NTIA TM-27-584

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Institute for Telecommunication Sciences
Technical Memorandum

JNR-ITScam: Dataset Track 2-1 from ITU-T Study Group 12 Validation of No-Reference Metrics for Camera Capture Impairments, Depicting the User-Generated Content Use Case

Margaret H. Pinson and Rob Grosso

October 2026
Boulder, Colorado
its.ntia.gov

Institute for Telecommunication Sciences
Technical Memorandum
NTIA TM-27-584
October 2026

JNR-ITScam: Dataset Track 2-1 from ITU-T Study Group 12 Validation of No-Reference Metrics for Camera Capture Impairments, Depicting the User-Generated Content Use Case

Margaret H. Pinson and Rob Grosso

United States Department of Commerce

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Institute for Telecommunication Sciences
325 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80305
its.ntia.gov

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

This publication is available free of charge from:
https://doi.org/10.70220/nxkzt99s

About the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences

The Institute for Telecommunication Sciences (ITS) is the research and engineering laboratory of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce (DoC). ITS manages the telecommunications technology research programs of NTIA and the DoC-owned Table Mountain Radio Quiet Zone. ITS works closely with other NTIA Line Offices to support Administration and Agency needs.

The mission of ITS is to ADVANCE innovation in communications technologies, INFORM spectrum and communications policy for the benefit of all stakeholders, and INVESTIGATE our Nation's most pressing telecommunications challenges through research that employees are proud to deliver.

ITS publishes fundamental research communications as part of its Technology Transfer efforts. We are committed to ensuring that our publications are substantive, technically sound, accurate, and clear. A rigorous peer review process, documented in the "ITS Publications Handbook Volume I: Policies (Third Edition)," safeguards the scientific integrity of ITS technical publications, journal articles, and conference papers. The principles for technical peer review of manuscripts guide parallel peer review processes for the publication of software and datasets.

ITS reports authored by NTIA employees are subject to 17 U.S.C. §105 and are U.S. Government works that are generally not subject to copyright protection in the United States. ITS publications, including software and datasets, are freely and openly available at its.ntia.gov or github.com/NTIA.

Principal NTIA Formal Publication Series Published by ITS

NTIA Technical Report (TR): Important contributions to existing knowledge of less breadth than a monograph, such as results of completed projects and major activities.

NTIA Technical Memorandum (TM): Technical information typically of less breadth than an NTIA Technical Report. The series includes data, preliminary project results, and information for a specific, limited audience.

NTIA Special Publication (SP): Conference proceedings; bibliographies; course and instructional materials; or major scientific studies mandated by Congress.

NTIA Monograph (MG): A scholarly, professionally oriented publication dealing with state-of-the-art research, or an authoritative treatment of a broad area. Expected to have long-lasting value.

NTIA Handbook (HB): Information pertaining to technical procedures; reference and data guides; and formal user's manuals that are expected to be pertinent for a long time.

For more information about NTIA fundamental research publications, contact the ITS Publications Office at 325 Broadway, Boulder, CO, 80305 Tel. 303-497-3572 or email ITSinfo@ntia.gov.

Disclaimer

Certain products, technologies, and corporations are mentioned in this report to describe aspects of the ways that video systems are used at present or may be used in the future. The mention of such entities should not be construed as any endorsement, approval, recommendation, prediction of success, or that they are in any way superior to or more noteworthy than similar entities that were not mentioned.

Contents

About the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences ii
Disclaimer iii
Figures v
Tables vi
Abbreviations/Acronyms vii
Executive Summary viii
1. Introduction 1
2. Raw Dataset from Videographers 3
3. Experiment Design 7
4. Subjective Testing 8
5. Conclusions 10
6. References 11
Appendix A. Guidance Provided to the Videographer 12
A.1 Choice of Cameras 12
A.2 Basic Requirements 12
A.3 Scenario Characteristics 13
A.4 Subject Matter 15
Appendix B. Instructions Provided to Subjects 17
B.1 Instructions for JNR-ITScam 17
B.2 Instructions for JNR-ITSps 18
REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE 19

