

## **NYU Use Case 1**

Variations on Video Usage Scenario: **Workflow options for collection building, with options for Descriptive Metadata Creation, Video Digitization QA, Pre-publication and Publication, Annotation with group-based permissions**

Source: New York University Digital Library Management Group: David Millman, Melitte Buchman, Brian Hoffman, Joe Pawletko, Eric Stedfeld, Jennifer Vinopal  
Last modified: 2010-09-30

### **Summary:**

NYU Digital Library Technology Services (DLTS), in partnership with a University program, will create a website with streaming video materials pertinent to the program's course of study. The website will include both video collected by the program and digitized/encoded by DLTS, as well as video hosted elsewhere but presented through the project website hosted at NYU. The website will also contain various kinds of descriptive information about the videos.

### **Scenario**

**Context:** While NYU DLTS already has a production workflow for digitizing/encoding video for this project, it does not currently have a tool to manage and control the production process from description, digitization and QA, through to publication.

### **Users:**

Subject Specialist (Luisa)  
Video Digitizer (Olga)  
Project/Service manager (Janina)  
Student doing QA (Lawrence)

### **Subject Specialist's view:**

The subject specialist logs into the system to review the videos from the collection and describe them. Videos in this collection can be served from any service, e.g., internally hosted servers, Vimeo, YouTube. Luisa doesn't need to know from which server the video is being served; from her perspective, all the video – whether hosted internally or externally – is simply part of the project collection and she interacts with all of the video in the same way.

Luisa watches a video and creates rich descriptive metadata that includes not only the title, creator, and performers, but also information like an abstract/summary, background information about the video, tags/keywords, etc. As she watches the video she also uses the video annotation tool to create time-based annotations and/or transcriptions for a few parts where the audio is hard to hear. When she's done she saves all of this descriptive metadata that then becomes part of the video's record in the system. After she's done describing a video, she can go back into the system and edit the descriptive metadata.

Note: although the workflow in this scenario starts with the subject specialist, the system should also be able to handle any other permutation of the workflow – for example, a workflow where the video is created and QA'd first and only after final video QA is complete does the subject specialist see the video and create the descriptive metadata.

**Video Digitizer's view:**

For video being produced in-house, Olga will digitize the video following DLTS standards. According to the project requirements, Olga creates a preservation-level master-copy that is transferred to the NYU preservation repository (i.e., this copy doesn't interact with the Variations service). Olga also creates a high-level "derivative maker" file which she places into a "drop-box" on her computer and the video is automatically imported into the Variations system at which point it automatically creates a streaming play copy according to the specifications set by the DLTS project team and transfers that play copy to the streaming server. In the Variations system, this video is now marked as "ready for QA."

**Project/Service Manager's view:**

The project manager can, at any point, log into the system to see where a given video is in the workflow and to get reports related to the project. Reports might include: number of items processed to date; number of items still needing QA; list of all video names processed; average time it takes from the first time a video enters the system to when it is published. If need be, Janina can also review videos and mark/annotate as can any other users with this permission.

**Student doing QA's view:**

Once Olga has uploaded video into the Variations system and it is ready for viewing, Lawrence logs into the system to QA the videos that are marked as "ready for QA." If there are any issues that need to be reviewed by the video digitizer, he uses the Variations annotation tool to mark the exact spot in the video where the problem is and creates a note for Olga. He then marks this video as needing re-check by the video digitizer. The next time Olga logs into the system, it tells her there are videos she needs to re-check. Once she does so she can re-mark the videos as "ready for QA" and, the next time he logs in, the system will let Lawrence know. Once QA is complete Lawrence marks the videos as ready for final QA. The next time the subject specialist logs in, she sees there are videos ready for her final QA. If they pass inspection she can immediately publish them through the system. If there are issues, she uses the same process as Lawrence to mark and annotation problems, and pushes them back up through the workflow for someone to review.

Note: annotations should have group-level permissions associated with them. For example, in the scenario above, all video QA annotations should be viewable by the DLTS group and subject specialists' groups, but not by the general user's group.

**Assumptions:**

1. Each video source provides persistent identifiers for the source video, and an API for extracting information, e.g., time-code, from the video player.
2. All of the rights have been cleared for the material.
3. There is a group-management component or system available.
4. The annotation display component uses group-membership information to determine which annotations to display. The annotation display component allows entitled users to enable any subset of group annotations, i.e., if Olga is a member of Group A and Group B then Olga can enable both Group A and Group B annotations, enable just Group A annotations, or enable just Group B annotations.

**Issues:**

1. n/a

## **NYU Use Case 2**

Variations on Video Usage Scenario: **Video Annotation Toolset**

Source: New York University Digital Library Management Group: David Millman, Melitte Buchman, Brian Hoffman, Joe Pawletko, Eric Stedfeld, Jennifer Vinopal

Last modified: 2010-09-30

### **Summary:**

#### **Scenario**

**Use tools to create time-based annotations for any video source that exposes identifiers and timecode in a standardized format. Video can be served from any service, e.g., Vimeo, YouTube, internal servers.**

### **Context:**

In collaboration with New York University's Hemispheric Institute, NYU DLTS created the Hemispheric Institute Digital Video Library (HIDVL <http://hidvl.nyu.edu> ). Although the Hemispheric Institute uses the publicly available HIDVL website in a variety of pedagogical settings they have requested a separate password-protected online teaching environment containing "Custom Interactive Teaching Tools". These teaching tools may be applicable in more general contexts and across multiple content sources.

### **Users:**

Lehyla (Professor)

Jose (Student)

Vlad (Scholar at another institution)

### **Professor Lehyla's view:**

In preparation for the upcoming semester, Lehyla creates a playlist for her course and adds content from various video sources to the playlist. For each piece of content, Lehyla selects time-in and time-out points for each entry in the playlist, adds textual and/or graphical annotation at specific points in each clip, and specifies which groups may see and add to her annotations. Lehyla is able to specify if students will be able to see each other's annotations or only Lehyla's and their own. (This may be useful for homework assignments in which student's have to critique a piece of video individually.) After configuring the playlist, Lehyla shares the playlist with her students and assigns critique homework for a selected playlist entry.

Lehyla is also doing research and analysis on several performances. She creates a new playlist for her research collaboration with Vlad. Lehyla adds tags to several playlist entries, and annotates the content in the playlist. For certain playlist entries Lehyla leaves questions for Vlad in the form on comments for a particular playlist entry. At some point in this process, Lehyla shares the research and collaboration (R&C) playlist with Vlad.

### **Jose's view:**

Jose logs into the Variations on Video system and selects the playlist for Prof. Lehyla's course. He watches the assigned video in the playlist. Jose keeps his annotations private while he refines his analysis. When Jose is finished refining his critique he shares his annotations with Prof. Lehyla so that she may grade the assignment.

**Vlad's view:**

Vlad logs into the Variations on Video system using his (Guest login? Federated?) credentials and selects the R&C playlist for Prof. Lehyla's course. He views the content in the R&C playlist, adds and annotates additional content he has been studying to the shared playlist, and then leaves playlist-item comments and one overall playlist comment for Prof. Lehyla.

**Assumptions:**

1. The institution supports federated authentication, or a guest-id program.
2. Online video providers provide open APIs with sufficient granularity to support annotation.
3. Online video providers provide persistent, or at least very long lived, URLs

**Issues:**

1. A generalized annotation strategy would greatly benefit from a common format for specifying annotations for time-based media.