Digital Cinema 2001
Conference Proceedings
"A New Vision for Movies"

January 11 - 12, 2001
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gaithersburg, MD, USA
Digital Cinema 2001
Conference Proceedings

Charles Fenimore and
Mary Floyd, Editors

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Technology Administration
Information Technology Laboratory
Convergent Information Systems Division
National Institute of Standards
and Technology
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

January 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Norman Y. Mineta, Secretary

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION
Dr. Cheryl L. Shavers, Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY
Karen Brown, Acting Director
Introduction
Charles Fenimore, Program Chair

Welcome to Digital Cinema 2001 Conference and Expo. The last year has seen a wave of new activity surrounding digital cinema. Many movies are being released digitally. There are conferences and shows addressing d-cinema on at least a monthly basis. International standards organizations such as SMPTE and MPEG have studied d-cinema and are beginning to set standards. Significantly, there have been several announcements and demonstrations of new technology supporting digital cinema, including new projectors, high capacity storage, and satellite delivery.

The promise that these evolving technologies can provide higher quality in motion pictures is a compelling new vision for the entertainment production industry, for theater owners, for imaging industries, and for the technology providers. For the convergence of information technologies to deliver picture quality in an interoperable and secure system raises significant technical challenges.

Digital Cinema 2001 Conference brings the National Institute of Standards and Technology's expertise in measurements and standards to bear in identifying these challenges. The objectives of the Conference are to:

- Articulate a vision for digital cinema.
- Identify technological and business issues that are barriers to the vision.
- Introduce strategies for breaching the barriers, including needed research, technology development, and standards.

Over the next two days, we will address, The Promise of Digital Cinema: Business Issues; Compression; Standards Issues and Activities; Human Vision: Image Resolution and Color Space; Measurements for Projected Imagery, Compression, and Cameras; and Security and Digital Rights Management. There are several presentations of digital cinema materials as part of the Conference. On Friday afternoon, we will wrap up with a panel discussion on needed areas of work for the future.

There are frequent breaks and a reception on Thursday evening for attendees and their guests. I hope you find these are significant opportunities for informal discussions with the participants.

This Conference is the result of hard work by many people. Members of the Program Committee are Phil Lelyveld and Bob Lambert of Disney, John Wolski of Loews Cineplex, Mike Tinker of Sarnoff, Dave Dawson of the Motion Picture Association of America, Thomas MacCalla of the Entertainment Technology Center, Guy Beakley of SAIC, and John Roberts and Chuck Fenimore of NIST. They have devoted many hours to the planning effort. The industry has generously supported the Conference with digital cinema equipment. In particular, Peter Nicholas of Digital Projection, Doug Darrow of Texas Instruments, Hank Dardy of the Naval Research Laboratory, Jeff Merritt of Panasonic, and John Wolski of Loews have been very supportive. The NIST staff, including Tomara Arrington, Patrice Boulanger, Omar Halmat, Ed Mai, and Teresa Vicente, have provided assistance. Finally, the Conference would not be possible without the the support of the staff and student interns in the Convergent Information Systems Division and without the vision and leadership of Victor McCrady and Xiao Tang.
Thursday, January 11, 2001

Continental Breakfast (NIST Cafeteria) 7:30 – 8:30 AM

Overview and Business Issues

NIST Greetings
Charles Fenimore, Program Chair, Digital Cinema 2001 8:30 AM
Karen Brown, Acting Director, NIST 8:35 AM
William Mehuron, Director, Information Technology Lab, NIST 8:50 AM

Overview
Phil Lelyveld, Vice President, Digital Industry Relations, New Technology and New Media, The Walt Disney Company, Overview of Digital Cinema 9:00 AM
John Fithian, President, National Association of Theater Owners, Digital Cinema - Promising Technology, Serious Issues 9:40 AM

Morning BREAK 10:05 – 10:35 AM

Brad Hunt, Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer, Motion Picture Association, MPA Goals for Digital Cinema 10:35 AM

Compression and Standards Issues

Digital Cinema Compression
Dave Schnuelle, Director of Technology, Digital Cinema, THX Division, Lucasfilm, Ltd., A Practical Testing Approach to Digital Cinema Compression 11:00 AM
Mike Tinker, Head of Video and Multimedia Applications, Samoff Corporation, Into Something Rich and Strange: Prolegomena to a Digital Cinema 11:25 AM
Steven A. Morley, Vice President Technology, Digital Media Division, QUALCOMM, Image Compression Designed to Meet Digital Cinema Requirements 11:45 AM
Gary Demos, President, DemoGraFX, Qnality and Efficiency in Digital Cinema 12:05 PM
George Scheckel, Vice President, Digital Cinema and Content Production, QuVIS, Inc., QnVIS' Quality Priority Encoding 12:25 PM
LUNCH

Matt Cowan, Principal, Entertainment Technology Consultants
Digital Cinema Clip Demonstration

Alan Balutis, Director, Advanced Technology Program, NIST,
Research Partnerships for Innovation

Survey of Standards Efforts
Donald C. Mead, Vice President, Digital Electronic Cinema Inc.
MPEG dcinema Profile

Robert M. Rast, Vice President, Business Development, Dolby Laboratories
Briefing on SMPTE DC28, Technology Committee on Digital Cinema

Stephen Long, Program Manager, Motion Imagery Technology,
National Imagery and Mapping Agency, Motion Imagery Standards

Afternoon BREAK

Human Vision, Image Resolution, and Color

Jeffrey Lubin, Senior Member of Technical Staff, Samoff Corporation,
Applications of Human Vision Modeling to Digital Cinema System Design and Testing

Edward F. Kelley, Physicist, NIST,
Impediments to Reproducibility in Display Metrology

Michael H. Brill, Samoff Corporation,
Encoding of Color Images for Digital Cinema

ADJOURN

RECEPTION & EXHIBITS
Holiday Inn, Gaithersburg
Friday, January 12, 2001

**Continental Breakfast** (NIST Cafeteria) 7:30 – 8:30 AM

Sean Adkins, Vice President, Advanced Technologies, IMAX Corporation,
*Cinematic Image Quality - what is it and why does it matter?* 8:30 AM

Thomas MacCalla, Chief Operating Officer, Entertainment Technology Center,
*Testing D-cinema at ETC* 9:00 AM

**Quality and Measurements for Digital Cinema**

Charles Fenimore, Digital Cinema Project, NIST,
*Quality Assessment for Digital Cinema: Test materials and Metrics for Compression* 9:20 AM

John M. Libert, Physical Scientist, Flat Panel Display Laboratory, NIST
*Video Quality Experts Group: Current Results and Future Directions* 9:40 AM

**Morning BREAK** 10:00 – 10:30 AM

Paul Breedlove, Digital Cinema Business Development Manager,
Texas Instruments Digital Imaging, *DLP Cinema™ Field Demonstration Project: Relationship to Digital Cinema Quality and Measurements* 10:30 AM

Paul A. Boynton, Flat Panel Display Laboratory, NIST
*Tools and Diagnostics for Projection Display Metrology* 10:50 AM

John Roberts, Program Manager, Advanced Display Technology Lab, NIST/ITL
*DMD Characterization for Digital Cinema* 11:10 AM

Steve Mahrer, Manager, DTV Engineering Liaison, Panasonic BTS
*Format Conversion and Image Resolution* 11:30 AM

Steven W. Brown, Physicist, Optical Technology Division, NIST
*Calibration of Digital Imaging Systems Using Tunable Laser Sources* 11:50 AM

**Digital Rights Management and Storage**

William E. Burr, Manager, Secure Technology Group, Computer Security Div., NIST,
*Digital Rights Management: How Much Can Cryptography Help?* 12:20 PM

David Sidman, CEO, Content Directions, Inc., *The Digital Object Identifier* 12:40 PM
LUNCH 1:00 – 2:00 PM

Robert Schuler, Vice President, Solutions Group, Savantech, Inc.  
*Providing Digital Rights Management for Dynamic, Interactive Cinema*  
2:00 PM

Michael Miron, Co-Chairman of the Board of Directors and CEO, ContentGuard, Inc.  
*DRM for the Digital Economy*  
2:20 PM

David Cavena, Digital Cinema, IBM Global Services, *The Role of Managed Storage in the Digital Cinema Infrastructure, from Capture to Archive*  
2:40 PM

Tom Lipiec, Vice President, Business Development, Video & Audio Entertainment, Constellation-3D, Inc., *Very High Density Storage for D-Cinema*  
3:00 PM

**Plenary Discussion: Resources for breaching the barriers**

Panel drawn from session chairs, keynoters, and selected speakers.  
3:20 – 5:00 PM

**Adjourn**  
5:00 PM
Exhibitors

Accom, Inc.  www.accom.com

Constellation 3D  www.c-3d.net

DVC Digital Video, Inc.  www.digitalvideosystems.com

eMotion, Inc.  www.emtion.com

JVC Professional Products Co.  www.jvc.com/main.html

Screen Digest  www.screendigest.com

National Institute of Standards and Technology  www.nist.gov
Karen Brown
Acting Director
NIST

Karen H. Brown is the National Institute of Standards and Technology’s deputy director. As a non-regulatory agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Technology Administrations, NIST’s mission is to strengthen the U.S. Economy and improve the quality of life by working with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements, and standards through a portfolio of four major programs: the Measurement and Standards Laboratories, the Advanced Technology Program, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and the National Quality Program. As deputy, Brown serves as chief operating officer of NIST, overseeing a $800M annual operating budget and 3,300 on-site staff complemented by 2,000 manufacturing and business specialists serving smaller manufacturers around the country. Brown, who was most recently a Distinguished Engineer at IBM Microelectronics in Hopewell Junction, N.Y., also served (on assignment from IBM) as director of lithography for SEMATECH from 1994-1998.
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Karen Brown, continued...

Brown's 22-year career at IBM concentrated on solving problems in semiconductor lithography and microelectronics. She has a proven track record in management, having successfully met the challenges of moving ideas from the laboratory into manufacturing. Brown also has a keen awareness of the impact of national and international standards on U.S. industry and the economy, having held a variety of standards leadership positions in Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International and helping to bring a semiconductor fabrication line on-board in France.

A native of Schenectady, N.Y., Brown holds a B.A. in chemistry and in history, and a Ph.D. in chemistry from the University of Rochester.
Dr. William O. Mehuron is the Director of the Information Technology Laboratory (ITL) of National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Department of Commerce in Gaithersburg, Maryland. He is also the Chief Information Officer at NIST.

ITL's mission is to strengthen the U.S. economy and improve the quality of life by working with industry to develop information technology. The laboratory works with industry, research, academic and government organizations to develop and demonstrate information technology capabilities that are usable, secure, scalable and interoperable. The laboratory also provides the information technology service (desktop computing, scientific computing and network) capabilities to the entire NIST organization. Detailed information about ITL can be found at http://www.itl.nist.gov/itl.htm.

Dr. Mehuron has held a number of senior management and technical positions in the Federal Government (including civilian, defense and intelligence agencies) and the high technology industry. In these positions, he has been responsible for research, development and acquisition of information systems, sensor and observing systems, and advanced electronic systems.
William Mehuron, continued...

He was with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) from 1995 until 1999 where he served as Director of the NOAA Systems Acquisition Office. He also served as the Acting Deputy Under Secretary (DUS) of NOAA from 1997 until 1998 with line management responsibility for the 12000+ staff NOAA organization. During his tenure with NOAA he directed the development and acquisition of major systems (information systems, satellite and radar systems, and other sensor systems).

Earlier in his government career, Dr. Mehuron was Director for Research and Engineering at the National Security Agency (NSA) where he was responsible for the research, technology, development and systems acquisition programs of NSA. In addition to the in-house activities, he guided a substantial amount of work performed by the industrial base and academia.

In the private sector, Dr. Mehuron has held senior management positions with several advanced technology organizations where he was responsible for research and development efforts in a number of areas including: high-performance work stations, fiber optic networks, network management and security software, computer and communications security products and systems, automated message handling systems, integration of commercial off-the-shelf computer hardware and software, and computer-aided engineering (CAE) design software products and systems.

Dr. Mehuron received a BSEE degree With Distinction from Purdue University. He earned an MSEE and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. He has also attended the Harvard University Executive Program in National and International Security and an Executive Management Program at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

He was awarded the SES Distinguished Rank Award at the National Security Agency for excellence in system acquisition management and leadership. He also received the NSA Exceptional Civilian Service Award for extraordinary performance and exceptional accomplishment, leadership, and personal dedication to the furtherance of the NSA mission.

Dr. Mehuron was awarded the Distinguished Engineering Alumnus award from Purdue University in 1991 for outstanding engineering accomplishment in the military, government and private industry. He is a member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE).
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Phil Lelyveld is Vice President of Digital Industry Relations for The Walt Disney Company’s New Technology and New Media group. The New Technology and New Media group supports more than 400 business units worldwide. Phil coordinates and participates in Disney’s representation at multi-studio and multi-industry forums dealing with the transition from analog to digital; including such new technology initiatives as content protection, DVD, digital cinema, enhanced TV, internet, and HDTV. He also works within Disney to make sure that all of the effected business units are aware of relevant developments, and provides support to individual business units on specific new technology projects. Phil holds an MBA from UCLA, an MS in Geophysics from Stanford, and a BS in Engineering and Music from Tufts.
This talk will present a high level overview of the major elements of the digital cinema process: content origination, compression, security, transport, storage, playback, exhibition, and back channel. Currently available and anticipated technical options for those elements will be discussed. Digital cinema standards efforts will then be reviewed. The presentation will end with comments on the challenges and possibilities of digital cinema.
John Fithian
President
National Association of Theatre Owners

Mr. Fithian is the President of the National Association of Theatre Owners (NATO). Before assuming this position, he represented trade associations, professional athlete unions, communications companies, non-profit organizations, pharmaceutical companies, publishers, and advertising professionals before White House officials and Congress. He also has conducted many press conferences, participated in radio talk shows, and conducted many one-on-one interviews with members of the press. In September of 1998, he was named one of the top forty Washington lawyers under the age of 40 by Washingtonian magazine.

