

Exiv2 - Bug #833

Sony NEX Lens Information

01 Aug 2012 05:54 - Pascal de Bruijn

Status:	Closed	Start date:	01 Aug 2012
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	Robin Mills	% Done:	100%
Category:	exif	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	0.25		

Description

For Sony NEX camera's Exiv2 seems to report conflicting Lens information (though I'm not sure that is fixable, as this is just what Sony embeds):

```
$ exiv2 -pt DSC02526.JPG | grep -i lens
```

```
Exif.Sony1.LensID Long 1 T-Mount | Arax MC 35mm F2.8 Tilt+Shift | Arax MC 80mm F2.8 Tilt+Shift | Zenitar MF 16mm F2.8 Fisheye M42 | Samyang 500mm Mirror F8.0 | Pentacon Auto 135mm F2.8 | Pentacon Auto 29mm F2.8 | Helios 44-2 58mm F2.0 | No Lens
Exif.Photo.LensSpecification Rational 4 180/10 550/10 35/10 56/10
Exif.Photo.LensModel Ascii 23 E 18-55mm F3.5-5.6 OSS
```

And I find the Exif.Sony1.LensID values rather odd:

```
{ 65535, "T-Mount | "
    "Arax MC 35mm F2.8 Tilt+Shift | "
    "Arax MC 80mm F2.8 Tilt+Shift | "
    "Zenitar MF 16mm F2.8 Fisheye M42 | "
    "Samyang 500mm Mirror F8.0 | "
    "Pentacon Auto 135mm F2.8 | "
    "Pentacon Auto 29mm F2.8 | "
    "Helios 44-2 58mm F2.0 | "
    "No Lens" }
```

Shouldn't that be exclusively "Manual lens", instead of listing every possible manual lens (which is going to be a very long list :)

Associated revisions

Revision 3765 - 29 Apr 2015 16:33 - Robin Mills

#833. Thanks to Torsten and Pascal. Change Minolta 65535 (-1) to "Manual lens" from "E-Mount, T-Mount, Other Lens or No Lens"

History

#1 - 28 Apr 2015 11:59 - Robin Mills

- Status changed from New to Assigned
- Assignee set to Robin Mills
- Target version set to 0.25

Pascal

Do you have a test image that I can use to investigate this.

#2 - 28 Apr 2015 20:03 - Pascal de Bruijn

This is more of a conceptual problem than an EXIF parsing issue.

Sony seems to use ID 65535 when there are no electronic connected to the lens mount. Thus it makes no sense to make any particular lens claim.

This issue already has been partially cleaned up here:

<http://dev.exiv2.org/projects/exiv2/repository/entry/trunk/src/minoltamn.cpp#L1922>

However, I think the current output is still slightly misleading. When there are no electronic available it's actually unlikely there was an E-Mount lens detected (since E-Mount lenses have electronics, and there it certainly no reason to think it may be a T-Mount lens above anything else at all. Since you can get manual mount adapters for pretty much anything these days.

Returning "No lens" doesn't seem to be useful either, as this tends to be fairly obvious to differentiate since the image will just be a big blur or something along those lines.

So "Manual lens" is the only return value that seems to make sense to me. Unless I'm missing something.

#3 - 29 Apr 2015 12:56 - Torsten Bronger

I have uploaded an ARW with a picture taken with my NEX-7 and a manual lens here: <https://bob.ipv.kfa-juelich.de/bronger/dsc07642.arw>

#4 - 29 Apr 2015 16:36 - Robin Mills

Fix submitted [r3765](#). Thanks to Torsten and Pascal for your input and help with this. I agree 100% with Pascal's logic. The only sensible thing is to say "Manual Lens".

#5 - 29 Apr 2015 16:37 - Robin Mills

- Status changed from Assigned to Resolved

#6 - 08 May 2015 16:21 - Robin Mills

- % Done changed from 0 to 100

#7 - 21 Jun 2015 16:42 - Andreas Huggel

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed

Files

exiv2-sonyminolta-manual-lens.diff	940 Bytes	01 Aug 2012	Pascal de Bruijn
------------------------------------	-----------	-------------	------------------