Figures

Figure 1. Subjective testing was conducted in an office with indirect natural light and sit-stand desks. Credit: Margaret H. Pinson.....8

Tables

Table 1. Scenes. 3
Table 2. Cameras. 5
Table 3. Gender demographics. 9
Table 4. Age demographics. 9
Table 5. Vision self-assessment demographics 9
Table 6. Number ratings skipped. 9

Abbreviations/Acronyms

5G	Fifth generation of cellular network technology
ACR	Absolute Category Rating
AI	Artificial Intelligence
ASL	American Sign Language
CDVL	Consumer Digital Video Library
CU	Close-up
DSLR	Digital Single-Lens Reflex
ECU	Extreme Close-Up
FPS	Frames Per Second
MUMC	Medium Close-Up
NR	No Reference
PVS	Processed Video Sequence
UGC	User Generated Content
WS	Wide Shot

Executive Summary

From 2025 to 2026, ITU-T Study Group 12 Question 19 performed independent validation testing of models that assess video quality using only pixel values, referred to as "no-reference" or NR models. This effort culminated in ITU-T Rec. J.344, *No-reference objective video quality assessment models for full high-definition video* (07/2026), In force (prepublished) [3].

This report describes a video quality dataset that NTIA–ITS created in support of the ITU-T Study Group 12 Question 19 validation testing of no-reference (NR) models. The dataset name, JNR-ITScam, is a portmanteau (blend) of the ITU project (J.noref), the organizational attribution (NTIA–ITS), and the focus of the dataset (camera impairments).

JNR-ITScam systematically examines the diverse responses of modern cameras. The dataset contains a matrix of 11 high-performance cameras, 4 consumer-grade mini cameras, and 23 scenarios that are designed to test camera performance. The videos were rated with the Absolute Category Rating (ACR) method from ITU-T Rec. P.910. The variance in subject ratings is higher than coding-only datasets, which is a known trend in datasets that contain camera capture impairments.

JNR-ITScam was designed to support the training and testing of NR models on contemporary camera systems. The matrix design helps researchers identify model weaknesses to specific cameras and scenarios. The dataset is not intended for comparing the performance of specific cameras, which would require tighter control on filming.

The JNR-ITScam dataset is freely available in the Consumer Digital Video Library (CDVL) (www.cdvl.org). The download includes 366 videos, individual subject ratings, and leftover videos (e.g., other scenarios filmed on the same cameras). ITU-T Rec. J.344 refers to this dataset as Track 2-1.

JNR-ITScam: Dataset Track 2-1 from ITU-T Study Group 12 Validation of No-Reference Metrics for Camera Capture Impairments, Depicting the User-Generated Content Use Case

Margaret H. Pinson[1] and Rob Grosso[2]

Abstract: This memorandum documents a video quality subjective test conducted by NTIA–ITS in support of the ITU-T Study Group 12 Question 19 validation of no-reference (NR) metrics from 2025 to 2026. This test focuses on user-generated content and is named JNR-ITScam. ITU-T Rec. J.344 refers to this dataset as Track 2-1. The videos demonstrate various camera capture impairments produced by high-performance cameras and consumer-grade mini cameras in late 2025.

Keywords: ACR, camera, dataset, ITU-T Study Group 12, no-reference (NR) metric, subjective test, validation, video quality

1. Introduction

This report describes a video quality subjective test that NTIA–ITS conducted in support of the ITU-T Study Group 12 Question 19 validation testing of no reference (NR) metrics in 2025 to 2026. This effort, referred to as J.noref, is the first independent validation test that was designed specifically for NR metrics. NTIA–ITS conducted two experiments in support of this model validation effort. The first dataset, JNR-ITScam, is described in this report. The second dataset, JNR-ITSps, is described in [1].

JNR-ITScam systematically examines the diverse responses of contemporary cameras. The design goal was to assess whether the J.noref models work well on contemporary camera systems, thus enabling a statement to that effect in the ITU Recommendation. The dataset examines camera capture artifacts and camera coding artifacts produced by the camera itself. Professional videographers filmed a full matrix of scenarios and contemporary cameras specifically for the J.noref effort. The subject matter depicts user generated content (UGC) on a variety of digital cameras available in late 2025. The videos were delivered in February

[1] The author is with the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, Boulder, CO 80305.
[2] The author is formerly with the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, Boulder, CO 80305.