Mr. Fithian received a B.A. from William and Mary College in 1984. He earned his law degree from the University of Virginia in 1987.
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For motion picture studios, movie theatre operators and their patrons, digital cinema may become the most important technological transition since the advent of sound. Indeed, our industry has operated with the same basic technology for decades. Digital cinema could revolutionize the business by transforming the nature of production, delivery and exhibition; by saving distributors hundreds of millions of dollars annually; and by making it easier for exhibitors to offer alternative content.

None of this will come easy, however. Significant issues and challenges confront the potential transition, not the least of which is the issue of costs. No one knows for sure which technology will prevail, when the transition will occur, nor how it is going to be financed. Nonetheless, the transition will come.

I represent the National Association of Theatre Owners (NATO), the largest trade group in the world for motion picture theatre operators. In the U.S., NATO has over 700 members who operate roughly 25,000 screens. We also have international members. NATO and its members are actively involved in all aspects of the digital cinema debate. NATO members participate in every facet of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers’ DC-28 group, which we wholeheartedly endorse. NATO has also helped to form the Digital Cinema Lab at the University of Southern California’s Entertainment Technology Center.

In addition to our participation in those industry-wide organizations, NATO also has two internal working groups that study the issue and chart our priorities. One group focuses on the technological issues, while the other is concerned with business.

continued....

January 11-12, 2001
National Institute of Standards & Technology
I would first like to thank the National Institute of Standards and Technology for convening this important conference, and for inviting me to participate. Second, I would like to make the disclaimer that I am not a digital cinema technology expert. NATO’s digital technology consultant, Michael Karagosian, is here with me if any of you have technical questions for us. I am very familiar, however, with the business issues involved. And that is what I would like to discuss today – the business of digital cinema.

For theatre operators, there are many important questions that must be answered before a full-scale roll out of digital cinema will make sense as a business proposition.

1. For Exhibitors, is the new technology worth the cost?

   In the current environment, a theatre operator can equip a projection booth with a new 35mm film projection unit for about $30,000. That equipment will last for many years, even decades. Digital projection units currently cost several hundred thousand dollars. The best estimate of cost once roll-out begins seems to be about $100,000 at the least. And how long will this equipment last before upgrades are necessary? Two years?

   It’s very simple math. If anyone expects theatre owners to pay for the transition, they simply don’t understand the math. $30,000 over twenty years, or $100,000 over two. Digital cinema could never drive enough extra traffic through our box offices and to our concession stands to make up the difference.

   Some say that equipment costs will come down as the roll-out takes place, just as personal computers or cellular telephones became vastly less expensive over time. Those observers haven’t examined the numbers. For a product’s cost to decline, there must be economies of scale. Hundreds of millions of consumers world-wide own computers or cell phones. In our world, there are approximately 36,000 movie screens in the U.S., and roughly 120,000 total world-wide. Those numbers do not produce sufficient economies of scale to drive down costs.

   continued...
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There are potential cost savings for exhibitors. In a fully implemented digital regime, we may need fewer staff and less real estate to operate. Those savings will take years to materialize, however. In the short term, the implementation will actually cost us more staff time and more real estate. We will have to train employees and position digital projection units next to traditional equipment. Only when all product is available in digital format, and when all theatre staff understand the new technologies will our savings occur.

Finally, the present economic challenges facing the exhibition industry exacerbate these costs concerns. With nine major companies in bankruptcy and others fighting to stay alive, paying for popcorn supplies can be challenging enough.

2. For Distributors, is the new technology worth the cost?

Motion picture distribution companies currently spend $1,500 to $3,000 producing a single print of a movie. First-run, wide release pictures need several thousand prints. Once a digital system were in place, costs likely would not exceed several hundred dollars, if that, to distribute a movie. Simply put, the studios stand to save more than $800 million dollars annually, just in distribution costs. Additional savings will occur in the synergies of producing, editing, and distributing a film all in digital format.

3. Who will control the system and the data?

In the current world, distributors ship films to exhibitors in metal canisters. From that point on, as long as they comply with their contractual obligations, theatre operators control the show. Exhibitors assemble their show elements and determine their screen times. Exhibitors know and interact with their customers. In other words, movie theatre operators operate their business.

In a digital world, data controls. And he who has the digital keys controls the digital data. Theatre owners do not want to be reduced to little more than brick and mortar businesses who build new complexes which the studios then operate remotely.

continued...
4. Will digital cinema offer a better movie-going experience?

Digital cinema is being tested in many locations around the world. Side-by-side demonstrations have been conducted with digital projection next to film. Cinematographers, directors, studio executives, theatre operators and patrons debate the quality of the experience. The technology is improving rapidly, but the jury is still out.

I’ve heard some commentators say that digital projection is just as good as film. That isn’t enough. Why change to an expensive, unproven technology to get an experience that is “just as good” as we have now?

Digital cinema must be better than film, and I believe it can be. Celluloid prints deteriorate over time. As the film runs through projectors over and over, and as the print gets shipped from one exhibitor to the next, the quality of the presentation wanes. Digital cinema will not experience the same effect.

To date, digital cinema has produced positive patron reaction, particularly with animation or action features. But there are still questions about the quality of the digital presentation with real life scenes.

5. Will systems be built toward open, uniform standards that promote competition, worldwide compatibility and interoperability?

A digital system will involve many components built by different manufacturers. The system will have to support different content from different providers. Open, uniform standards must be developed to promote competition, worldwide compatibility and interoperability.

Competition is necessary to avoid monopoly pricing in equipment manufacturing or in digital product delivery. Theatre operators will not agree to a world where all of our product comes through one satellite provider, or one broadband pipe. Nor will we support a system where any one manufacturer, or any one technology has monopoly control.

continued...
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Compatibility is equally important. Exhibitors should be able to play any distributors’ movies, and alternative content as well, on one system. We cannot repeat the mistakes made during digital sound implementation, where different systems were necessary to play different product. Interoperability is also important. Different equipment components must be able to work together.

6. Will the system be secure?
Without sophisticated encryption technologies, digital cinema could enable pirates to steal first-run movies for home viewing at the very onset of the theatrical release. Secure transmission must be a priority.

7. Will digital technologies open new business opportunities to exhibitors?
Movie houses need not be just movie houses. From 1990 through 1999, domestic screen count grew from 23,814 to 37,185. The number of movies, however, did not expand at the same rate. Indeed, in the past several years, production has declined.

Granted, there are too many screens in this country and the exhibition industry is suffering as a result. But even as our industry is now reducing screen count, we could still use new product. Digital cinema technologies would make it easier for our members to show musical concerts, sporting events, fine art entertainment, business theatre, religious events, and even educational programming.

Motion pictures will always be our biggest business. But digital cinema may open new doors to essential new revenue streams.

8. Will the digital revolution be open to all potential participants?
I represent more than 700 members. They range from large international circuits, to small one-screen operators in small towns. The digital experience must be open to all potential participants.

Some say that digital cinema will wipe out the small town theatre operator. I disagree. Today, the small town operator is often overlooked by the distributors. My smaller members often cannot get that print they need on the continued...
first-run break. With digital cinema, the costs to produce that print and ship it across the country or across the world will be virtually eliminated. I believe digital cinema might make it easier for those smaller operators to provide service to their customers. Digital cinema can be good for competition and good for the patrons, but only if managed correctly.

9. Will the industry undertake the planning necessary to effectuate the revolution?

Digital cinema should not be implemented as a private deal between select parties trying to seek quick advantage over their competitors. In the end, they will find that the advantages were ephemeral. In fact, the first companies to roll out digital may find that they have implemented an unproven, costly technology that quickly becomes obsolete, or for which upgrades prove difficult.

Instead, digital cinema should be implemented pursuant to an industry-wide plan. The planning process should involve all distributors and all exhibitors. And the planning needs to take place on two tracks: technical and business.

That's why NATO formed two task forces whereby our membership could have input with selected representatives who would carry exhibition's concerns and goals into the discussions. On the technical side, this construct has born fruit. The SMPTE process is very useful and must continue.

On the business side, however, very little industry-wide planning has taken place. NATO and our members are prepared to undertake this planning immediately. Business planning and standards development can occur simultaneously. There is no reason to wait for the ultimate conclusion of the standard setting process before any business plans are made.

10. Will legal concerns impede industry-wide planning?

I do not believe that the antitrust laws prevent us from engaging in comprehensive planning. We have closely examined this issue and are confident that pro-consumer, pro-competition industry plans, which comport with continued...
all legal standards, can be achieved and approved in a timely fashion. Some matters must be addressed in the context of individual business deals. But the structure and plans can and must be developed as an industry, in the interest of fair competition and consumer protection.

The technology is promising, but the issues involved are serious. This conference is a great way to advance the ball. Thank you for inviting me to participate.
Mr. Hunt is currently the Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer for the Motion Picture Association. He works closely with the seven major studios that make up the Motion Picture Association in providing guidance on technology issues and policymaking. He chairs internal MPA working groups focused on copy protection, digital cinema, and Internet security issues. He has worked in the motion picture and television industry for over twenty years. His career experiences have included jobs in research and product development, marketing, business development, international sales, and strategic planning in the film, broadcast video, DVD, and post-production service industries. Mr. Hunt has a B.Sc. degree in Chemical Engineering from the Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology and an M.B.A. degree from the William E. Simon Graduate Business School at the University of Rochester. He has served as an Executive Board Member of the Technology Council of the Motion Picture & Television Industry and is a Fellow of the Society of Motion Picture & Television Engineers.
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The member companies of the Motion Picture Association believe that the introduction of digital cinema represents the greatest opportunity for enhancing the theatrical film experience since the introduction of sound and the advent of color. The conversion from photographic film distribution and display to an all-digital system has the potential of providing real benefits to theater audiences, theater owners, filmmakers, and feature film distributors. But in order for these benefits to be fully realized, digital cinema must be defined, standardized, and implemented in a way that ensures that the benefits accrue to all stakeholders.

The MPA member companies have been involved in public demonstrations of prototype digital cinema systems. We have also held meetings with equipment manufacturers, service suppliers, theater owners, and the creative community to better understand the views of others concerning the implementation of digital cinema. The MPA and its member companies have also participated in the Society of Motion Picture & Television Engineers (SMPTE) Digital Cinema DC28 engineering study groups in the preparation of their reports on considerations in the standardization of digital cinema. Through these activities and the dialogue with other stakeholders, we have developed a list of ten goals that we believe are critical to the successful implementation of a digital cinema system that provides real benefits to all stakeholders. These goals consist of the following:

1. ENHANCED THEATRICAL EXPERIENCE - The introduction of digital cinema must be used by the motion picture industry as an opportunity to significantly enhance the theatrical film experience and thus bring real benefits to theater audiences.

2. QUALITY - The picture and sound quality of digital cinema should represent as accurately as possible the creative intent of the filmmaker. To that end, its quality must exceed the quality of a projected 35mm “answer print” shown under optimum studio screening theater conditions. Any image compression that is used should be visually lossless.

3. WORLDWIDE COMPATIBILITY - The system should be based around global standards so that content can be distributed and played anywhere in the world as can be done today with a 35mm film print.

continued...
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4. OPEN STANDARDS - The components and technologies used should be based on open standards that foster competition amongst multiple vendors of equipment and services.

5. INTEROPERABLE - Each of the components of the system should be built around clearly defined standards and interfaces that insure interoperability between different equipment.

6. EXTENSIBLE - The hardware used in the system should be easily upgraded as advances in technology are made. This is especially important in evolving to higher quality levels.

7. SINGLE INVENTORY – Once a consensus on digital cinema standards is reached and implemented, upgrades to the system should be designed so that a single inventory of content can be distributed and compatibly played on all equipment installations.

8. TRANSPORT – The system should accommodate a variety of secure content transport mechanisms, including electronic as well as a physical media delivery.

9. SECURE CONTENT PROTECTION – The system must include a highly secure, end-to-end, conditional access content protection system, including digital rights management and content watermarking, because of the serious harm associated with the theft of digital content at this stage of its distribution life cycle. Playback devices must use on-line authentication with the decrypted content files never accessible in the clear.

10. REASONABLE COST - The system standards and mastering format(s) should be chosen so that the capital equipment and operational costs are reasonable. All required technology licenses should be available on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms.

In addition to documenting these goals, the MPA member companies are preparing a document that more specifically outlines a consensus view of the System and Performance Requirements for Digital Cinema. This document will be posted at a later date on the MPA digital cinema web site located at http://www.mpaa.org/dcinema. Comments on these documents can be directed to the Motion Picture Association’s Office of Technology by sending e-mail to: dcinema@mpaa.org.

January 11-12, 2001
National Institute of Standards & Technology
Dave Schnuelle

Director of Technology,
Digital Cinema,
THX Division
Lucasfilm Ltd.

Dave Schnuelle is the Director of Technology, Digital Cinema, for Lucasfilm Ltd., THX Division. He was the Project Supervisor for the Star Wars Episode 1 digital cinema release, and previously was the founder and Principal Engineer of the Lucasfilm THX Digital Mastering Program, a service used by the major motion picture studios to ensure the technical quality of their home video releases. Prior to that Mr. Schnuelle was Chief Engineer of several major post-production facilities in Los Angeles. As an independent consultant, Mr. Schnuelle designed and supervised the construction of Universal Studios High Definition Transfer Facility. Mr. Schnuelle is a co-inventor of several patents on test signals and vertical oversampling in film transfers.
Following the digital cinema release of Star Wars Episode 1 - The Phantom Menace in the summer of 1999, it was apparent that a much higher compression ratio for the program material was needed. The 4:1 ratio used with the Pluto disc recorder was not practical for distribution to multiple sites. Since that time various other compression schemes have been proposed for digital cinema applications. This paper details a practical testing methodology that takes into account the post-production procedures and equipment currently used in preparing digital cinema masters. Subjective "Double-blind A/B" test sessions are conducted separately with expert viewers and with professional film reviewers. Selection of the test material will be discussed, and examples will be shown.
Mike Tinker has been working in the field of digital image compression since he joined RCA's David Sarnoff Research Center (now Sarnoff Corporation) in 1985. From 1988 to 1993 he worked for Intel Corporation, where he supervised the building of video compression engines, ran a worldwide video compression operation, and was manager of Video Compression Algorithms. During this time he was a delegate to MPEG and served on the Requirements Committee for MPEG2. In 1993, he returned to Sarnoff where he is now the head of Video and Multimedia Applications. For several years, his work has been concentrated on digital cinema. In the past year he has been an active member of the SMPTE Digital Cinema Committee (DC28) and has served as vice-chair of the compression working group of that committee.
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Digital cinema is about to happen. But what form it takes is neither predetermined nor rigid. That form will evolve over time; it will certainly be very different five years from now from what it is this year; ten years from now it will be barely recognizable compared to the cinema of today. There are those who believe that d-cinema may be the biggest change in movies since the introduction of color: In fact, it will be a transforming event that will blur the edges between traditional movies and other forms of entertainment. Initially, we will see movies that have been processed and compressed to meet constraints of bandwidth and storage but that are otherwise electronic emulations of the film-based environment. That is where many of us are working today. Eventually, however, evolving digital cinema will open up possibilities far beyond traditional film. Theatres will become a new kind of entertainment center in which traditional linear storytelling in moving pictures will be only one of the possibilities available to patrons. Part of what we must do today is prepare for the coming technologies and the new ways of thinking that will open up the artistic possibilities of the future.
Outline

• Prologue
• Today: Getting Started
• Tomorrow: Ensuring Quality
• The Day After Tomorrow: Expanding functionality
• Epilogue

Prologue

• Technology doesn't provide answers.
• Technology facilitates solutions.
• We don't even know the questions yet, . . .
• So we'll get the answers wrong, but . . .
• We can drive to a set of goals.
• In the end, it's about telling stories.

