

# MC-IF Profiling WG Minutes

17 April 2019, 9am Pacific Time

## Attendees

Jill Boyce (Intel) , Alexis Tourapis (Apple), Stephan Wenger (Tencent) , Brian Lee (Dolby), Alan Stein (Technicolor), Lucasz Litwic (Ericsson), Matthew Osborne (InterDigital)

## Agenda

- Roll call
- Presentation of Motivation and Background for sub-profiling (previously sent via email)
- Review and revision of WG charter
- Solicitation of WG chair candidates
- Scheduling of next call

## Discussion

After presentation of “Motivation and Background for sub-profiling” document, discussion about what a sub-profiling allocation process would be.

Concern raised about scope of the conversation within MC-IF, as we don't have a patent policy.

MC-IF is considering using Causeway. Would support voting, upload, commenting. But may want to disable commenting function on proposals for a codepoint allocation.

Question: Should MCIF do anything to avoid fragmentation by defining large number of similar sub-profiles by MC-IF or other groups?

Response: MC-IF defined sub-profile allocation process will naturally impose some hurdles in getting allocated an MC-IF code point

The by-laws state that the board would need to approve any public outputs of MC-IF.

Question: How would voting be defined? Would there be a quorum requirement for a vote?

Response: That would be part of the process that would be defined.

Should we add a charter item about defining a process for sub-profile allocation? Consensus that we should do that.

Question: What about interaction with other MC-IF WGs, particularly the interoperability WG?

Response: When we define a process, interaction with other MC-IF WGs can be considered.

Question: Should sub-levels also be defined by MC-IF? DVB has historically done that, e.g. by separating 50 Hz vs 60 Hz frame rates.

Response: Suggestion that definition of a sub-profile could incorporate that capability to restrict level as well, by restricting values of syntax elements.

Discussion about possible imposing requirements on a bitstream rather than just disallowing some syntax element values in the bitstream, such as requiring inclusion of a particular SEI message. This would require further discussion, as part of the definition of the process.

WG recommends modification of the draft charter as follows:

Replace this:

- Consider if MC-IF could act as registration authority for sub-profiles

With this:

- Define a process for MC-IF to use to serve as a registration authority for sub-profiles, initially focusing on VVC

Communication with application spec groups is important. Other MC-IF WG may be involved (Marketing, Outreach).

May want to solicit input from other organizations as we define our process. Will certainly want to communicate after the process is defined. Informal communication could also be helpful.

Question: What about duplication of effort to define the same or similar sub-profile by MC-IF and by other groups? How to communicate to avoid this duplication of effort?

No other volunteers for WG chair. Jill is willing to continue to serve after interim period.

Next meeting scheduling: Don't plan a WG F2F at Yokohama meeting. Plan another call.

Plan to send an email on the WG mailing list with the revised charter, ask for any objections within a week. If no objections, send to the board, and schedule next WG meeting for after board has approved (or disapproved/modified) charter.