R&D

Improving Media Standards

• A few things brewing in R&D

• Media Standards
A few things brewing in R&D

- Internet Tracking (Listings)
  - Different mechanisms / Same info (DD)

- One Data Feed / Multiple Uses
  - Mechanism to specify what fields get to be used by who for what reason?

- OUID
  - Basic layout design done (easy part) – now need to populate (harder part)

- PUID
  - Separate Workgroup : ECCMA / RESO versions
Media Standards – Survey

• Online: 2015-05-26 – 2015-05-29

• Survey Target ::
  • RESO membership (all)
  • MLSs (provided by Wave Group)
  • Canadian boards & associations

• Great Response ::
  • 150 respondents!

• Why?
  • Determine scope of photo issues – anecdotal reports
  • Cross-Workgroup (Transport WebAPI, DD media fields, R&D problem id)
What area(s) do you most closely associate yourself with? Check all those that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board or Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLS Vendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Vendor/Provider (Client or Server)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Media Standards – Survey – Q2**

*What photo issues do you most commonly encounter? Check the ones that are most problematic.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad’ photo (i.e. out-of-focus, blurred, bad angle, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo too small for intended use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo too big for intended use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No photo of needed size available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying or unknown photo resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow photo load times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media Standards – Survey – Q2
Other – Most Common

• **Orientation / Aspect Ratio / White Banding / Cropping / Branding**
  - Watermarking, Branding Name/TM: Overlay position & size
  - Copyright details

• **Too many binary image transfers**
  - Not using mod / date indicator + reorder issue
  - Storage & transfer times
  - Use of URL would be better (one high-res image resized on-the-fly)
  - Too many images

• **Lack of control (resolution, size) once in the wild**
Do you believe that a RESO standard framework for relatively categorizing (i.e. Thumbnail, Medium, Large, Best), and making known (i.e. exposing) what image sizes are available, along with a means of obtaining the most suitable image for a given purpose (i.e. better than Thumbnail, but not Best quality, to display on a tablet for instance), would help improve the photo issues you encounter in question 2?

1 = 0-Do not believe it would help, 2 = 1, 3 = 2, 4 = 3, 5 = 4, 6 = 5, 7 = 6, 8 = 7, 9 = 8, 10 = 9, 11 = 10-Very Much Believe it would help

Number of Responses | Rating Score*
---|---
141 | 7.2

*The Rating Score is the weighted average calculated by dividing the sum of all weighted ratings by the number of total responses.

Convention:
- LMT - Keep
- Approx. size/quality
- MLS dependent

Absolute Quality:
- No standard
- Vendors compete

Trend:
- Best +++
- Diff form factors

Relative:
- Ordered
- Quality Description
- Range Query
- Best option
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>(8.5%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td>(19.9%)</td>
<td>(13.5%)</td>
<td>(7.8%)</td>
<td>(18.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Much Believe it would help

Hold the mouse over each color of the bar to see the number of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Media Standards – Survey – Q4

Comments – Summary (1)

- High Res Images get diluted along the way; not used to their fullest!
- No standard Last Modified Date/Time Stamp (DD!)
- Hard to specify & educate agents on image requirements
- Need minimum & recommended image size standards at MLS level
- Categorizing will help MLSs better define image sizes for REALTORS
- Standards are nice; enforcing compliance is another issue
- Want rich image metadata (i.e. caption, branding, copyright, etc.)
- Cost concerns for storing & serving multiple image sizes
Media Standards – Survey – Q4
Comments – Summary (2)

- Vendor image size restrictions
- Focus on a video standards!
- Standards will help better feed 3rd party websites
- Top realtor.ca complaints (1) Image size & quality (2) Too few photos
- Helping vendors create best practices around compressing, storing (in the cloud - CDN) for delivering varied image sizes could help
- Focus on having one high res image – resize from that on-the-fly
- Do not allow enhanced, stretched, distorted images
Thank You / Questions?

• Questions?

• Email me if you are interested in joining ::
  • R&D Workgroup
  • PUI Workgroup
    • lpd@EquiNetConsulting.com Paul Desormeaux

• Thank you!