D-Cinema Goals

• Quality
  • Imagery
  • Sound
• Extensibility
  • Flexible
  • Interoperable
  • Compatible
• Security
  • Multi-layered
  • Standardization

Today: Getting Started

• New projectors
• New technologies
  • Storage
  • Transmission
• Cost differentiation
  • Film costs are rising
  • Technology costs are falling
• Exciting beginnings

We Want More

• We want an improved experience, but . . .
• Film is great: everybody goes to the movies. But . . .
• It has some drawbacks
  • Deteriorates with time
  • Runs at 24 frames per second
  • Is costly
  • Is inflexible
Tomorrow: Ensuring Quality

• First, emulate the existing technology
  • Horseless carriages
  • Radiotelegraphy
• Do make electronic film
• Don't make television
  • Different history
  • Different constraints

The Price of Quality

• Forget Storage Costs
  • Compression is necessary for a while, but . . .
  • Storage is moving faster than Moore's law
• Don't worry about bandwidth
  • 100 Mbs transponders
  • Fibre to the world
• Demand highest quality regardless of cost today
  • Next year it will cost half as much

Quality: At least as good as film

• RGB
  • Reduced chroma is television
  • KISS: RGB in, RGB out
• Forget "interlaced" and "progressive"
  • Television words
  • Neither compression nor projection uses scanlines
• At least 10-bit log
• At least resolution equal to the best projector
• At least 8 channels of sound

Extensible

• Must be ready for technology improvements
• Must be ready for technology changes
• Must leverage cost curve
  • Old belief: it will cost more next year
  • New reality: it will cost less next year
• Must be interoperable and available world wide
  • Creation compatible with distribution
  • Distribution compatible with local system
  • Local system compatible with projector

Secure

• Layered security
  • Not just one barrier to theft
  • More secure than film
• Encryption: Stop the thief
  • Bitstream encoding
  • Key control
• Watermarking: Catch the thief
  • Insert at all stages
  • Embed the history
• Camcorder foiling: Disable the thief

Standards

• Necessary to achieve goals
  • Remove confusion
  • Sift and winnow technology
  • Bring d-cinema faster
  • Make d-cinema broader
• Promote competition
  • Level playing field
  • Inclusive of all stakeholders
  • Forum for all concerns
The Day After Tomorrow: Expanding Functionality

- It’s about telling stories
- It’s about making magic
- It’s about enhancing the audience’s experience
  - Better images and sound
  - New tools for the storyteller

Incremental Changes: Better Images

- Brighter projectors
- Higher resolutions
- Bigger screens
  - Projectors will get less costly
  - Images will fill more of the audience’s field of view
- More frames/second
- 3D without glasses

Radical Changes: The Magician’s New Tools

- Multiple story lines
  - breakdown between linear and non-linear
- “Live” movies
  - breakdown between live and pre-recorded
- Audience participation
  - adaptive entertainment
- Immersion
  - From seeing to experiencing
  - From observing to participating
  - From acted upon to acting in

Epilogue

Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic.
—Arthur C. Clarke

- We must facilitate the magic
- We must enable the magicians
- We must enhance the experience

Nothing of him that doth fade
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich and strange.
—William Shakespeare

- Movies are suffering a sea-change
- Digital cinema will be:
  - Richer than we can know
  - Stranger than we can imagine
  - An ongoing celebration of the human spirit
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January 11-12, 2001
National Institute of Standards & Technology
Even in this age of shrinking costs for digital storage and increasingly wide band communication channels, image compression is still a critical component of a digital motion image system, such as digital cinema. An uncompressed two-hour motion picture at today’s image resolution requires more than 1.3 Terabytes of storage and would require nearly three days to transmit at T3 data rates (i.e., 45 Mbps). Using advanced image compression techniques, this storage is reduced to around 40 Gigabytes and can be delivered in “real time” on a 45 Mbps channel. However, existing image compression systems have been developed to support “television quality” performance that will fall short of meeting “cinema quality” when projected on large theatrical screens.

The challenge of an appropriate digital cinema image compression system is to deliver the image quality that filmmakers and audiences are used to seeing in cinema theatres while doing so at data rates that support economical operation of the digital cinema system. Also, the compression system needs to consider tradeoffs in the overall system architecture, such as the security methods and system optimization that are appropriate for digital cinema systems. Finally, the image compression approach must include flexibility for enhancements in the future of digital cinema, such as increased resolution and frame rates.

This presentation will address and itemize the quality considerations that factor into the selection of an appropriate digital cinema image compression decision. Also, a proposed solution to these requirements will be presented and shown to meet the necessary aspects for a high-quality, cost-effective digital cinema compression system.
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Overview
- The Case for Image Compression in Digital Cinema
- Important Definitions of Characteristics of Digital Images and Compression
- Comparison of Digital Cinema and Digital TV Image Requirements
- Candidate Compression Technologies for Digital Cinema
- Implementation Considerations
- A Practical Solution for Digital Cinema Compression
- Summary

Digital Cinema Is Coming, But "Size Matters"
- An uncompressed digitized movie requires lots of bits
  - for a two-hour movie at cinema resolution:
    - 1920 pixels wide x 1080 pixels wide x 30 bits per pixel x 24 frames per second = 1.5 billion bits per second (approx. 300 times more than the data rate of a DVD video)
  - 1.3 terabytes (trillions of bytes) for a two-hour program (not including audio), (equal to 40 36GB hard disks or 80 maximum density double-sided double-density DVD's)

Image Compression to the Rescue
- Reduces bit rate for digital representation of an image by taking advantage of:
  - Redundancy within an image frame ("Spatial Redundancy")
  - Redundancy from frame to frame in a motion picture ("Temporal Redundancy")
  - Visual aspects not readily perceptible to the human eye

Compression Rates for Various Applications
- Uncompressed Digitized Film "Original" (at HD resolution) - 1.5 Gbps
- Digital Edit Master - 140-270 Mbps
- Archive - 60-80 Mbps
- Digital Cinema Release Master - 35-45 Mbps
- HDTV Broadcast* - 15-20 Mbps
- High-Quality SDTV* - 4-10 Mbps
- Average-Quality SDTV* - 2-6 Mbps
- Streaming Video - less than 2 Mbps

Compression Savings
- Using digital compression at 45 Mbps, a two-hour movie requires only about 45 GB of storage (including audio)
- This means an entire movie can be stored on a single hard disk or 3 DVD-18 disks
Definition of Image Compression Terms

• **Compression Ratio:** Uncompressed bit rate divided by compressed bit rate (e.g., 30:1)
• **Encoding Rate:** Typically expressed in "Bits per Pixel" (BPP)
• **Compressed Bit Rate:** Data rate (in bits per second) of compressed material

More Compression Terms

• **Coding Efficiency:** A metric relating to the compressed bit rate necessary to achieve a certain image quality
• **Scalability:** The ability of a compression system to operate at different quality/compression ratio levels

There's 'Lossy' and Then There's 'Lossy'

• **Lossless Compression:** Compression that does not cause any distortion in the digital image
• **Visually Lossless (or "Transparent") Compression:** Compression that does not cause any distortion in the electronic image visible to the human eye under normal viewing conditions

"Lossiness" Continued

• **Lossy Compression:** Some visual distortion is visible to the human eye under normal viewing conditions
• **Artifacts:** Distortions caused by lossy compression

Intraframe vs. Interframe Compression

• **Intraframe Compression** processes each frame in a moving image without consideration for any previous or future frames (aka "I-Frame Only")
• **Interframe Compression** processes sequences of frames, typically encoding only the differences between frames

Comparing Intraframe and Interframe Compression

• Interframe compression would generally yield better efficiency due to removal of frame-to-frame (temporal) redundancy
• However, interframe compression can also cause motion artifacts under "motion" stress conditions (e.g., scene changes, fast pans, lightning/strobe lights, etc.)
**Rate-based vs. Quality-based Compression**

- **Rate-based Compression** sets a constant number of compressed bits available per frame.
- **Quality-based Compression** sets a "required quality" level and lets bit rate automatically adjust to meet that quality.
- Quality-based approaches yield better quality at lower average bit rate.

**Contrast and Contrast Resolution**

- **Contrast** refers to the comparison of the "blackest black" and the " whitest white."
  - Several different methods used to measure this characteristic.
- **Contrast Resolution** refers to the number of "shades" possible in each color component.
  - Determined by the number of bits used to represent each of the three uncompressed video components and the method of encoding the values ("linear" or "log").
  - Digital television typically uses 8-bit linear encoding, digital cinema will use at least 10-bit linear (log encoding is preferred).

**RGB is Not Very "Efficient" for Compression**

- There are no perceptual efficiencies in representing a value in RGB.
- The human eye is not as sensitive to color detail as it is to luminance detail.

**Quality-based vs. Fixed Rate Compression**

**A Little About Color**

- Unlike "film", electronic projection is based on color "addition".
- Traditional representation of a pixel value (i.e., the color and luminance) is with a weighted combination of specific Red, Blue, and Green components (RGB).

**"Luminance/Chrominance" Representation**

- The three axes of Red, Blue, and Green can be converted to three axes of "luminance" (commonly referred to as "Y") and two "color difference" chrominance components, such as "I,Q" or "U,V" or "Pr, Pb" or "Cr,Cb".
- When compressing luminance/chrominance representations, typically more attention is paid to accurately representing the luminance values, since the eye is more sensitive to these.
Decimating Chrominance

- Also, chrominance values typically have less information in them to start with, so they compress more efficiently
- And, because the eye is less sensitive to chrominance resolution, in many compression systems 1/2 or 3/4 of the chrominance values are discarded (decimated) before compression

Typical Chrominance Resolution Notation

- 4:4:4 refers to representations with no chrominance decimation
- 4:2:2 refers to representations where half of the chrominance information has been decimated, and
- 4:2:0 refers to representations where 3/4 of the chrominance information has been decimated

Quantifying Visual Quality

- Objective Metrics:
  - Mean Square Error ("MSE")
  - Frequency Weighted MSE
  - PSNR (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio)
    - \(10\log_{10}\) (peak/MSE)
  - JND (Just Noticeable Differences)
- Subjective
  - Mean Opinion Scores ("MOS")

Status of Image Compression Technology

- Existing "standards-based" compression systems have focused on television applications and have made trade-offs based on that level of quality and the limited bandwidths available
- "Cinema Quality" compression requires different approach
  - Simply "Turning Up the Knob" on the bitrate of existing systems will not provide the necessary quality
- Fortunately, technologies exist that meet the requirements

Digital Cinema Image Compression Requirements

- Compression ratios that support fast transfers of digital cinema programs
- Agile support for various resolutions, frame rates, quality levels
- Support for future upgrading
- Ideally would be a low cost, small size implementation for embedding in projector system

TV vs. Digital Cinema Image Requirements

- Digital TV profiles are based on 8-bit, 4:2:0 or 4:2:2 with resolutions ranging from 720x480 pixels (SDTV) to 1920x1080 pixels (HDTV) with compression ratios of approx. 60:1 to 200:1
- Good digital cinema image quality involves 10-bit (preferably "log") encoding, 4:4:4 ("RGB-like"), with minimal resolution of 1920x1080, expanding to much higher as projection technologies advance, with compression ratios of approx. 35:1 to 50:1
**Candidate Digital Cinema Compression Technologies**

- Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) based
- Wavelet based

**General Concept of Wavelets**

- "Wavelets" are special types of orthogonal signals, similar to sinewaves, that allow efficient frequency-space representation of digitized images
- Wavelet compression "builds up" an approximate representation of the image using successively higher frequencies of wavelets and sub-images within the constraints of the available bit rate

**Examples of Wavelet-based Algorithms**

- MPEG 4 Still Textures
- JPEG 2000 (Still Images)
- QuBit™ (QuVis)

**Typical Artifacts Caused by Wavelet Algorithms**

- Wavelets result in "soft" or "fuzzy" images with "wavey" distortion (due to aliasing) when compression ratios get higher

**Discrete Cosine Transforms (DCT)**

- Most commonly used compression technology for digital motion images today
- Image redundancy is more readily filtered out by first transforming from "pixel domain" to "frequency domain"
- DCT is a "nearly ideal" transform for conversion from pixel domain to frequency representation
- Once in DCT domain, frequency-weighted quantization reduces bit rate with "graceful" layered reduction in image quality

**Typical DCT-Based Compression System**

- Uncompressed Digital Image
- Discrete Cosine Transform
- Quantization
- Lossless Compression
- Reconstructed Digital Image
A Typical DCT-Based Decompression System

Compressed Digital Image Output

- Huffman Decoding
- Inverse DCT
- Weighting
- Re-mosaic Blocks into Frame
- Inverse Deblock
- De-noise

Examples of DCT-based Algorithms

- JPEG (Intraframe DCT)
- MPEG (1 and 2) (Interframe DCT)
- MPEG4 Video Coding
- Adaptive Block Size DCT (QUALCOMM)