2026, after model submission. The videographers commented that it was an unusual challenge to allow these cameras to produce low-quality videos.

The JNR-ITScam dataset was inspired by the Consumer Content Resolution and Image Quality Dataset (CCRIQ) dataset [2], where Intel, NTIA–ITS, and the University of Ghent systematically assessed the image quality produced by different types of digital cameras. The CCRIQ data design diverged from prior camera studies in that the cameras were handheld (for greater mundane realism), instead of mounted on tripods (to eliminate uncontrolled variables). The matrix of scenes and cameras makes the CCRIQ dataset particularly valuable for NR model training and testing, since model failures can be systematically attributed to specific cameras or scenarios.

More information on J.noref can be found in ITU-T Rec. J.344, *No-reference objective video quality assessment models for full high-definition video* (07/2026), In force (prepublished) [3].

2. Raw Dataset from Videographers

NTIA–ITS provided the guidance in Appendix A to the professional videographers. Table 1 lists all scenarios filmed. Cameras A to L were high-performance cameras. Cameras M to P were consumer-grade mini cameras. Table 2 lists the 16 cameras selected by the videographers. Artificial intelligence (AI) was used to create a short description of each camera's properties that omits make and model information. All cameras captured 1920×1080 resolution at 30 frames per second (fps).

The raw dataset, as filmed, is not a perfect matrix. Some scenes were not captured for some cameras, and some scenes were filmed twice with different camera settings. For more information, see file "Cameras and Scene Chart (FINAL).xlsx" in the JNR-ITScam distribution package on CDVL.

Table 1. Scenes.

Scene Name	Subject Matter	Camera Test Goal and Design Elements
Amaryllis	Amaryllis flowers	Testing different focal points; extreme close up (ECU) detail and zoom (when available); vibrant color
ASL	American Sign Language (ASL) person signing rapidly	Testing movement (hands and mouth) in foreground against "visually noisy" background
Asphalt	POV walking on street	Testing repetitious or indistinguishable fine detail while camera is in motion; motion blur
BigFish	Aquarium CU large fish	Testing movement of large item (grouper) behind glass
Bridge	Bridge over Pee Dee River at boat launch	Testing flowing water under bridge of various straight lines; moving traffic; everything in focus
Candlelight	Candle lighting artwork	Testing extremely low light (single candle) against static dark background
CityLights	Uptown Night Lights	Testing focus and grain amount in low light
Coltrane	Black, white, grey Coltrane mural	Testing pan across black, white, grey artwork; Southern town; music video-style background
ColtraneStatic	Black, white, grey Coltrane mural	Testing black, white, grey (static shot); grungy Southern town; music video-style background; flat artwork
DepthofField	Lantana, berries, leaves	Close up (CU) testing shallow depth of field

Scene Name	Subject Matter	Camera Test Goal and Design Elements
Fenceline	Fenceline Ft. Fisher	Testing camera traveling along straight lines; walking with camera; jiggling/bouncing picture; backlit
FirePlace	Flames in propane fireplace	Testing controlled flames
FountainLgts	Daniel Stowe Conservancy - fountain lights	Testing at dusk and dark; splashing water, low light
FruitsVeggies	ECU fruits and veggies	Testing ECU to pull back and/or pan across vibrantly colored items (fruits and veggies); professionally lit; high saturation of color
GolfSwing	CU golf swing	Testing impact and fast motion across one section of the screen
Hockey	Hockey practice	Testing numerous moving objects (people)
InsideOut	Sunroom, vertical blinds: sunny outside, natural lighting inside	Testing bright natural light outside, darker, unlit inside
LotsoFish	Aquarium fish swimming, schooling	Testing movement of many items behind glass; low light
Marathon	Charlotte Marathon	Testing many bodies in motion (from far away to CU); early morning sun
MauiLgts_stationary	Botanical Gardens Holidays in the Garden	Testing stationary camera in low light; multiple lights; flashing lights; color at night
MauiLgts	Botanical Gardens Holidays in the Garden	Testing camera pan of multiple lights; flashing lights; color at night
MorrowMtn	Morrow Mountain State Park - WS pan from scenic overlook	Testing visible levels of color and depth while panning
Mums	ECU mums	Testing ECU ability/clarity coupled with camera movement
Murals	City Artwork - Uptown Charlotte	Testing bright colors in monochromatic setting
Piano	Hands playing on piano keys MUMC	Testing hands in motion against black and white lines
PianoMan	Young man playing piano	Testing very light skin tone; young person hands in motion
RackFocus	Mums and golf course	Testing rack focus; change of focal point
Rain	Slow rain on deck	Testing slow rain on surfaces

