distinguish these better?

Heather:

People are likely to communicate before embrace -- so "meet" will precede embrace.

Jon:

There may be overlap, however "meet" is not a necessary condition. For example, a couple walking together before an embrace would not require a "meet" (*PeopleMeet*) event.

Paul:

Or there could be a "good bye" embrace followed by people splitting up.

Ciarán:

There seem to be two different event classes and the optional set looks significantly easier -- we're happy with the test set.

Dennis:

Cell phones taking a picture may be hard for annotation, and for the technology to detect.

Heather:

We will only annotate instances according to the reasonable interpretation rule. As a result, we will only include the obvious cases, not ones where the interpretation could vary.

Paul:

Also included the *TakePicture* event because of input we received from people who work in airport security.

Jon:

Since cell phones are such a common way to take pictures, we needed to include them as well.

Heather:

May miss some that happen (in ambiguous cases), but should not occur too often given the reasonable interpretation rule.

Heather:

Regarding ObjectGet: 20 object gets for eating potato chips -- may want to exclude objects that are part of another object?

Stephanie:

Eliminate food/beverage? Napkins? Forks?

Heather:

If "object get" / "object put" are similar enough, can replace "object get" with "object put".

Dave Eichmann:

Rummaging in a bag will depend on the resolution we have -- e.g., candy bar vs. gun at this resolution will appear similar.

Jon:

Are the 10 events possible for this evaluation track?

Dave:

It's possible -- we expect to do one pass through the data followed by tuning on the features.

Murtaza:

Depends on what is actually in the data, should be possible.

Ciaran:

Yes, should be possible.

Dennis:

10 events should be possible.

LDC:

Will keep track of time required to annotate each type of event. Will do some more analysis, zooming in on the timeline (in ViPER) is expected to help for the finer-grained events.

**Action items (NIST):**

- will decide whether to refine the "object get" definition further, or replace with "object put".
- will post the evaluation data online.

Next call:

Thursday March 27, 2008 at 11:00 am Eastern Time.

Telecon adjourn