Typical Artifacts Caused by DCT Algorithms

- Blocking Artifacts
- Mosquito Noise
- Motion Artifacts (if using interframe compression)

Enhancing the Basic DCT Approach

- While basic DCT approaches (such as JPEG) are OK, enhancements have been developed to increase efficiency

DCT Enhancement: Interframe Coding

- Most popular enhancement is to use "interframe" compression (e.g. MPEG)
  - Encodes the differences from frame to frame
  - Adds additional concern for motion artifacts and synchronization
  - Adds circuit sophistication and processing latency due to additional memory and processing
  - Very difficult to edit

Enhancement Methods: Adaptive Block Size Coding

- Another enhancement uses dynamically variable sized blocks for processing
  - Yields more efficient use of bits by assigning more "attention" to areas of higher detail
**Advantages to ABSDCT Compression**

- Excellent compression quality at reasonable bit rates without requiring inter-frame compression
  - No motion artifacts
- Is a much simpler algorithm than inter-frame methods
  - Decoder or encoder circuits are implemented in a single ASIC chip
  - Searching and editing are straightforward

**“FutureProofness” of an ABSDCT Digital Cinema**

- Expanded resolution is supported by multiple decoder devices
  - e.g., A 4kx2k image requires four chips (using today’s technology)
  - Still provides low cost, small implementation
- The decoder device is very flexible to work with enhanced encoding
- The ABSDCT algorithm can support layered compression, flexible transcoding and resolution remapping

**Example of “Adaptive Block Size” DCT Approach**

- The image frame is divided into smaller “Blocks” of different sizes for compression
- Areas with more detail get more “Attention” in smaller blocks

**QUALCOMM’s History with Image Compression**

- 1989 - Invented and developed adaptive block methods initially for specialized “higher than hi-def” applications
- 1992 - Demonstrated real-time compression decompression hardware implementation
- 1995 - Enhanced ABS algorithm specifically for digital cinema applications and demonstrated cinema quality compression of motion picture clips transmitted over satellite link
- 2000 - Introduction of single-chip implementation of ABSDCT encoder
**Implementation Considerations**

- Ideally, the digital cinema decoder function should be implemented in a small, low-cost design to allow integration inside digital cinema projector
  - Better Security – no ability to "tap" digital video outside projector
  - Easier System Integration – no need for "video server", compressed images are input to projector directly from storage
  - Lower Cost -- simpler implementation with fewer parts

**Implementing the ABSDCT Decoder**

- Single-chip solution based on standard CMOS technology
- Implements complete ABSDCT decompression on a single chip
- Includes 3-DES decryption of image and sound channels
- Synchronizes image and sound files

**The ABSDCT Decoder Device (cont.)**

- Compressed information is input on standard PCI bus format
- Output images provided in standard SMPTE-274 interface
- Output audio supports AES-3 formats (up to 8 channels)
- Interfaces with standard smart card module which stores long-term secret key information

**A Complete ABSDCT Decoder Module**

- Interfaces with standard fibre-channel hard disk storage devices
- Performs decryption, decoding, image/sound synch and formatting
- Designed to embed in digital cinema projectors

**QUALCOMM's Digital Cinema Decoder Module**

**Summary**

- In order to provide the necessary image quality for digital cinema economically, advanced image compression methods must be used
Summary (cont.)

- Existing "television-based" image compression systems do not meet cinema quality, but specially designed algorithms such as QUALCOMM's ABSDCT approach do provide the necessary quality at efficient compression ratios.
- The ABSDCT algorithm implemented in a single device with built-in encryption, synchronization, and audio processing provides a very effective solution to this key digital cinema technology.
Gary Demos attended California Institute of Technology. In 1975, he joined Information International, where he not only supervised the development of the first Digital Film Printer (for which he received an Academy Scientific and Engineering Award in 1995, and an Academy Technical Achievement Award in 1996), in addition, he helped pioneer the field of computer graphics. In 1981, Gary co-founded Digital Productions and served as the Chief Technical Officer. The company produced photo-realistic images for feature films, television and advertising. Gary and his colleagues received the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences’ Scientific and Engineering Award in 1984 for work on The Last Starfighter and 2010. In 1986, Gary co-founded Whitney/Demos Productions, and in 1988, he founded DemoGraFX, where he serves as President/CEO and Director. Since 1989, Gary has been a prominent strategist in Advanced Television (HDTV) standards, is recognized for his patented Layered Compression System technology, is a member of the Motion Picture Academy’s Digital Imaging Technology Subcommittee, is a long-standing member of SMPTE, and is an Associate Member of the American Society of Cinematographers (ASC).
Digital cinema is best conceived as a system. While projector improvements allowed serious consideration of digital cinema, there have been corresponding breakthroughs in other system elements. These include electronic cameras, disk recorders, telecines, and compression. Compression improvements now show us that high compression ratios can be achieved while maintaining very high visual quality. While the work of DemoGraFX is centered on compression quality, we are very mindful of all elements of the system which captures, processes, compresses, encrypts, stores, transmits, decrypts, decompresses, and displays the image. Such key system attributes as color primaries, non-linear digital pixel representations, and image dynamic range have a significant effect on the quality of the digital cinema system. Current practices in HDTV are sub-optimal for digital cinema. Thus, digital cinema would significantly benefit from new specifications for such system parameters.

Of special consideration is the opportunity to increase the digital cinema frame rate above 24fps while retaining 24fps interoperability. Maximum interoperability with 24fps is achieved utilizing 72fps, while providing improved computer display compatibility as well.
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George D. Scheckel, Jr.

Vice President, Digital Cinema and Content Production

QuVIS, Inc.

George D. Scheckel, Jr., Vice President of Digital Cinema and Content Production of QuVIS, Inc., has more than 21 years of management, marketing and sales/service experience. Scheckel received a BA in General Business from Washburn University and joined Southwestern Bell where, for 18 years, he was responsible for regional sales and telemarketing centers, product management and promotions programs. Positions with Bell include: Area Manager-Regional Staff, Area Manager-Sales/Service Center, Area Manager-Customer Product Promotion Center-Kansas and Area Manager-Accounting Separations Systems.

Prior to joining QuVIS, Scheckel was the Director of Marketing and Sales with Telecommunications Research Associates (TRA), an international telecommunications training company specializing in emerging communications technologies.

As V. P. for QuVIS, Inc. Scheckel has been a key member of the initial management team during company and product development and now focuses on digital cinema activities from the West Coast branch and directs operations to advance QuVIS imaging technology with key studios and post production customers. Since 1996 he has developed relationships with leading companies including Disney, Pixar, DreamWorks, LucasFilms, Warner Brothers, Sony, Miramax, Laser Pacific, and many other industry leaders. He has been a speaker and panelist at trade conferences and expositions and has consulted on QuBit applications worldwide, including cinema, theme park, content production and image distribution.

QuVIS Inc., headquartered in Topeka, Kansas, is the leading provider of digital motion imaging technology. QuVIS provides digital solutions based on quality priority encoding, a real-time recording process that guarantees image quality at user definable levels. QuBit, a high-resolution digital recorder, records, stores and plays back motion images for video and film production, computer animation and television broadcast.

As the heart of the digital cinema production, distribution and playback systems, QuBit is used in pilot D-Cinema applications worldwide. In short, the QuBit is the source for the digital image that replaces film. QuBit has been playing digital motion pictures since November 1999 in more than 30 commercial theaters in North America, Europe and Asia and has been used for the digital screenings of Toy Story 2, Bicentennial Man, Mission to Mars, Dinosaur, Fantasia 2000, Space Cowboys, The Perfect Storm, 102 Dalmations, and more. For more information please contact QuVIS, Inc., 2921 SW Wanamaker Drive, Suite 107, Topeka, KS 66614, (785) 272-3656, 800-554-8116 or visit the QuVIS web site at www.quvis.com.
QuVIS uses a proprietary encoding technology called Quality Priority Encoding. This method of encoding assigns the highest priority to capturing all the information present in the image so that statistical guarantees can be made for the resulting image quality. Using this process the data stream will vary, while the image quality will not. Quality Priority Encoding has its roots in wavelet-based algorithms however a number of key factors and unique processes are deployed in achieving favorable results. What follows is a summary of attributes of QPE that define the approach and differentiate it from other compression approaches.

The QuVIS QPE compression architecture has proven expandability, and was designed to range applications from consumer standard and HD video through resolutions of up to 4 billion image components per second (32 times HD)

The QuVIS QPE system is suitable for archive and critical technical applications, because it can provide quality guarantees, similar to uncompressed systems.
Matt Cowan
Principal
Entertainment Technology Consultants

Matt Cowan is a principal at Entertainment Technology Consultants, where he is involved in digital cinema developments in the areas of projection, systems, and mastering. Entertainment Technology Consultants developed the mastering methodology in current use for mastering feature films for digital release. He has worked extensively with dynamic range and colorimetry of DLP based projectors to achieve the best image performance for the cinema. Entertainment Technology Consultants has mastered extensive test material for digital cinema, and supported the tests and digital mastering for Star Wars: Episode 1 - The Phantom Menace, Tarzan, Toy Story, and Bicentennial Man.

Mr. Cowan has also worked with industry players and has prepared detailed digital cinema business models that link the traditional cinema business with the new opportunities presented by a digital system.

Mr. Cowan has been an invited speaker and panelist for numerous industry conferences and film festivals, where he has presented papers on digital cinema business, technology, and image quality issues.

Prior to founding Entertainment Technology Consultants, Mr. Cowan was Director of Technology at Electrohome; developing high performance projector platforms aimed at digital cinema applications, and new technology based business initiatives.

Mr. Cowan has a masters degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Waterloo, and is a member of SMPTE. He has been active in SMPTE technical conferences both as speaker and as session chair, and has participated in a number of industry panels on Digital Cinema. He is currently the Chairman of the SMPTE Digital Cinema Compression Study Group, and a participant in the MPEG ad hoc group on digital cinema.
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This presentation will demonstrate a number of digital cinema clips from theatrical releases. These clips were mastered for DLP Cinema™ technology, and have been chosen to illustrate different theatrical intents, and to demonstrate the ability of the digital system to deliver the intent.

The clips were mastered using a Texas Instruments DLP Cinema™ projector as the display target in the digital mastering suite. The clips originate from film and from digital files. For the film material, scanning was performed by C-Reality™ and Spirit™ telecine machines. The digitally generated material was rendered directly to the desired digital format.

The digital clips are stored for this presentation using wavelet based compression in a QuBit™ server manufactured by QuVIS, Inc. Bitrates range from 45 to 60 Mbits/sec, depending on the material. The material is projected in a DLP Cinema™ projector manufactured by Digital Projection, Inc. The projected image is 1280 x 1024 pixels, and uses 1.5:1 and 1.9:1 anamorphic lenses to create the correct aspect ratio for flat and scope material, respectively. Contrast ratio is greater than 1000:1, and the image brightness is 12 foot Lamberts for peak modulated white. The projector’s color space is significantly extended beyond conventional SMPTE color gamut to give better yellow-gold, cyan, and green performance. This system is representative of the systems in current use in the digital cinema field trials.

Each clip will be briefly introduced with a discussion of its technical production and its theatrical intent.
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Alan Balutis came to Washington in 1975 as a National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) Fellow. He worked in a variety of budget, personnel, policy and legislation, and management analysis positions at the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) before coming to Commerce in 1979.

Prior to coming to Washington, he served as an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the State University of New York at Buffalo and worked with the New York State Legislature and the National Conference of State Legislatures. He is the author or co-author of four books, over 100 articles, and numerous conference papers on government reorganization, legislative reform, budgeting, and internship programs.

In Commerce, he worked as Director, Office of Systems and Special Projects (1983-84), as Director, Office of Management and Organization (1984-87), as Director for Budget Planning and Organization (1987-94), as Director of Budget, Management and Information (1994-1998), and as Deputy Chief Information Officer (1998-2000). He was named to his current position, Director of the Advanced Technology Program, in April 2000. The Advanced Technology Program (ATP) co-funds with industry high-risk research projects to develop enabling technologies that can form the basis for new and improved products, manufacturing processes and services. It stimulates partnerships among companies of all sizes, universities, and the rest of the R&D enterprise.
Digitul Cinema 2001  "A New Vision for the Movies"

"Research Partnerships for Innovation"
by Alan Balutis

This presentation provides an overview of the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. This exciting program co-funds high-risk, enabling technology development with the potential for broad-based economic benefits. The presentation also provides details on new initiatives and the role of Digital Cinema in the Program.
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MPEG, a working group of the International Standards Organization (ISO) has developed 3 Standards (MPEG 1, MPEG 2, and MPEG 4) over the last 12 years and is about to release a fourth (MPEG 7). It has now begun work on a very challenging effort to provide compression standards for very high resolution content.

This paper covers the effort thus far, the requirements, the documents that have been generated, and the "Call for Proposals" that will be released in late January 2001.

Special emphasis will be placed on critical issues of the first round of testing. These include content selection, projectors, screens, and the methodologies of testing.

One of the new items in this proposed standard is that it will include truly lossless coding for archival purposes and "perceptually lossless" coding for distribution.
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MPEG & dcinema
Donald C. Mead
11 Jan 2001

MPEG Background
- MPEG is a subdivision of the International Standards Organization (ISO)
  Formally, ISO/IEC SC29 WG11
- Started in 1988 under Convenorship of Dr. Leonardo Chiariglione
- MPEG has developed the MPEG 1, MPEG 2, & MPEG 4 standards. A fourth standard, MPEG 7, will be finalized shortly.