Scene Name	Subject Matter	Camera Test Goal and Design Elements
RaysandBranches	Sun through bare trees	Testing shooting into sun through bare branches
RockWall	Pan along rock wall	Testing pan across uneven surface background; black, grey, white
SlotCar	Slot car on track	Testing camera following a fast-moving object; motion blur
SlotZip	Slot car zips through shot	Testing object (hot pink slot car) zipping across the screen; motion blur
Sunset	Sunset Airport	Testing ramped color/lighting
TetheredLeaves	Leaves in the wind	Testing zoom coupled with attached objects moving (autumn leaves in the wind)
TrafficArch	Moving traffic through arch	Testing moving objects in one section of the frame
TunnelLgts	Daniel Stowe - tunnel lights	Testing nighttime lights with camera tilt motion
WaterTower	Tilt down on Water Tower	Testing zoom; straight lines with camera tilt; simple image against blue sky background
Waves	WS beach, ocean waves, coastline Ft. Fisher, Kure Beach	Testing entire scene intended to be in focus; splashing water

Table 2. Cameras.

ID	Type	Description	Typical bit rate
A	phone	Advanced dual-camera smartphone with strong video stabilization	15 Mbps
B	phone	Budget 5G smartphone camera with everyday versatility	17 Mbps
C	phone	AI-enhanced smartphone camera with excellent computational photography	22 Mbps
D	phone	Compact single-camera smartphone with reliable image quality	15 Mbps
E	phone	Triple-camera smartphone with strong low-light performance	15 Mbps
F	phone	Affordable 5G smartphone camera for casual photography	20 Mbps
G	tablet	Tablet camera suited for video calls and scanning	15 Mbps
H	pro	Professional broadcast camcorder with excellent manual video controls	35 Mbps
I	mirrorless	Advanced mirrorless camera for hybrid photo and video	48 Mbps

ID	Type	Description	Typical bit rate
J	DSLR	Beginner-friendly DSLR with strong battery life and autofocus	30 Mbps
K	point-and-shoot	Compact point-and-shoot camera with basic zoom capabilities	40 Mbps
L	action	Rugged action camera for stabilized outdoor adventure footage; no zoom	45 Mbps
M	action	Budget action camera with basic waterproof recording features; no zoom and no capability for visual monitoring while shooting	21 Mbps
N	dash	Compact dash camera with discreet design and night vision; no zoom	7 Mbps
O	nanny	Low-cost wearable camera with basic recording functionality; no zoom and no capability for visual monitoring while shooting	16 Mbps
P	spy	Concealable pen camera with simple covert video recording; no zoom and no capability for visual monitoring while shooting	22 Mbps

3. Experiment Design

The J.noref test plan allows datasets with 200 to 400 processed video sequences (PVS). The videographers filmed approximately 600 videos, so some had to be left out of the experiment.

We started by eliminating cameras and scenes that contained aspects that are outside the scope of the J.noref model validation test plan. Camera K was eliminated because it occasionally drops a frame (i.e., write speed cannot keep up with the frame rate). Scene *Fenceline*, *RaysandBranches*, and *Sunset* were eliminated because they contain sun flares, which are prohibited by the J.noref test plan.

Of the remaining 35 scenes, we pulled from all 15 cameras for 12 scenes that do the best job of demonstrating differences among cameras that would impact subject ratings. This selection produced a total of 180 PVSs. This scene pool contains *ASL*, *BigFish*, *Candlelight*, *CityLights*, *Coltrane*, *FruitsVeggies*, *Marathon*, *MauiLgts*, *RackFocus*, *SlotCar*, *SlotZip*, and *WaterTower*.

