

MAM 2005 benchmark study

Executive Summary	2
1. Methodology	9
2. Sites visited, people met	15
3. Inventory of existing applications	23
3.1. Main DAM applications in TV channels	32
3.2. Main DAM applications out of TV channels	33
3.3. New uses for browsing and indexing in TV stations	36
3.3.1. The state of the Arts before 2003	36
3.3.2. The current situation	38
3.3.3. Transmission	40
<i>Browse visualization for legal, branding, sponsoring issues</i>	
<i>Browse visualization for advertising</i>	
<i>Browse visualization for planning & scheduling</i>	
<i>Browse editing for multiple renditions</i>	
<i>Browse editing for trailers & promotions</i>	
3.3.4. Production	43
<i>Reediting and repurposing for multiple output channels</i>	
<i>Increasing audience level</i>	
<i>Production improvement in live sport events</i>	
<i>Improvement in program content</i>	
<i>Cost reduction and horizontal rationalization</i>	
3.3.5. Distribution	52
<i>Broadcasters are transforming into "distribution factories"</i>	
<i>Digital distribution</i>	
<i>Reselling of content</i>	
<i>New revenue sources for news and sports</i>	
<i>Content shared between different media</i>	
<i>Multiple format program delivery</i>	
4. Analysis of the market and of current MAM offerings	61
4.1. Four supplier categories	61
4.2. Comparison of the principal MAM content management products	66
<i>NB. Kane uses a grid of 104 features to compare 12 products: Blue Order, Harris Invenio, Harris Arkemedia, Pro-Bel Morpheus, Omnibus, Ibis, Siemens Colledia, DaletPlus, Ancept, Ardendo, Artesia, Virage-Autonomy.</i>	

5. Differing strategies and organizational approaches	78
<i>Organisational & technology choices to be made</i>	
<i>4 different project categories for complete digital migration</i>	
<i>Interdepartmental projects</i>	
5.1. Playout Centers	80
<i>Project scope, architecture & scheduling</i>	
<i>Video format issue</i>	
<i>Relation between rights and storage duration</i>	
<i>Container for multiple languages audio tracks</i>	
<i>Human vs. automatic indexing</i>	
<i>Volume & medium of storage</i>	
5.2. News production and archiving	82
<i>3 divergent strategies</i>	
<i>3 implementation strategies for mass storage</i>	
<i>Cataloguing methods</i>	
<i>Edited items vs. rushes</i>	
<i>Long GOP vs. Intra</i>	
<i>Volume & medium of storage</i>	
<i>Production metadata inheritance</i>	
5.3. General program production and archiving	86
<i>Sub-contracting & innovation</i>	
<i>Sports highlights</i>	
<i>Reality TV</i>	
<i>Dailies storage for dramas</i>	
5.4. Deep Archives	87
<i>Master formats for preservation</i>	
<i>2 different practices regarding deep archive in TV channels</i>	
<i>Diverse right owners strategies</i>	
5.5. Network architecture	89
<i>SDI vs. IP</i>	
5.6. Data architecture	92
<i>in search of MXF</i>	
<i>Component and services architectures</i>	
<i>Traffic system vs. MAM</i>	
5.7. Metadata capture methods	96
<i>Creative & editorial units vs. specialists</i>	
5.8. MAM Project Management	98
<i>Key success factors</i>	
<i>2 different strategies: universal content repository vs. services oriented /multiple repositories</i>	
6. Return on Investment	106
<i>ROI dependant on project category</i>	
7. Impact on jobs and human resources	108
<i>Multiskilling</i>	
<i>Increased IT staff numbers and roles</i>	
<i>Staff reduction due to automation</i>	
<i>Documentalists and librarians new role</i>	
8. Conclusions	112