MPEG Process
- Develop Requirements
- Public Call for Proposal
- Evaluate proposals and develop Verification Model
- Refine Verification Model through Core Experiment Process
- "Design Freeze" with Committee Draft

dcinema Profile Chronology
- Dec 99 - Top level requirements presented to MPEG
- Feb 00 - Unanimous U.S. National Body resolution to MPEG requesting development of a dcinema profile
- Mar 00 - ad hoc group formed to develop requirements
- July 00 - 4 Output documents / ahg re-established
- Oct 00 - ahg under Test Group / 2 output documents
- Dec 00 - Special Meeting of ahg to develop Test

Requirements Summary
- Must have algorithms for both lossless (archival) and perceptually lossless (distribution)
- Must support input images up to 16 million pixels
- Must support pixel intensity up to 16 bits per color
- Must support simple transcoding from lossless to lower resolution
- Must support both constant and variable bit rate coding

Key Test Issues
- Content
- Test Methodology - sequential or side-by-side viewing, for example
- Screen - perforated or not, power or not, reflectivity
- Projector - lack of a high resolution projector requires compromise
- Anamorphic properties or not
Digital Electronic Cinema Inc. (DECI)

Schedule
- Jan 01 - Release Call for Proposals
- Feb 01 - Reservations Due and Test Content Available
- June 01 - Proposals Due and Shoot out
- July 01 - Verification Model 1
- Jan 02 - Committee Draft (CD)
"Briefing on SMPTE DC28, Technology Committee on Digital Cinema"

Robert M. Rast
Vice President,
Business Development
Dolby Laboratories

Bob Rast is responsible for business development at Dolby Laboratories, San Francisco. Development projects include digital cinema (d-cinema), music delivery, and expanding usage of Dolby technology in computers and games.

Bob joined Dolby in September 1998 to lead Dolby's efforts in digital cinema. He is vice chairman of the SMPTE Technology Committee on Digital Cinema (DC28). He also continues as an industry leader in digital television (DTV), and is a member of the executive committee of the ATSC (Advanced Television Systems Committee).

Previously, Rast was Vice President, Technical Business Development, for General Instrument, where he focused on HDTV and coordinated GI's participation in digital television standards setting. Following GI's historic proposal for an all-digital HDTV system, in 1990, Rast led the effort to make GI's system the U.S. broadcast standard. When the remaining four competing systems merged and became the Digital HDTV Grand Alliance in 1993, Bob became one of its leaders. The Grand Alliance system is the basis for the DTV broadcast system now being deployed in the U.S. and other countries, and which included Dolby Digital™ surround sound.

Before General Instrument, Rast spent seven years with American Television & Communications (ATC), the cable TV division of Time, Inc. A senior vice president, he was responsible for business and technology development.

Prior to ATC, Bob was with RCA for eleven years. At RCA's Consumer Electronics Division he was an engineering manager responsible for design and development of digital products. At RCA Laboratories, he was Group Head, TV Systems Technology Research.

Rast holds 13 patents. He was a co-recipient, in 1980, of the RCA David Sarnoff Team Award for Outstanding Technical Achievement. In 1997, he accepted, on behalf of General Instrument, an engineering Emmy awarded to the Grand Alliance member companies for contributions to the broadcast DTV standard. He was named to the DTV Honor Roll by Broadcasting and Cable magazine, and is a member of the Academy of Digital Television Pioneers. His contributions to HDTV and the Grand Alliance are described in New York Times writer Joel Brinkley's 1997 book, Defining Vision.

Mr. Rast holds a BSEE degree from the University of Maryland, and attended graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania.
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“Briefing on SMPTE DC28, Technology Committee on Digital Cinema”
by Robert M. Rast

SMPTE is the host organization for a digital cinema standards activity for the motion picture industry. The committee formed early in 2000. Throughout the year numerous meetings on its study groups were held. Mr. Rast, vice chairman of DC28, will provide a briefing on DC28, its progress, and the outlook.
Jeffrey Lubin received a Ph.D. in Psychology at the University of Pennsylvania, and is currently a Senior Member of the Technical Staff at the Sarnoff Corporation, where he is the lead scientist in a group that develops and applies human vision models to various problems in electronic display. Dr. Lubin holds numerous patents in both human vision modeling and image processing, and is the principal investigator behind the Sarnoff JNDMetrix™ family of image quality metric algorithms that were recently awarded a technical Emmy from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.
"Applications of Human Vision Modeling to Digital Cinema System Design and Testing"
by Jeffrey Lubin

Quantitative modeling of a human observer’s ability to detect differences between two image sequences can provide useful performance information for the design and testing of digital cinema systems and components. In this talk, the basic elements of a human visual discrimination model will be reviewed, and specific applications in digital cinema will be discussed. In particular, the applications of visual modeling to “perceptually lossless” digital compression will be described.
Edward F. Kelley
Physicist
NIST

Graduating from University of Idaho in 1970 in physics, he entered graduate school at Montana State University finishing in 1977 with a Ph.D. in experimental atomic physics. He started in a post-doctoral position at NIST (formerly the National Bureau of Standards) in high-voltage impulse measurements using the electro-optical Kerr effect. He continued on at NIST as a staff member for approximately 11 years investigating liquid dielectric breakdown and high-voltage pulse-measurement techniques. In 1988, he received the R&D 100 award for an Image Preserving Optical Delay designed for observing the initiation of random phenomena such as partial discharges. After having returned to Idaho to get a taste of private consultation and university teaching, he returned to NIST and is now the Project Leader of the Display Metrology Project and oversees the Flat Panel Display Laboratory at NIST to assist industry in developing display metrology and measurement standards to quantify display quality.
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Most people are surprised to learn of the complexities of measuring the performance of electronic displays. Serious errors are encountered in even seemingly simple measurements if we blithely measure displays without being aware of the pitfalls. We discuss the nefarious veiling glare, the measurement of resolution, the remarkable complications found in reflection measurements, and other surprises that affect reproducibility of the measurements.
Dr. Brill is presently developing models and metrics for vision-based display standards, and also colorimetric standards for digital cinema. He developed the color part of Sarnoff’s JNDmetrix vision model, for which he holds four patents, and also has written parts of VESA’s standard on flat-panel display metrology. In earlier work, he designed and implemented simulation of nerve-fiber electrical behavior; designed and implemented performance-prediction models for sonar systems; designed algorithms for automatic recognition of human speech. He has reviewed technical papers for more than 15 journals, and has published more than 50 refereed technical articles. For work on the mathematical basis of machine and human color constancy, he received the 1996 Macbeth Award from the Inter-Society Color Council (ISCC). Also, he has published articles in color reproduction, color rendering, and other topics in computational colorimetry. In addition, he has contributed extensively to the use of geometric and photometric invariants in machine vision. Dr. Brill has chaired or co-chaired three conferences with SPIE, and also co-chaired the 1995 ISCC Pan-Chromatic Conference in Williamsburg, VA. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the ISCC from 1992-1995, and was President of the ISCC from 1998 to 2000. He is on the Editorial Board of Color Research and Application, and is an Associate Editor of Physics Essays.
The goal of digital cinema is to replace film distribution of movies by a softcopy alternative, but to ensure that the image quality in the movie theater is at least as good as it was for film. Therefore, insofar as it is possible, the colors presented on film should be copied faithfully into the projected digital images. There are two classes of problems inherent in film-to-digital transfer: managing the color (between scanned inter-positives and projected images), and encoding the digital signal for transmission once the color-management problems have been resolved. The present paper deals with the second of these issues, and summarizes the work of the SMPTE Digital-Cinema Ad Hoc Committee on Colorimetry (chaired by Fred Van Roessel). In particular, there has been a recommendation to encode digital-cinema images at 10-bit precision through the logarithm of three chosen extra-spectral primaries. This expedient avoids wasting code values, either due to their being outside the spectrum locus or due to their being indiscriminable from each other. Although some difficulties might be envisioned with the blue primary (which has a negative luminance), analysis reveals that these difficulties will not emerge in practice.
Encoding of Color Images for Digital Cinema

Michael H. Brill
mbrill@samoff.com
11 Jan 2001

Overview


2. Must maintain or exceed film visual quality, e.g.:
   a. Copy colors faithfully
   b. Minimize artifacts like quantization
   c. Be compatible with present, future projection technology.
   d. Be bit-efficient
   e. Be computationally efficient at distribution time (i.e., just prior to compression)

Task: Film-to-Digital Color Transfer

- Manage color between scanned inter-positive and projected images:
  - Electronic cinema must be visually indistinguishable from its film-based predecessor.
- Encode digital signal for distribution (e.g., choose color primaries, white, nonlinearity on each primary). Subject of this talk
- Compress digital signal (e.g., by MPEG)

SMPTE Ad Hoc Group on Colorimetry

- Formed 8 Feb 2000:
  - Chair: Fred Van Roessel, Panasonic.
- Responds to request of DC 28.2 (Mastering) and DC 28.8 (Projection) Study Groups
- So far, addressed selection of color primaries, white point, signal representation
- Docs at ftp://smpte.vwh.net/pub/dc28
Additive Color Mixture
(from John Silva, Modern Digital Systems)

Contributing and Resultant Colors
in an Additive Mixture - Snapshots

W
R
B
White point (W) is the origin of color specification for all primary colors on this plane.

Ways to Waste Code Values
- Values are un producible (e.g., outside spectrum locus)
- Values are indistinguishable (e.g., small absolute steps at high luminance)

Candidate Color Primaries
$u' = 4x / (-2x + 12y + 3)$ and $v' = 9y / (-2x + 12y + 3)$
(from T. Maier, G. Kennel, M. Bogdanowicz, Kodak)

3D Gamut of RGB cube
(from T. Maier, G. Kennel, M. Bogdanowicz, Kodak)

Choice of Color Primaries
- Red ($x = 0.75, y = 0.25$)
- Green ($x = 0, y = 1$)
- Blue ($x = 0, y = -0.08$)
- Rationale: minimum of unused codes (5% for linear codes)
- Note 1: Primaries are extra-spectral (to represent as integers, no sign)
- Note 2: Blue has negative luminance

Proposed DCDM Primaries
(from F. Van Roessel, Panasonic)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>0.750 0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.000 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>0.000 -0.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White Point

- Needed to convert CIEXYZ to RGB of DCDM, and also to projector primaries
- Standard white point doesn't limit cinematographer's choice
- No recommendations of white point could be made: Film studios use 5500K. Theaters use 6500K (a bit more efficient).
- Mastering & Projection Groups will have to decide

White Point Specification
(D. Richards, 3 Dec 1999)

White Point Error Bound

\[ u' = 4x / (-2x + 12y + 3) \quad \text{and} \quad v' = 9y / (-2x + 12y + 3) \]
Uniform-Chromaticity \(T\) limits nominal here

Correlated Color Temperature
Error bars denote delta \(u'v' = 0.010\)
4 9300
Limit
6500 Limit
\( i^* \) Enforced
0.17 0.18 0.19 0.20 0.21 0.22

Signal Representation

- Mastering, Compression SGs agreed that best interface to compression is full-bandwidth RGB
- Log transfer functions on R, G, B; no linear portion at low-luminance end; 10 or 12-bit word; 10 bits yield ~4 decades D.R.
  [\( \text{code } r = (1 + d)^n \), where \( d \approx 0.01 \)]
- Log to base 2 could simplify hardware, software
  (Variable luminance modifier in metadata if needed)

Logarithm Transfer Function
(from F. Van Roessel, Panasonic)

\[ y = \log_2(x) \]
Implementation of base-2 Log
(from F. Van Roessel, Panasonic)

12 bit base-2 logarithm
XXX.XXXXXXXXX

4-bit exponent, 8-bit mantissa

Contrast Range: 65536:1
Smallest Increment: 0.27%

Problem with Negative-Luminance Blue Primary?

- Log makes larger steps at higher B values
- Higher B values drive luminance lower
- Thus there might be larger luminance steps at lower luminance—Conspicuous contouring artifacts possible
- Scenario: deep blue sky from a spacecraft
- Resolution: There is not enough luminance decrement to incur even a CIELAB unit of artifact.

Future Work of Ad Hoc DC Colorimetry

- Generate R, G, B signals with the proposed primaries by a telecine
- Deliberately limit DCDM color gamut, so it will be more compatible with actual projectors.
- Convert from DCDM color space to the various projector color spaces:
- Convert from full bandwidth RGB color space to luminance and chrominance color space for compression.
Mr. Adkins is the Vice President, Advanced Technologies with Imax Corporation where he heads the research and development activities of the company and its subsidiaries. Mr. Adkins has 6 U.S. patents issued or applied for in the area of entertainment technology. Mr. Adkins has been designing and developing technology for the entertainment industry for over 22 years. Mr. Adkins is a member of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, the International Society for Optical Engineering (SPIE), and the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees. In 1988 he co-founded the Canadian Centre for Image and Sound Research, a non-profit Society that performed research in new technologies for the arts.
The coming transition to digital cinema projection naturally raises questions about the impact that digital technologies will have on the quality of the projected image and the nature of the cinema experience. In this brief address the speaker will discuss the technical, aesthetic and business elements of the cinema, highlighting the ways in which projected image quality affects each of these elements. In particular the discussion will consider the effect that digital technology will have on each of the stakeholders in the cinema experience, from the artists to the audience.
**Digital Cinema Conference 2001**

**Cinematic Image Quality**
- What is it and why does it matter?

Sean Adkins
Vice President,
Advanced Technology
IMAX Corporation

**Introduction**

- Cinematic Image Quality
  - about excellence
  - consists of aesthetic and technical dimensions

Cinema is a unique form of moving image

**Goals**

- Understand the stakeholders in the cinematic experience
- Develop some new ideas about the transition to digital cinema
- Question the fear of change

**The Stakeholders**

- The Audience
- The Producers
  - creative
  - business
- The Equipment Manufacturers
- The Postproduction Service Providers
- The Exhibitors

**Image Quality**

- What do we mean?
- How has the standard evolved?

**The Cinematic Experience**

- Made of many dimensions
- Developed over time
- Art and technology are linked

The Future of Visual Entertainment, An Innovator's Perspective
The Future of Visual Entertainment, An Innovator's Perspective
Thomas MacCalla has a multi-disciplined point of view on entertainment technology. He combines computer science and telecommunications disciplines with an understanding of picture and sound technologies. His role as Chief Operating Officer (COO) of the Entertainment Technology Center (ETC) at the University of Southern California (USC) has immersed him in technologies directed at solving many entertainment industry challenges.

His current focus is on: Digital Cinema, Virtual Stage, Entertainment on Demand (EOD), Immersive Simulation, and HDTV. Last March, ETC launched a Digital Cinema Lab, in conjunction with MPA, NATO, ITEA and SMPTE. The purpose of the lab is to provide benchmarks for attributes of film and video, needed to move the industry forward.