We then selected a second set of scenes that show fewer differences among cameras. This scene pool contains *Amaryllis*, *ColtraneStatic*, *DepthofField*, *FirePlace*, *Hockey*, *LotsoFish*, *MorrowMtn*, *Mums*, *Piano*, *PianoMan*, *Rain*, *RockWall*, *TetheredLeaves*, and *TunnelLgts*. We were concerned that subjects would get frustrated, because some cameras produced very similar videos for these scenes. Therefore, we eliminated four cameras that had the least unique characteristics: Cameras C, D, G, and J were removed. This reduced the camera pool to 11 cameras but added an additional 186 PVSs to the dataset.

The entire JNR-ITScam dataset has 366 PVSs:

- 180 PVSs from the first scene pool
- 186 PVSs from the second scene pool

The remaining scenes did a poor job of demonstrating differences among cameras.

Some of the PVSs were slightly longer than allowed by the J.noref test plan. These PVSs were edited in duration to be within plus or minus 3% of 5 seconds (146 to 155 frames). Like the professional videographer, we saved the edited videos at a high bit rate to avoid adding coding artifacts.

4. Subjective Testing

Appendix A shows the instructions given to the subjects. Readers who prefer to learn by example may want to read those instructions before this section.

The subjective test was conducted on a 27-inch monitor with 1920×1080 native resolution. Figure 1 shows the quiet room used for subjective testing. This room contained our standard office configuration: a quiet room with sit-stand desks, ergonomic chairs, fluorescent lights, and indirect natural light coming through large windows. The temporary agency provided 28 subjects with a broad distribution of genders and ages (see Table 3 and Table 4). The data spreadsheet contains ratings from one pre-test subject (29) who used a 13-inch laptop monitor with 1920×1080 native resolution. The pre-test subject took the test in a different location and is omitted from the demographics reported below.



Figure 1. Subjective testing was conducted in an office with indirect natural light and sit-stand desks. Credit: Margaret H. Pinson.

The experiment was controlled by the AVRateNG software [4]–[5]. The experiment was conducted according to ITU-T Rec. P.910 [6] and used the Absolute Category Rating (ACR) method with a 5-point scale and the skip option.

The experiment was self-paced. Subjects were paid for four hours, encouraged to take breaks, and left as soon as they finished. Most subjects took between 2 to 2.5 hours to finish both experiments, and very few subjects took longer than 3 hours.

Table 3 shows the distribution of subject genders, Table 4 shows the distribution of subject ages, and Table 5 shows the distribution of subject visual acuity (self-assessment). Table 6 shows the distributions of number of PVSs skipped. This shows that the skip option was not abused: 46% of subjects never used the skip option and the maximum was 4% of PVSs skipped.

Table 3. Gender demographics.

Male	Female	Non-binary	Rather not say
15	11	1	1

Table 4. Age demographics.

18 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69
9	3	9	4	2	1

Table 5. Vision self-assessment demographics.

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Bad
10	14	4	0	0

Table 6. Number ratings skipped.

0 Skip	1 Skip	2 Skip	3 Skip	5 Skip	6 Skip	7 Skip	15 Skip
13	4	4	2	2	1	1	1

5. Conclusions

The JNR-ITScam dataset is available on the Consumer Digital Video Library (CDVL, www.cdvl.org). The ZIP file contains the following:

- 366 videos rated by subjects
- Spreadsheet with individual subject ratings
- Spreadsheet that shows the matrix of duplicate and missing scenes (e.g., where the videographer filmed the same scenario with two different camera settings)
- Leftover videos filmed by the professional videographers but not used for the JNR-ITScam experiment

ITU-T Rec. J.344 refers to JNR-ITScam as Track 2-1.

