MCIF Profiling WG meeting #3

19 June 2019

Attendees

Jill Boyce (Intel), Brian Lee (Dolby), Sean McCarthy (Dolby), Jim Harlan (InterDigital), Miska Hannuksela (Nokia), Alexis Tourapis (Apple) , Jud Cary (Cable Labs)

Agenda:

- Opens
- Review of presentation to board May 2019 Yokohama meeting
- Discussion about how MC-IF can define sub-profiles for VVC
- Review of strawman proposal
- Discussion, next steps

Presentation of slide deck.

Discussion:

Decoders may conform to one or multiple sub-profiles of a profile, or may conform to the full profile.

Question: What is MC-IF's motivation for defining VVC sub-profiles?
Responses:
- Want to achieve interoperability for VVC, while certain applications have a need for sub-profiles. Don't want proliferation of large number of sub-profiles in a way that would cause fragmentation of market.
- Process for defining sub-profiles should be clear, transparent, and unambiguous.
- Sub-profiling might encourage market adoption of VVC

Question: What requirements should there be for applications for a sub-profile code point allocation?
Response: Perhaps it would be useful to have applicants for code point describe why they think a sub-profile is needed, and the benefits.

Question: What would make 3rd party entities work with MC-IF instead of allocating code points on their own?
Response: This is probably not the most important issue to address, since MC-IF is aimed at benefiting the entire industry, not just MC-IF.

Question: What information would MC-IF Profiling WG members want to see to help decide if a code point should be allocated?
Responses:
- What is the intended use case for the sub-profile?
- Why is an existing profile or MCIF-defined sub-profile not sufficient for intended use?
    - Suggested that it is OK for MCIF to duplicate a sub-profile defined outside of MC-IF, to bring benefits such as public availability of description and conformance bitstreams

Question: Would information about intended use case be part of the published sub-profile documentation?
Response: This might be useful.

Question: What is the timeline for defining this sub-profile allocation process?
Response: It would be useful to have the process ready to go when VVC is finalized, or even before that.

Suggestion to have a guideline for MC-IF Profiling WG members to use to evaluate code point allocation. This could be in an internal document. There may be a potential issue with applicants accessing this document.

Question: How long would the decision making process take? Should that be documented?
Response: It would be difficult now to commit ourselves to any particular schedule.

Suggestion to make software available to modify an existing bitstream to indicate a sub-profile.

Question: Is voting OK to make decisions on sub-profile code point allocation?
Response: Support expressed for having a voting process to make decisions.

Suggestion to schedule a periodic meeting of the Profiling WG, perhaps every 3 months.

Question: Should we be communicating to the outside world about our intent to perform sub-profile code point allocation?
Response: May want to wait until process is defined, but that is not required. External communication should be discussed with the Board and the Marketing WG.

Question: Should we solicit input from industry to help define our code point allocation process?
Response: We can communicate to industry that MC-IF is planning to do sub-profile allocation, and ask those interested in contributing to the definition of the process to join MC-IF.

Next Profiling WG meeting to be scheduled after the July JVET/MPEG meeting.