

MC-IF Profiling WG Minutes

2 April 2019, 3pm Pacific Time

Attendees

Jill Boyce (Intel) , Alexis Tourapis (Apple), Stephan Wenger (Tencent) , Brian Lee (Dolby), Alan Stein (Technicolor), Justin Ridge (Nokia)

Agenda

- Roll call
- Review of draft charter and discussion on possible revisions
- Review of strawman proposal for sub-profile indicator code points
- Additional discussion and revision of charter
- Solicitation of candidates for WG chair
- Schedule next WG meeting

Discussion

Draft Charter for Profiling WG:

- Identify need for profiling, sub-profiling, constraint flags, and sets thereof, initially for VVC
- Communicate MC-IF requests or recommendations to relevant bodies, including VCEG, MPEG
- Consider if MC-IF could act as registration authority for sub-profiles

A document with a strawman process for MCIF sub-profiling had been previously circulated on the Profiling WG reflector.

Suggestion: Make clear that MC-IF sub profile idc can't be revoked or recommitted.

Response: Can worry about that later.

Question: Does definition of a sub-profile impose any restrictions on a decoder?

Response: No, the sub-profile indicator constrains the bitstream, not a decoder. If a decoder can decode bitstreams conforming to a profile, it will automatically be able to decode bitstreams conforming to a sub-profile of that profile. However, it is possible for a decoder to choose to conform to a sub-profile without conforming to the full profile.

Question: Should MCIF try to provide some type of conformance checker?

Response: Might be worth considering.

Comment: Strawman sub-profile proposal could change the role of the board to be more of a gatekeeper than merely administrative in nature.

Response: The by-laws require that the board approve anything made public by MC-IF, so there doesn't seem to be any way around having board approval of a sub-profile code point.

Question: Should we also define a process to retire a sub-profile idc?

Response: Could be postponed, and could be considered if we start to run out of code points.

Suggestion: Consider to split the third charter bullet into 2 items?

1. Consider whether MC-IF should publish a list of recommended sub-profiles
2. Collect from other organizations about sub-profiling e.g. about if it would be useful for MC-IF to publish such a list of sub-profiles

Comment: MC-IF could do the small amount of work necessary to define such a process, and the market will decide later whether or not to utilize it. This is a service that we could offer to the industry, and if nobody chooses to use it, there isn't any harm.

Question: Should we limit this to VVC? What about PCC or MPEG-5 EVC? May wish to communicate with MPEG about adding support within V-PCC or MPEG-5 EVC to enable sub-profiles.

Response: All that would be required for those other specifications would be to add a sub-profile indicator in their syntax and tool constraint flags. The MC-IF code point is tied to a particular specification & profile. The strawman process document could be easily updated to be more general than just VVC.

Comment: Should announce on the reflector that a chair can be selected, and ask if anyone wants to be considered. The Bylaws say that there is one chair per WG.

Asked to finalize charter and nominate chair by May 3.

For next call, try to rotate the time to be friendly/unfriendly to other time zones. Aim for some time the week of April 15. Good Friday is April 19, so try to aim for early that week.

Aim to make some charter revisions at the next meeting. Ask people to submit suggested revisions on the email reflector. Encourage people on the main reflector to join the profiling WG reflector in order to access the minutes of this meeting. The email reflector has an archive available to subscribers.