6. References

[1] Margaret H. Pinson, John Dumke, and Rob Grosso, "JNR-ITSps: Dataset Track 2-2 from ITU-T Study Group 12 Validation of No-Reference Metrics for Camera Capture Impairments, Depicting the Public Safety Use Case," Technical Memorandum NTIA TM-27-585, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, October 2026. https://doi.org/10.70220/nqwtpz2l

[2] Michele A. Saad et al., "Impact of Camera Pixel Count and Monitor Resolution Perceptual Image Quality," in *Proceedings of the Colour and Visual Computing Symposium (CVCS) 2015* (Gjovik, Norway, August 2015), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/CVCS.2015.7274887

[3] International Telecommunication Union, Recommendation ITU-T J.344 (07/2026), In force (prepublished), *No-reference objective video quality assessment models for full high-definition video*, ITU, Geneva, Switzerland. https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-J.344-202607-P/en

[4] Steve Göring, Rakesh Rao Ramachandra Rao, Stephan Fremerey, and Alexander Raake, "AVrate Voyager: An Open Source Online Testing Platform," in *2021 IEEE 23rd International Workshop on Multimedia Signal Processing (MMSP)* (Tampere, Finland, October 2021), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/MMSP53017.2021.9733561

[5] "AVRateNG – GitHub Project," https://github.com/Telecommunication-Telemedia-Assessment/avrateNG. Accessed: January 5, 2026.

[6] International Telecommunication Union, Recommendation ITU-T P.910 (07/2026), *Subjective video quality assessment methods for multimedia applications*, ITU, Geneva, Switzerland. https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-P.910.

[7] Margaret H. Pinson et al., "The Influence of Subjects and Environment on Audiovisual Subjective Tests: An International Study," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* 6, no. 6 (October 2012): 640–651 https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTSP.2012.2215306

Appendix A. Guidance Provided to the Videographer

The information in this Appendix was provided to the videographer to explain their task. Normally, videographers use professional cameras and seek to obtain the highest quality possible. This experiment requires the opposite mindset, where the videographer uses low quality cameras and the intent is to obtain low quality videos. This in-depth explanation was intended to flip the videographer's mindset.

A.1 Choice of Cameras

We would like to make sure the cameras have different quality responses, from good to bad.

The set of 16 cameras must include:

- Two DSLRs
- One compact / point and shoot
- Two action cameras or bodycams
- Two spy cameras (e.g., nanny cam)
- One dash cam (installed by the driver, not for law enforcement)
- Six smartphones, mostly phones released recently
- One tablet
- One professional camcorder (the highest quality you own)

A.2 Basic Requirements

- Record a minimum of 400 unique videos, each 5 second duration (edited or as filmed)
- Photograph the same scenarios with a set of modern digital cameras
- Use a diverse set of 16 cameras
- Record 25+ scenarios with each camera
- Cameras are typically handheld and used one after the other (i.e., some variations will result)
- Tripods may be used for professional cameras and DSLRs
- Handheld photography is preferred if tripod use is rare (e.g., cell phones)
- Some scenarios will intentionally include camera impairments (e.g., low light, too quick pan)

- We would appreciate good aesthetics where possible
- 1920x1080 resolution
- Landscape orientation
- Frame rates from 24 to 60 fps (as appropriate for the camera)
- Standard dynamic range (not high dynamic range)
- Sound is optional (the validation test will be visual only)
- Each 5-second scene must be filmed continuously (no scene cuts)

A.3 Scenario Characteristics

The videographer will choose a set of 25+ scenarios to be filmed by each camera. The goal is that the scenarios show different situations where cameras are used, and the different responses from the cameras (some better, some worse).

The scenario characteristics are to be selected for specific characteristics, with the intention of stressing the cameras in different ways. Since each camera is used one after another, we expect large differences among the recordings from the cameras (e.g., when filming a dog running in a park, the dog's position will change, scenes will be framed slightly differently, and pan speeds will not be identical). It is allowed for the scenario to change slightly among cameras (e.g., film a different portion of a longer dance, film a stage magician demonstrating a variety of tricks).

The videographer should use their best judgement when operating the high-end cameras (e.g., settings for DSLRs and professional camcorders). The other cameras should be used in their default configuration (automatic mode) and handheld.

The following scene elements and scenarios are of interest. Some scenarios may not be possible on all cameras.

