

So Many Standards, So Little Time: An Analysis of Two Video Digitization Standards and Their Development Environments

Jimi Jones

A presentation to the CELLAR Working Group of the Internet Engineering Task Force
2017 Annual Meeting

July 21, 2017



I L L I N O I S

School of
Information Sciences

The iSchool at Illinois

Introduction



- Doctoral dissertation for the School of Information Sciences at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- Qualitative analyses of two examples of standards development and their implementation
- Data gathering/research Fall 2017, Spring 2018
- Writing Fall 2018, Spring 2019

Library Of Congress (FADGI) Standard



- 'AS-07' developed to support the digitization efforts at the Library, especially their AV facility in Culpeper, VA
- Uses the MXF (Material Exchange Format) container and JPEG2000 lossless compression for picture essence
- Developed with considerable input from American television broadcast community (AMWA - Advanced Media Workflow Association)

CELLAR Standard



- Is being developed by American and European archivists (CELLAR working group) and video digitization vendors
- Adapts open-source Matroska (MKV) multimedia container and FF Video Codec 1 (FFV1) lossless video compression codec
- **This is where you come in!**

Research Question 1



How do power and influence dynamics affect these two groups as they create standards and define quality and sustainability for moving image preservation?

Interview Concepts



Research Question 1

- How do the standards development groups negotiate their definitions of quality with respect to digital video?
- Do the groups have leaders? If so, how are the leaders assigned? What are the power dynamics?
- Do archivists, engineers and preservation specialists have differing notions of quality and sustainability? How are these differences negotiated and how do they inform the resultant standards?

Research Question 2



What roles do these standards play in the moving image preservation community's video digitization work?

Interview Concepts



Research Question 2

- What factors inform preservation professionals' decisions of which standard(s) to use for video digitization?
- Do the digitization standards work 'as is' or do they need to be adapted for local practice? What are those adaptations?

Data Gathering



Interviews with standards developers and/or implementers (via Skype and/or in person at 2017 AMIA conference in New Orleans)

Site visits with implementers of AS-07 or MKV/FFV1 combinations - Indiana University and LOC Culpeper (so far)

Review of documentation related to standards development and/or implementation - specifications, drafts, meeting minutes, best practice documents, etc

Closing



Absolutely, positively NOT about which standard is 'better.'

Absolutely, positively NOT about which development group is 'better.'

This is about how the groups operate and how and why the standards are (or are not) being implemented

Closing



If you would like to participate in my work, please contact me at

jjones7@illinois.edu

Thank you for letting me observe your meeting today!

Selected References



Federal Agencies Digital Guidelines Initiative (FADGI). (2010). Audio-Visual Format Documentation Project: Background Paper. Available at:

http://www.digitizationguidelines.gov/guidelines/FADGI-AV_AppSpecProj_Bkgd_101007.pdf. Accessed on March 7, 2017.

MediaConch. <http://www.preforma-project.eu/mediaconch.html>. Accessed on March 7, 2017.

Mosco, Vincent. (2009). *The Political Economy of Communication: Rethinking and Renewal*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pinch, Trevor J. and Wiebe E. Bijker. (1987). "The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts: Or How the Sociology of Science and the Sociology of Technology Might Benefit Each Other". In *The Social Construction of Technological Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 17-50.

Sterne, Jonathan. (2012). *MP3: The Meaning of a Format*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Woolgar, S. (1990). Configuring the user: the case of usability trials. *The Sociological Review*, 38(S1), 58-99.