Thomas’ past ETC activities include:
-- 1995- the first live demonstration of wide area digital transport, for entertainment production, to an audience of over 500 entertainment professionals.
-- 1997- the first wide area broadband security test of production content recognized by the State of California Trade and Commerce Agency.
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-- 1998- the first live 8 node wide area demonstration of digital dailies integrating various speeds (400 kbps to 155 mbps) using terrestrial, wireless and satellite transport simulcast to three Hollywood Studios (Warner Brothers, Sony Pictures, and Universal Studios).

Thomas' previous experience includes his:
-- MBA in 1978, from the University of California at Los Angeles, with triple majors in Marketing, Finance and International Business
-- Work at Xerox, four years, during Xerox's development of Ethernet, micro-computing, and artificial intelligence. He held positions in System Design and Marketing.
-- Work at Pacific Bell for Fourteen years starting just before the breakup of AT&T. He was the first Director of Entertainment Technology at Pacific Bell. During his tenure, he was instrumental in several innovative developments including:
  o Pacific Bell's first digital implementation to voice networks
  o Pacific Bell's first implementation of advanced video services for production and post-production
  o Pacific Bell's first commercial implementation of ATM at OC3 (155 mbps) and OC-12 (622 mbps) for use of CGI effects and animation transport.
Charles Fenimore currently leads NIST’s Digital Cinema Project in the Convergent Information Technology Division. For several years he has been involved in quality assessment for digital video and digital cinema and has developed test imagery and test metrics for moving picture compression. For the last two years he has chaired the SMPTE Group on TV Assessment Materials which has collected subjective assessment materials for distribution by SMPTE. He has also contributed to the development of test methods for the Video Quality Experts Group (VQEG).

Fenimore has been a mathematician at NIST for 16 years. In addition to his work on imagery, he has developed models for non-linear characteristics of fluid and electrical flows. He holds a B.S. in Math from Union College and a Ph.D., also in Math, from Berkeley.
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Compression is one of several enabling technologies for digital cinema. The digital cinema imagery which is projected onto a screen may have passed through several stages in a chain of processing. Assessing one component (such as compression) in this complex system requires that other components of the system be qualified or controlled. This includes:

- the content of the cinema to be used,
- format conversions which are applied,
- the characteristics of the display, including its measured resolution or sharpness, brightness, contrast, and dynamic response,
- the environment for viewing, and
- the visual acuity of the viewing panel in the case of subjective testing.

Both objective and subjective test materials are essential in this process. The experience gained in developing materials for digital video give direction to the process of finding and developing materials which are useful in assessing digital cinema.
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Quality Assessment for Digital Cinema: Test Materials & Metrics for Compression

Quality measurement in video
- Compression in digital cinema.
- Subjective testing is the gold standard, objective testing is a useful adjunct.
- Selection of test materials.
- Qualification of the test system.
- Test methods smorgasbord: ITU-R Rec 500.

Goals of Testing
- Characterize for a range of typical materials OR Stress the system, to see where it breaks.
- Compression or decompression testing.
- Threshold vs. Wide Range Tests.

Qualifying the system
- Resolution and sharpness.
  - Spot-size: trade flicker for resolution
  - Motion rendition and flicker, image stability
- Dynamic range, tone
- Brightness and contrast
- Visual acuity of the viewers

SMPTE RP 133 – resolution pattern
Selection of subjective test materials

Desired attributes include a range of:
- resolution and detail patterns,
- image and camera motion,
- luminance,
- color saturation and hue,
- skin tones,
- noise, and
- graphics and titles.
A sense of presence, reality, and depth.

Selection of subjective test materials

Experience provides surprises in coding difficulty.

Range of image detail, motion, color and luminance.

Criticality: a computable measure of image detail and motion in electronic imagery.

Synthetic test patterns

Used in engineering evaluation of imaging systems.
- SMPTE color bars, Philips
- SMPTE Rec. 133 Resolution Chart
- Sarnoff, AT&T, many other contributors
- NIST spinning wheel (blocking) and moving spirals (mosquito noise) patterns.

Conclusions

Subjective and objective metrics & materials are valuable for imaging system evaluation.

Properly designed d-cinema testing:
- Know who are users, what are needs and goals.
- Translate user needs to engineering requirements (subjective and objective criteria, resolution and sharpness, color characteristics).
- Specify measurement protocol to test requirements: metrics and materials.
John M. Libert
Physical Scientist,
Flat Panel Display Laboratory
NIST

John M. Libert received his B. S. degree in Experimental Psychology and his M.S. in Quantitative Geology from the University of Maryland in 1970 and 1981, respectively. His early work included geophysical data analysis and remote sensing via multi-spectral imagery and synthetic aperture radar. He later worked in the areas of signal and image analysis, including development of computational vision models for image motion perception and stereopsis. In 1997, he joined the Electronics and Electrical Engineering Laboratory of the National Institute of Standards and Technology where he conducted research in digital video image quality measurement. He now continues his work in the Flat Panel Display Laboratory of NIST's Display Metrology Project where he is developing a transfer standard for the assessment of electronic display measurement methods and instruments.
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Subjective assessment methods have been used reliably for many years to evaluate video quality. They continue to provide the most reliable assessments compared to objective methods. Some issues that arise with subjective assessment include the cost of conducting the evaluations and the fact that these methods cannot easily be used to monitor video quality in real time. Furthermore, traditional, analog objective methods, while still necessary, are not sufficient to measure the quality of digitally compressed video systems. Thus, there is a need to develop new objective methods utilizing the characteristics of the human visual system. While several new objective methods have been developed, there is to date no internationally standardized method.

The Video Quality Experts Group (VQEG) was formed in October 1997 to address video quality issues. The group is composed of experts from various backgrounds and affiliations, including participants from several internationally recognized organizations working in the field of video quality assessment. The majority of participants are active in the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and VQEG combines the expertise and resources found in several ITU Study Groups to work towards a common goal. The first task undertaken by VQEG was to provide a validation of objective video quality measurement methods leading to Recommendations in both the Telecommunications (ITU-T) and Radiocommunication (ITU-R) sectors of the ITU. To this end, VQEG designed and executed a test program to compare subjective video quality evaluations to the predictions of a number of proposed objective measurement methods for video quality in the bit rate range of 768 kb/s to 50 Mb/s. The results of this test show that there is no objective measurement system that is currently able to replace subjective testing. Depending on the metric used for evaluation, the performance of eight or nine models was found to be statistically equivalent, leading to the conclusion that no single model outperforms the others in all cases. The greatest achievement of this first validation effort is the unique data set assembled to help future development of objective models.
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Paul S. Breedlove, Digital Cinema Business Development Manager at Texas Instruments (TI) Digital Imaging, has spent the last four years working with the movie industry to adapt TI's DLP™ technology to meet industry requirements. Previously, Paul worked in TI's Calculator Division where he invented the popular Speak & Spell™ talking learning aid, receiving the prestigious IEEE Masaru Ibuka Consumer Electronics Award in 1993. Paul has also managed TI's Personal Computer engineering department and served as Worldwide Computer Strategy manager for TI's Semiconductor Division.

Paul holds five patents and is a member of IEEE and SMPTE.
For the past year, Texas Instruments (TI) has worked with Technicolor, movie studios, exhibitors, and other manufacturers to conduct field demonstrations of digital cinema in 31 locations located in North America, Europe, Japan, and Asia. The results of these demonstrations have provided many insights into the image quality, standards, and supporting measurement technology needed for digital cinema.

Color stability, contrast ratio stability, and field reliability were tested and evaluated for possible inclusion in standards. Color gamut, bit depth requirements, and other areas of possible impact on quality and standards will be discussed. TI’s views on some possible standards will be presented.
Digital Cinema Projection Systems
ITVA MediaPort 2000  Orlando, FL  June 29, 2000

### DLP Cinema™ Field Demonstration Technical Results - System Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N. America</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Japan-Asia</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>11,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Lost</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Lost</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Film projector reliability: 99.95% of shows pass
- Digital synchronization lost 1 show in Europe
- System influenza killed one projector
- Male delivered late
- Operation error
- Cave left behind due to DLP Cinema projection

### DLP Cinema™ Prototype Projector Set-up in Each Location

- Resolution: 1280 x 1024 pixels (1.5:1)
- Film formats: 1.85:1 & 2.35:1 (anamorphic lenses)
- Display frame rate: 24 fps (like film)
- Luminance: 12 FL (16FL open gate film proj.)
- Brightness: up to 10,000 lumens (60W lamps)
- Screen size: > 50 ft. depending on screen gain
- Contrast ratio: >1000:1 full-on/full-off
- Effective bit depth: 14 bits/component - linear
- Color temperature: 6500° Kelvin
- Color gamut: Equivalent to film, > HDTV

### DLP Cinema™ Technology Important Image Quality Attributes

- Digital fidelity
  - Same colors on every screen
  - Colors determined by precise division of time
  - No lag or motion smearing as in LCD light valves
- Digital stability
  - No change in colors with time
  - No change in contrast ratio with time
  - No image damage due to use
  - Quick setup and low maintenance
- Projection booth compatibility
  - Intensive light path (like film projectors)
  - Compact

### DLP Cinema™ Prototype Projector Color Gamut Comparison

- Rec. 709 (HDTV)
- DLP™ Projector (FND = 2.3)
- DLP Cinema™ Projector

### DLP Cinema™ Prototype Projector Color & Contrast Stability

- Measure of light and contrast in an operating theater environment during daily full load operations.
Mr. Boynton received his BSEE at Northwestern University. He has been at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) for nearly twenty years. He presently works in the Flat Panel Display Laboratory, where he performs research in the evaluation and development of electronic display measurements, standards and procedures. He serves on several standards committees, including ANSI/PIMA, ISO, and VESA.
Electronic projection display specifications are often based on measurements made in ideal darkroom conditions and assume ideal measurement instrumentation. However, not everyone has access to such a facility, and not always will the light-measuring devices necessarily provide accurate information. In many environments, ambient light from other sources in the room illuminates the screen. This includes room lights directly illuminating the screen and the reflection of these light sources off of walls, floors, furniture, and other objects. Additionally, back-reflections arising from the image on the projection screen must be considered. These stray light components contribute to the measured values and give rise to inaccurate measurement of the projector light output.

Measurement instrumentation face challenges as well. Light from outside the measurement field can reflect off the lens surfaces of the light-measuring devices, creating a veiling glare that corrupts the measurement. Projectors using a high-energy scanning beam to render the image may pose difficulties for some instruments to accurately measure. Likewise, saturated colors may be difficult to measure with some spectroradiometers and especially colorimeters.

Thus, these and other conditions may make the task of adequately comparing and evaluating different projection systems difficult. We can better verify whether the projector is operating according to its specifications or compare its performance with other projectors by compensating for stray light and testing the measurement instrumentation. Simple tools and diagnostics will be discussed that address some of these concerns.
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Tools and Diagnostics for Projection Display Metrology

Paul A. Boynton
Flat Panel Display Laboratory
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

BASIC CONCERNS

- What are the effects of stray light?
- How does the scanning beam of flying spot displays affect the LMD?
- What are the effects of saturated colors?

FRONT-PROJECTION DISPLAY MEASUREMENTS AND STRAY LIGHT

EFFECT OF STRAY LIGHT ON ILLUMINANCE MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Illuminance of black rectangle (lux)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reflective surface in close proximity</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reflective surface in far away</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECTION MASK

EFFECT OF PROJECTION MASK ON ILLUMINANCE MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Illuminance of black rectangle (lux)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reflective surface in close proximity</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reflective surface in far away</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflective surface without mask</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reflective surface without mask and light entering from outside</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement with projection mask (lux) | Corrected measurement (lux)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECT OF MASK DISTANCE FROM SCREEN

STRAY LIGHT ELIMINATION TUBE (SLET)

USING THE SLET

EFFECT OF STRAY LIGHT COMPENSATION

MEASURING CONTRAST RATIO

MEASURING CONTRAST RATIO
EFFECT OF ROOM LIGHTS WHEN USING THE SLET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Image Quality with SLET</th>
<th>Image Quality without SLET</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room Light</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEASURING LUMINANCE

FLYING-SPOT DISPLAYS

Concern has been expressed that many LMDs cannot properly measure many properties of flying-spot displays.

MEASUREMENT CONCERNS

- Pulses are too narrow (integration error)
- Pulses contain too much energy (saturation error)

BREAKOUT OF DIAGNOSTIC BOX
TESTING THE LMDs

- Adjust sources to match in luminance and color
- Measure luminance or illuminance with the LMD
- If the measurements of the two sources are close, then your instrument is not affected

- If not, then measure the sources with an ND filter in place.
- If both sources are reduced by the same amount, then this would point to a possible integration error, or some other cause.
- If the ratio of the measurements differ, then this would indicate a possible saturation error.

"SIMULATE" FLYING SPOT

- 5 - 40 ns pulse width
- 200 nJ per pulse
- 60 Hz repetition rate

DIAGNOSTIC WITH A PULSED SOURCE

ALTERNATIVE METHOD

ALTERNATIVE METHOD
John Roberts is Program Manager for the Advanced Display Technology Systems Lab, within the Convergent Information Systems Division of the Information Technology Laboratory at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

This lab is dedicated toward research on the role of displays (including, but not limited to visual displays) as the human-machine interface in information technology systems. Current projects include development of new display characterization techniques, investigation of stereo display requirements and electronic book readers, and development of new Braille display technology for E-books and other information devices.

John has conducted display research since 1993, and participates in the display-related technical committees of the Video Electronics Standards Association (VESA).
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DMD (micromirror) projectors can provide high resolution, fast response time, and a large number of colors and brightness levels (grayscales). These properties make DMD highly suitable for digital cinema projection systems. However, as with any display technology, a detailed knowledge of system operation can be helpful in optimizing performance. DMD characterization techniques being developed at NIST will be useful for digital cinema, both in production and in installation/diagnosis of projection systems.
DMD Characterization for Digital Cinema

John Roberts
Tracy Comstock
NIST

DMD Projection Systems
- High resolution
- Many colors and brightness levels (grayscales) - improves realism
- Fast response time, high frame rate
- Good for Digital Cinema, however...
- As with all displays, knowledge of display operation is needed for optimum performance!