- Skin tones, including a diversity of genders, ages, and skin colors / genetic background
- Indoors and outdoors, including landscape with distant objects
- Various lighting levels and lighting types (e.g., sun shining into the lens, full sun, partial shade, backlight, low light, night, artificial light, streetlights, and professional lighting)
- Various focal distances and focal depth, including small objects very near the lens (e.g., ants moving) to very long (e.g., landscape)
- Different camera motions including pans with various speeds and moving forward or backward
- Various camera zooms, including zoom past the optical zoom limit, static zoom, and dynamic zoom of different speeds
- Jiggling or bouncing picture (e.g., handheld camera)

- Follow a fast-moving object (e.g., car driving on the road)
- A flat object (e.g., painting or diagram)
- Different amounts of motion in the scene
  - Low motion = most of the pixels stay the same from frame to frame
  - High motion = most of the pixels change dramatically from frame to frame, and the scene contains a huge variety of colors
- Very fast motion, object moves across the screen in ≈1 second (e.g., boxing)
- Different amounts of details in the scene (little to lots)
- Different amounts of color in the scene (nearly black/white to many vibrant colors)
- Different stabilization conditions from no stabilization used up to external mechanical stabilization.

Note that high-motion scenarios are surprisingly hard to create. The most famous high motion scene used for our research shows a race with maybe 100 people running from far away and left to close and right. Sports, races, and dancing tend to be high motion, especially if combined with camera motion.

The following unusual elements are of interest:

- Repetitious or indistinguishable fine detail (e.g., gravel, grass, hair, rug, pinstripes)
- Sharp black/white edges
- Blurred background, with an in-focus foreground
- Entire picture is intended to be in focus
- Motion blur
- Night or dimly lit scene (camera noise, noticeable white level problems)
- Too bright lighting (potentially washing out colors, noticeable black level problems)
- Ramped color (e.g., sunset)
- Water, fire, or smoke (for unusual shapes and shifting patterns)
- Flashing lights or other extremely fast events
- Action in a small portion of the total picture
- Colorful scene
- Small amounts of analog noise (e.g., camera gain from dim lighting)
- Multiple objects moving in a random, unpredictable manner

- Visually simple imagery (e.g., black birds flying across a blue sky)
- Very saturated colors
- Many straight edges
- A person with pierced tongue, tattoos, or painted fingernails
  - Note: American Sign Language interpreters told us that these may cause odd or distracting camera effects, as the mouth or tattoo or fingernails move.
- Something behind glass (e.g., painting or display behind a window), for the reflections on the glass
- Something that has only shades of black, white, and grey (e.g., ink drawing)

Where possible, each scenario should be recorded on all cameras. Deviations are allowed. We recognize that some interesting scenarios might not be possible on a few cameras (e.g., the zoom option is not available). Or a camera might break.

A.4 Subject Matter

The following kinds of subject matters are of particular interest. Many of these have been particularly useful for video quality research.

- Amateur sports (e.g., tennis, martial arts, boxing, soccer, baseball, volleyball)
- Action sports (i.e., the person holding the camera is moving quickly)
- Crowd of people (e.g., busy sidewalk, stadium stands, people exiting an event)
- Many people running
- Racing (e.g., horses, cars, bicycles, dogs, swimming, motorcycles)
- Dancing (e.g., ballet, street dancing)
- The look and feel of a segment from a music video or concert
- DJ with light show in front of a large pixel wall showing new age digital art or animations
- Tiny objects moving erratically (e.g., confetti falling, sparklers, fireworks)
- Physical comedy with brightly colored costumes (e.g., stage magic, mime, slapstick, juggling)
- Someone conversing fluently in ASL
- Look and feel of a nature documentary scene (e.g., trees, leaves, moving water, animals with high detail)
- Close-up macro shot of insect(s)

- Scenarios inspired by the most popular short videos (e.g., Instagram, TikTok)

We would like enough visual interest and variety among subject matter to keep people entertained. Where possible, the subject matter should be interesting and visually pleasing. The NR metrics cannot assess aesthetics. Good aesthetic elements (including framing) will help keep people entertained as they watch the videos and rate their quality.

Appendix B. Instructions Provided to Subjects

This Appendix contains the instructions for two experiments: JNR-ITScam (described in this memorandum) and JNR-ITSps [1]. Subjects participated in JNR-ITS-cam and then JNR-ITSps.

We conducted JNR-ITScam first, because it has a narrower range of quality than JNR-ITSps. Subjects always adapt the rating scale to the context of videos presented. MOSs are relative, not absolute [7]. By conducting JNR-ITScam first, we allowed for as wide a range of MOSs as possible for JNR-ITScam.

B.1 Instructions for JNR-ITScam

Thank you for participating in our study. The purpose of this study is to gather individual perceptions of the quality of several short videos. Your data will support an international effort to validate the accuracy of metrics that estimate video quality.

In this experiment, you will be presented with a series of 5-second videos. Each time a video is played, you will be asked to judge its quality. A rating screen will appear with the options of excellent, good, fair, poor, and bad. Use the mouse to select the rating that best describes your opinion of the video. After you have clicked on one of the options, click on the "Rate" button to record your response and play the next video.

You can pause the test at any time by entering your quality judgement but not pressing the “Rate” button.

The rating screen includes a “skip” option, in case you get distracted and cannot rate the video. This happens to everyone occasionally.

Do not worry about somehow giving the wrong answer; there is no right or wrong answer. Everyone’s opinion will be slightly different. We simply want to record your opinion.

Two warnings about the test software. First, the very first video played and the first rating screen are sometimes not well synchronized. This should not happen again. Second, you can move the rating window, but please don’t. We want you to watch the entire 5 second video before rating it.

Today’s experiment is divided into two topics. In the first part, the videos show the same scenarios filmed on a variety of modern cameras. One of these videos examines the camera’s ability to change focus from a near object (flowers) to a far object (trees). In the second part, the videos show modern video systems used by first responders. I will need to change some settings on your computer before you can proceed to the second part.

We will start with a few practice clips while I am standing here. After that, the experiment will be self-paced. We encourage you to take breaks occasionally, but this is not required.

<<play the practice session>>

I will be in the room next door. Come get me if you have any questions, problems, or need to use the restroom. Feel free to adjust the desk, chair, and monitor.

B.2 Instructions for JNR-ITSps

The second part of our test explores the first responder use case: in-car cameras, automated driving, video surveillance, drones, search and rescue, firefighters, law enforcement, training events, etc.

10% of the videos in this session are pictures, because law enforcement officers often need to extract single frames from videos to understand what is going on.

The test interface is the same, but you will see a mixture of camera capture impairments and video compression impairments. As you rate these videos, pretend you are a first responder, and you have to use the video or picture to do your job.

We will start with another short training session, to help you adjust to this scenario and the new range of quality.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED	
		START DATE	END DATE
October 2026	Technical Memorandum	01/2025	09/2026

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
JNR-ITScam: Dataset Track 2-1 from ITU-T Study Group 12 Validation of No-Reference Metrics for Camera Capture Impairments, Depicting the User-Generated Content Use Case

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	5b. GRANT NUMBER	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
5d. PROJECT NUMBER	**5e. TASK NUMBER**	**5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER**
3147012-300	1	NTIA-ITS.TAM

6. AUTHOR(S)
Margaret H. Pinson and Rob Grosso

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Institute for Telecommunication Sciences
National Telecommunications and Information Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
325 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80305

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
NTIA TM-27-584

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
National Telecommunications and Information Administration
Herbert C. Hoover Building
1401 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
NTIA

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
This memorandum documents a video quality subjective test conducted by NTIA–ITS in support of the ITU-T Study Group 12 Question 19 validation of no-reference (NR) metrics from 2025 to 2026. This test focuses on user-generated content and is named JNR-ITScam. ITU-T Rec. J.344 refers to this dataset as Track 2-1. The videos demonstrate various camera capture impairments produced by high-performance cameras and consumer-grade mini cameras in late 2025.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
ACR, camera, dataset, ITU-T Study Group 12, no-reference (NR) metric, subjective test, validation, video quality

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	C. THIS PAGE		
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UU	28

19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	19b. PHONE NUMBER *(Include area code)*
Margaret H. Pinson	*720-601-7314*