Optimizing Display System Performance
- Make best use of grayscale/color generation methods used by the display
- Avoid “pathological cases” that degrade image quality
- Evaluate a model for given classes of application - interaction of input signals, internal control algorithm
- Check a specific display for correct operation

Basic DMD Operation
Micromirrors machined into a megapixel array
Light is reflected through projection optics, or into a light trap
Switching time tens of microseconds
Pixels are binary (fully on or fully off)

Generation of Colors/Grayscales
- Pixels are always “on” or “off” - no inherent grayscales
- Grayscales are generated by temporal modulation and spatial modulation
- Colors (red, green, blue) shown sequentially, or using multiple DMDs

Temporal Modulation
- Fast mirror switching permits many brightness levels
- Binary coded pulse widths for switching control within frame
- “Bit splitting” - rearrange sequence of binary time steps to reduce visible artifacts such as flashes
Spatial Modulation

- Patterns of pixels produce variations in visible grayscale
  - Effective resolution is reduced
- Used with temporal modulation for more grayscales, fewer visible artifacts

The Need for DMD Characterization

- Operational details not always available to the customer
- Manufacturer may not be aware of detailed needs for a specific application
- Diagnosis when problems arise

Method of Observation

- High speed screen image capture
  - Continuous, or periodic
  - Triggered, or free-running
- Selected test images (animations)

Experimental Setup

- Test images with known properties
- Repeated image capture, timing offset wrt frame rate
- Reconstructed animation shows mirror timing

Designing Test Images

- Horizontal, vertical gradients to look for potential critical grayscales
- Blocks with known grayscales to observe spatial, temporal modulation
- Add visual tags to assist optical triggering (e.g. full-red block appears in red field only)
- Video tests: either rapid sequential capture camera, or short-cycle repeating animations
Pathological Cases

- Temporal
  - Flicker observed at certain gray levels
  - Color breakup, geometric distortions
  - Possible workaround: remap some colors, use spatial modulation

- Spatial
  - Regular patterns (in graphics, halftoning) interfering with modulation pattern
  - Workarounds: avoid deliberate use, filter

Application for Digital Cinema

- Content creators: Test material for suitability with selected displays
- Theater owners: portable device and test suite for checking installed projectors
- Possible future development: extended video sequences, with mathematical analysis of captured images

Summary

- Selected test patterns and high-speed image capture can be used to observe DMD operation and detect problems
- DMD characterization can be useful for digital cinema, both in production and in testing installed systems
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With the introduction of DTV, digital format conversion has become a well accepted process in video production, distribution and presentation. It has been utilized in both high-end professional applications and leading edge consumer products. Depending on the constraints of the application, the quality can vary in a number of aspects. Due to the large viewing angle of digital cinema presentations, compromises in image quality are typically magnified rather than masked. We will consider the effect that format conversion processes have on the quality of the final displayed images. This will include a discussion of the limitations of current techniques for both spatial and temporal conversions. Both electronic video and scanned filmed sources will be considered. A demonstration will be given to illustrate the type of artifacts and distortions that can be produced in this process.
Dr. Brown received a BS degree in Physics from the College of William and Mary and a PhD in Applied Physics from the University of Michigan. After receiving his PhD, Brown was an NRC postdoctoral researcher at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, DC, where he worked on detailed studies of the optical properties of nanostructures. He joined the Optical Sensor Group within the Optical Technology Division at NIST in 1997. His current interests include colorimetry, display metrology, and optical remote sensing, along with the development of calibration techniques for digital imaging systems.
Accurate evaluation of the colorimetric performance of digital cameras is critical for accurate color reproduction in digital cinema. Digital imaging systems, such as digital cameras, are often calibrated against incandescent sources that have a broad, featureless spectrum. When these instruments subsequently observe a scene, unforeseen errors in color measurements can occur because of the very different spectral distribution of the calibration source from the measured scene. These colorimetric errors can in turn adversely impact accurate color reproduction in digital cinema.

To address this issue, we have developed a laser-based facility for Spectral Irradiance and Radiance Responsivity Calibrations using Uniform Sources (SIRCUS) for the radiometric, photometric and colorimetric calibration of digital imaging systems such as CCD cameras. In this facility, tunable lasers are directed into an integrating sphere (IS), producing a uniform, monochromatic, Lambertian source. We describe the calibration of a monochrome CCD camera equipped with a removable photopic filter. Details of the facility and the calibration approach will be presented. During the radiometric calibration, the pixel-to-pixel uniformity, linearity, and absolute spectral spectral responsivity were determined over the visible spectral range (400 nm to 800 nm).
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“Digital Rights Management: How Much Can Cryptography Help?”

William E. Burr
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Bill Burr is the manager of the NIST Security Technology (SecTech) Group, a member of the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) team and Chairman of the Federal Public Key Infrastructure Technical Working Group, and one of the inventors of the Bridge CA concept. The SecTech Group is responsible for Federal Information Processing Standards for cryptography. Mr. Burr has worked at NIST for 22 years in Information Technology Standards, was the Chairman of the Small Computer System Interface (SCSI) standards committee in the 1980s and has been working on computer security, public key infrastructure and cryptography for about a decade.
Cryptography offers powerful techniques for data protection in “classical” communications applications. Claims are often made that some new “technology” will enable or make electronic publishing “safe.” This talk sounds a cautionary note, at least for large scale, controlled distribution of digital content to millions of consumers or subscribers. The essential difference is that both the sender and the receiver are trusted parties in a communications protocol (an attacker is a third party), but in DRM applications the consumer who receives the data is the likely attacker. This is a much more difficult problem. Cryptography may also offer small comfort to traditional intellectual property rights holders in the face of changing ethics and notions of property rights, and evolving business models, all of which are driven by new digital technologies.
Digital Rights Management: How Much Can Cryptography Help?

Bill Burr
william.burr@nist.gov
Digital Cinema 2001
January 12, 2000

My Daughter the "Pirate"

- College freshman
  - Biggest use for her laptop is to acquire, store, and manage MP3s, and burn CDs
  - Napster, Kazamalia, MP3.com, etc.
  - not a hacker, but good at Napster, etc.
  - CD burner is required equipment
- Copyright pirate?
  - University doesn't care, society as a whole, doesn't care
  - Little public sympathy for record companies
  - Can IP rights fly in the face of technology?
  - given the technology, would it take a police state to stop the "piracy?"

DRM Problem
- Rights holders want to have their cake and eat it too
  - Easy to copy digital document
    - low publishing costs
    - but the copy is as good as original, and anybody can make it
  - Advantages of digital network distribution
    - low cost, convenience
  - May want to charge per use
    - whatever happened to original sale doctrine?
  - Can encryption protect digital documents from unauthorized access?
    - But allow sales and distribution of creative works

Classical Encryption Model
- Alice and Bob want to communicate in secrecy so they encrypt their traffic
- Eve, an eavesdropper, intercepts all Alice’s and Bob’s traffic, and knows their encryption algorithm, but not their key.
- Eve still can’t tell anything about the contents of Alice’s and Bob’s communication

We have this problem fairly well solved
- Strong symmetric key encryption such as AES
- Public-key exchange and strong authentication
- Many protocols such as S/MIME, SSL, TLS, IPSI, etc.
- Direct cryptanalytic attacks are impractical if Alice and Bob protect their keys
DRM Cryptographic Problem

• Don’t want Bob to make “unauthorized” copies
  – Enforce this cryptographically somehow
• Forget Eve, we don’t trust Bob
  – Bob can always copy the encrypted file
  – DVD CSS does nothing to prevent copying of DVD
  – But Bob has use of the key or he couldn’t use the document at all
  – Bob doesn’t have to actually “break” the cryptography itself to get at the plaintext
  – May be millions of Bobs
• A big-time key management/ protección problem

Key Management

• Even with hardware, key management is tough
• Don’t want any key that can compromise more than one thing
  – With DVD there are lots of keys, any one of which effectively decrypts everything
  – Millions of keys?
  – Change keys frequently?
  – On-line?
• Complexity
• Can you fit rigorous key management into an attractive product and business model?

Things that don’t Work Well

• Strong cryptography in a weak system
• Security by obscurity
• Hacker challenges

Strong Crypto in a Weak System

• Attacker attacks the weakest link
  – A $500 lock in a $50 door is a waste of money
• Crypto algorithm is almost never the weakest link
  – Plaintext is often exposed
  – It may suffice to copy the ciphertext
  – How do you protect the keys?
    • DVD uses a weak algorithm, and then gives away the key so you don’t even have to break the algorithm
• AES encryption is very strong, but by itself it doesn’t solve the real problem

Obscurity Doesn’t Work

• Security by obscurity won’t work long
  – Any widely used consumer system will be known in detail by too many people, and will be reverse engineered in time even if the secrets were otherwise kept, Circumvention of Technological Protection Measures legislation notwithstanding
  – “Keeping the algorithm secret isn’t much of an impediment to analysis, anyway—it only takes a couple of days to reverse-engineer the cryptographic algorithms from executable code...” - Bruce Schneier
• If you have to keep anything more than a few keys secret, you’re usually dead meat.

Hacker Challenges

• Offer a prize to anyone who can “hack” some protection scheme
  – If nobody wins the prize the scheme must be good
• Just doesn’t work
  – Can only prove that protection is broken
  – Never enough time
  – Can rarely harness the best talent
    • Not enough reward to be worthwhile
  – There is more fame and profit from waiting until the technology is deployed and then exploiting or announcing the hack.
### Things that may Work a bit Better
- Steganography/watermarks
- Hardware protection
- Genuine open competition

### Steganography
- Steganography hides a message in something else (e.g., a "watermark" in a digital video)
  - Typically would identify the original source
  - Might include a serial number
- Requires very tight controls to be useful
  - Records of every original sale
  - Every original must be a little different if you're to trace the "leak"
  - How can it work to protect mass distribution to millions of viewers?
- Can sometimes be defeated technically

### Hardware Protection
- Use a semiconductor chip that won't give the key directly to Bob, and ensures he pays.
- Helps reduce IP piracy, but
  - Consumer product protection can't cost much
    - The key is there and it can be extracted at time
      - Bob can activate the key, but
        - To do right, one key should never "give away the store"
    - The plaintext digital copy still exists during playback
      - A probe in the right place recovers what the pirate wants
        - Encrypting everything on one chip with very high resolution
          lithography makes probing harder
    - High-quality analog can be recognized
- Who can ignore the software player market?

### Open Competition
- Worked with AES
  - NIST invited submissions from anybody
  - Analysis of algorithms by crypto community
    - Got expense money could never buy
  - NIST picked winner
- Could we do something similar with DRM?
  - Basically a tougher problem
  - Wouldn't solve larger business/social problems
  - Takes a long time
  - Who could run it?

### Copyright
- Statute of Anne, in 1710
  - Beginning of modern copyright law
  - Limited term of protection
  - Limited rights: print, publish, sell
    - Original sale doctrine
  - Earlier laws gave rights to printers
  - Nominally gave rights to authors, but
    - Printers controlled presses and in a practical matter still controlled copyrights
      - Many authors, few printers, big investment in presses
    - Today perception is publishers, record companies, and movie studios primary copyright beneficiaries
  - Authors and performers often get a small part of total revenue

### Copyrights & Technology
- Copyrights were a reaction to the printing press
  - No need for copyright when copies were made by hand
- Copyright law evolves with technology
  - *Folsom v. Marsh* - 1841, fair use
  - 1909 Copyright Act - Player Piano, mechanical royalties
  - Betamax Case - 1984
  - Home Audio Recording Act - 1992
  - Digital Millennium Copyright Act - 1999
  - ISP Liability
    - Circumvention of Technological Protection Measures
      - Can this even stop software hacks?
      - How much will it slow down hardware hacks?
A Changing World

- **Old**
  - Production, publication, marketing and distribution are expensive, favoring large industrial corporations.
  - Most of the costs have to do with production and publication, distribution and marketing, not creativity.

- **New**
  - Digital technology and the Internet make production, publication, distribution and even marketing less expensive and capital intensive.
  - Disintermediation is more or less the name of the e-commerce game.
  - Sometimes you have to "eat your children."

Conclusion

- Cryptography does some things very well, but
- *A small* part of a DRM solution, no answer to:
  - The digital challenge to manufacturing and distribution
  - Disintermediation
  - Evolving hacker friendly social attitudes
- Can often "hack around" strong cryptography in consumer applications
- A good business model for DRM is needed
- Cryptographic hardware protection can at least slow down unauthorized access
  - Combined with appropriate pricing & business models this may be enough.
“The Digital Object Identifier”
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Prior to Wiley, Mr. Sidman was Director of Strategic Technologies for Moody’s Investors Service, IT Director for the International Capital Markets Division of Barclays Bank, and held various other positions involving Wall Street and the Information Industry, both on the customer side and the information provider side. He is a graduate of Harvard University.
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The Digital Object Identifier (DOI) was developed 4 years ago to enable e-commerce and protect copyright for all online content industries, although it was first implemented in the scientific publishing community where 61 of the largest international Scientific Journal publishers have already tagged over 2 million articles with DOIs and are using it to cross-link the world’s primary-science literature. Based on technology developed by the principal inventor of the Internet, Dr. Robert Kahn, and implemented within the scientific/university community which was also the early adopter for the Internet itself (and later the Web), the DOI is now ready for adoption across all other content industries: film, video, photography, music, etc. The DOI does not replace other numbering systems for content (SMPTE, etc.); instead it empowers them with an Internet-based, DNS-like routing system which guarantees a permanent link from the identifying number to the actual content, and which facilitates transactions of all kinds: syndication, distribution, e-commerce, revenue tracking, digital rights management, etc. David Sidman will provide an overview of the DOI and explain its business benefits for Digital Cinema.
The Digital Object Identifier
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What is the DOI?

- “The DOI is the UPC (Bar Code) for objects of intellectual property on the Internet.” Two aspects:
  1. Uniquely identifies content - therefore enables computers to execute transactions of all kinds: Buy, Sell, Syndicate, Track, Compute Royalties, Clear Rights, Enforce Copyright, Grant Permissions...
  2. Provides a Stable, Persistent Link to the Content Itself (or to the Owner’s website)

- Initiated (1996) in order to:
  a) create an e-commerce market for intellectual property online
  b) protect copyright in that market (otherwise no one gets paid)

#1 - Unique Content ID

- Any type of content: text, music, film, video, photographs, software...
- Any level of granularity: whole book, individual chapters, illustrations, data sets, tables, music tracks, versions (e.g. dif. resolutions)...
- Compatible with (super set of) any & all other numbering schemes (ISBN, ISSN, ISWC, UPC...)
- Once assigned, never changes ("A DOI is Forever")
- Why is a unique ID so important for transactions? (UPC/Bar Code example...)

The UPC (Bar code)
more than just a quick way to get through the checkout lane

So in the physical world, a Unique Identifier:
- UPCs are used for inventory, distribution, and logistics
- In the online world, content has the physical inventory, transportation, or physical logistics "But"
- content is now fully on-line, it is complex, chain of transactions and systems which may involve the facilitation of sale, distribution, copyright protection, license, etc.
- Unlike other computer systems, these systems must share information universally such as track to each other - success fully, reliably, and cost-effectively

O2000 CONTENT DIRECTIONS, INC
02001 CONTENT DIRECTIONS, INC
#2 - Persistent Identifier

- DOI never changes, but URL does: Content Owner maintains the correct URL pointer in a directory
- Directory is similar to Domain Name System (DNS): single directory logically, but distributed physically
- If maintained faithfully, a DOI link survives:
  - moving the content to a different server
  - Content Owner’s sale of that content unit/product line
  - acquisition of Content Owner by another company

Why a Persistent Identifier?

URLs are not sufficiently reliable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>http</th>
<th>gopher</th>
<th>ftp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of journals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URLs listed</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% functional</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Ford, Harter, College and Research Libraries, July 1998
Brewster Kahle (1997): half life of a URL = 44 days
**Underlying Technology for DOI**

- "Handle System"
- Robust, scalable, live & working since 1997
- Developed by CNRI (Corporation for Nat'l Research Initiatives - non-profit research org)
- Run by Dr. Robert Kahn, one of principal inventors of the Internet
- CNRI runs, coordinates, or supports many Internet standards bodies: IETF, IAB, etc.

**Publishing Industry Support**

- **Association of American Publishers** (project was initiated by the AAP Enabling Technologies Committee, 1996)
- **International Publishers Association** (IPA endorsed its launch at the Frankfurt Book Fair 1997)
- **STM International** (also endorsed the launch, and has given special support because the STM market was the first to go online)
- **Many individual publishers, esp. STM Journals**

**Current State of Deployment**

- **Scientific Journals**
  - 61 of the largest international journal publishers funding permanent non-profit DOI tagging operation ("CrossRef")
  - 2 million DOIs registered to date
  - "Killer app": Cross-linking the world's scientific journal literature, based on a common "DOI Lookup" database
- **eBooks**
  - Stephen King moves 500,000 eBook copies in 24 hours
  - Wake-up call to Trade Publishers: 1) there is a market, but 2) the content had better be copyright-protected...
  - AAP/Andersen Consulting "eBook Standards" initiative about to declare DOI the identifier of choice for eBooks
- **Other Content Industries** (Music, Video, Photography, Software...)
  - Digital Rights Management (DRM)
  - Conecto Management Systems (ExhibiTec, Inc)
  - "If you can't sell it, you can't license it"

**How the DOI System Works**

- **DOI number format**
  - 10.1065/abc123defg
  - 10 = DOI
  - 10.1065 = Handle prefix
  - abc123defg = Handle suffix
    - item identifier
    - any format
    - naming authority (publisher)
  - in use, a DOI is an opaque string (a "dumb number" - a good thing)
What does DOI do for Digital Cinema?

Improves 3 areas:

1. **Post-Production (content development)**
   - No organized Digital Workflow today
   - Many parties work on different aspects
   - Can’t easily “modularize” or manage the content itself

2. **Distribution**
   - “Last Mile” problem for hi-bandwidth content requires extraordinary control of distribution logistics

3. **Commerce, Syndication, Rights Management**
   - Don’t get Napstered
   - Profit from the efficiencies of digital distribution

---

**Special Focus: DRM (Digital Rights Management)**

- Allows the Studio to specify all the things that can be done with the content downstream:
  - Sample Preview
  - View fully, but with limitations (see below)
  - Forward
  - Re-sell
  - Syndicate
- Can also specify:
  - How many times
  - For how long a period
  - For what price
  - To whom (forwarding)
- Not just negative (locking content up), but also affirmative (new ways to sell, great mktg potential)

---

**DRM is More than Anti-Piracy**
Super-distribution:
The “Holy Grail” of DRM
• Turn customers themselves into points of additional distribution
• The most targeted, effective selling imaginable (friend to friend; knows tastes interests; more pre-qualified than the best sales lead, targeted banner ad, or bookstore display)
• Turns pass-along from an act of piracy into an additional sale
• Instead of undermining revenue, multiplies revenue

How does the DOI assist DRM?
• DOI is “necessary, but not sufficient”
• DRM vendors must support it
  - but they will, because it will make their products work much better, and will facilitate a more seamless and friction-free end user experience
  - Also, they all use internal content IDs anyway - but they only work internally; they’d be glad to use a universal ID, assigned at the source by the Content Owner
• Mostly, everyone is waiting for the Content Producers to assign DOIs to their content

How DOI works with DRM...

Case Study: Digital Rights Management (DRM)
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An Even Simpler Case:

Digital Distribution to Theaters...
Market Opportunity

- 54% of all Internet users indicate a willingness to buy content  
  - Jupiter Communications, Aug 1999
- $40 billion digital commerce market opportunity by 2003  
  - SIMBA, Jan 1999
- $185 billion market today for online intellectual property, growing to $275 billion by 2003  
  - J.P. Morgan, November 1999
- $200 billion in media content already sold in the U.S. in 1999  

Further information

- International DOI Foundation (IDF):  
  http://www.doi.org
- Corporation for Nat'l Research Initiatives (CNRI):  
  http://www.cnri.reston.va.us
- CrossRef Consortium (scientific journal publishers)  
  http://www.crossref.org
- Content Directions, Inc. (coming soon):  
  http://www.contentdirections.com

Thank you!

David Sidman  
CEO  
CONTENT DIRECTIONS, INC.  
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Robert heads up the professional services for Savantech, serving the content industry to provide solutions that enable digital delivery and monetization of digital content and rights. Prior to Savantech, he was a senior member of the engineering team for Xerox Rights Management where he helped to architect and design Xerox’s Digital Rights Management technologies, yielding patent-pending works and contributing to emerging standards. Robert’s broad DRM experience comes from his professional engagements on major accounts in the Publishing, Music, Movie, Government and Corporate markets for digital content. Robert holds a bachelor of science degree in computer science from the University of Southern California.
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The range of obstacles set before the purveyors of content to successfully exploit digital distribution is evident. Clogged pipelines are choked for sufficient bandwidth. The dearth of essential automated systems within content companies, including Digital Asset Management and IP Management, inhibits the efficient and scaleable utilization of digital content. Incompatible, competing and immature content interchange formats, software applications and industry standards leave confusion and apprehension. Piracy, fueled by the popularity of file sharing tools, threatens ownership of content. Legacy systems for rights and royalty management fall short of comprehending the issues raised by digital distribution or to support newer business models. Whether for business-to-business distribution or direct to consumer sales, a wide range of issues must be addressed to provide meaningful digital rights management to exploit the dynamic and interactive content opportunities available.
Providing DRM for Dynamic, Interactive Cinema

Robert Schuler
Savantech, Inc.

Overview

What is New Media?

DRM solutions for New Media

"New" Media

What's "New" about "New Media"?

"New"
- Distribution method changes
- Value Chain changes
- Service Providers change
- Technology changes

Media
- But the media is still "Old"

"Digital" + "Old Media" = "New Media"

Misconceptions

"Digital Content" is simply about turning "Atoms" into "Bits"

The user experience is canned -- same passive experience for each user

The product is packaged and sent to the consumer from a single source

Facts

New content is created that exploits the online opportunity

Content is a Service with critical dependence on Quality of Service (QoS) and comes from multiple sources

User experience is 2-way and Active
New Media is...

- Service-oriented (not a static package)
- Multi-sourced (not single-sourced)
- Active, 2-Way Experience (not a 1-way, passive experience)

...not just "Digital Old Media"

...Dynamic, Interactive Cinema

Other Voices

...every e-business is in the content business...
- Contending with Content (Seybold)
  Susan Aldrich

The traditional link – between the medium and the message... between the informational value chain and the physical value chain... – is broken.
- Blown to Bits (HBSP)
  Evans and Wurster

...need to liberate e-books from tree books...
- Why e-Books Could Fail (NIST)
  Jim Shaffer, CEO, Clickshare Service Corp.

DRM Solutions

DRM and Security

Overemphasis on Protection leads to misunderstandings:
- DRM is synonymous with Cryptography
- Security is the limiting factor for digital distribution
- Protection varies from vendor to vendor

"Content" + "Cryptography" ≠ "DRM"

Solution Needs

DRM beyond Security
- Rights Workflows (acquisition, granting, licensing)
- Modeling of complex Business Agreements
- Support business models & consumer expectations

Solutions with DRM
- Service Integration and Service Contracts
- Streamlined, automated internal processes
- External integration with Service Providers
- Interoperability between Trading Partners
- Market Imperatives must be factored
Example Environment

Streamline motion picture systems and processes
- Management, regulation, distribution of digital content
Distribute content in multiple digital formats
- Self-distribute from company's web site
- Sell through Trading partners
Reuse content in different ways

Scenario: Direct Distribution

Scenario: IP Licensing for Film

digital Commerce Framework

Savantech, Inc.

Content Integration Platform (dCI)
- Platform for building digital distribution solutions
- Integration of content applications, business agreements and workflows

Professional Services
- Experienced in providing solutions for the digital content market
- Leverages solutions sets, such as eMedia, ePublishing and RGS

Thank You

Robert Schuler
VP, Solutions
(310) 318-8822
robert.schuler@savantech.com
www.savantech.com
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Dave Cavena is the IBM Global Services Principal developing Digital Cinema opportunities in the areas of Systems Development, Application Development and Systems Integration, with the Major film studios and postproduction companies. His recent experience is as an IBM-Certified Executive Project Manager specializing in Systems Integration and Application Development projects in the area of Digital Cinema. Dave is a part of the Media and Entertainment Industry sector of IBM Global Services. He has twenty-two years of experience in the computer and communications industries, with a wide range of experience in Project Management, Management and Technical positions.
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Digitally captured, processed and presented motion images generate large volumes of data storage. The amount of storage required will continue to increase as projector resolution increases and as true digital multimedia archive capabilities come into being. From the projector back through the production chain, this storage will be located in places unaccustomed to managing digital systems. Given the build-out costs of the infrastructure, without a managed storage environment, Digital Cinema will be less efficient and less cost-effective than it most likely will need to be.

Storing and managing the storage and storage subsystems at an exhibition location will require different skills, and more expensive skills than currently exist at the exhibition point.

Back through the production chain, the storage requirements will continue to increase as we get to the uncompressed content, CGI, Digital Intermediates, stock footage and archiving. Increases in projector resolution will drive resolution increases back up the chain, as well.

Should archiving ultimately become a 4K x 3K environment, archiving of Hollywood content alone will require 7 Petabytes of data annually, or 7 million Gigabytes.

In the process, large amounts of data are stored and require secure management, yet the organizations within the production companies, studios, distributors, exhibition companies and exhibition venues, are not geared to manage digital content, its security, backup and recovery, capacity planning, failure trend analysis of disk subsystems, etc.

Increasing use of digital tools in postproduction, and the large data volumes required to post features today also necessitate a requirement to surge data storage as needed for post. One recent live action/animated feature required 197TB to post.

Technology refresh, the term we use to indicate capacity and performance increases in digital systems necessitating system replacement in order to keep speeds up and environmental consumption and floor space down, also are not within the purview of most of those in the production chain of feature films. The capabilities of storage systems are increasing as fast or faster than any other area of the digital infrastructure that will be used in Digital Cinema.

The ability of the Digital Cinema viewer to absorb the experience of Digital Cinema, and thereby the success of Digital Cinema itself, rests on the ability to store and manage the storage of content. The requirements of content owners and exhibitors for storage and the delivery of storage services will start high and continue to increase over the near term.

What does this all mean to the Digital Cinema world? That the delivery of cost-effective, well managed, secure storage must evolve to a point at which the obstacle to the delivery of Digital Cinema is not the cost of the storage, nor of the storage management, of the content.

The model for the cost-effective delivery of the storage required for content is undergoing change with the recent advent of providers of managed storage services: technology companies experienced in the business of managing digital storage systems. A storage services provider can plan for and gracefully manage backup, recovery, capacity planning, failure trend analysis, storage management systems and technology refresh – the replacement of subsystems made obsolescent by technological advances, where content creators managing those assets internally may lack similar capability and flexibility.

Through a services delivery model, these capabilities, as well as the capability to provide a timely and cost effective surge of storage capacity as required by postproduction, these needs can be met.
Thomas has been involved in the cinema business for 20 years. The following is a list of some of his latest accomplishments:

- Served as R&D Coordinator for the professional division of THX (1997-2000).
- Assisted THX with implementation and cinema design process of the "Surround EX" sound format for the release of "Star Wars Episode 1: The Phantom Menace".
- Co-designed and produced optical test films to critically analyze projection lenses and projection systems.
- Conducted research projects to analyze the acoustical efficiency of cinema auditorium construction designs.
- Designed and produced audio test films for THX.
- Assisted the THX Digital Mastering Program to master and exhibit the Digital Cinema releases of "Titan AE" and "Star Wars Episode 1: The Phantom Menace".
- Assisted in the development of the Lucasfilm/THX Digital Cinema Program.
- Joined Constellation 3D in June 2000.
"Very High Density Storage for D-Cinema"
by Tom Lipiec

Issues covered within the speech:

- Storage capabilities of the Fluorescent Multilayer Disc (FMD) and how it will benefit the Digital Cinema industry. A single FMD is capable storing 100GB of content with read rates of 45 to 100 Mb/s.
- The problems and solutions of Digital Cinema content transportation and storage.
- Content data storage security issues and options.
- Disc-based infrastructure and cost saving issues.