

From: Benzler Ulrich (FV/SLM) * <Ulrich.Benzler@de.bosch.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2002 12:42 AM
To: Shun-ichi Sekiguchi; Luthra Ajay-MGI1164
Cc: Jvt-Experts (E-mail)
Subject: [jvt-experts] Re: Special (Funny) position + MC memory analysis is adhoc group

Dear Sekiguchi-san, Ajay, colleagues,

I agree to all the points in Sekiguchi-san's Email, i.e.

- only use 2 interlaced sequences instead of 6 (Bus is OK, maybe it's better to use Canoa instead of Football for fast motion because of less motion blur)
- only use IBBP, as IPPP gives no additional insight
- set the number of reference frames to 2 for HHR to save computation time - after all, we do not really compare coding efficiency here. This leads me to the question if 5 reference frames are needed for CIF...

I would further propose to skip QP40 in favour of QP24 (four RD points should be enough, so this means replacing QP28 by QP12 in the "old counting" in VCEG-N81), and use only QP24 and QP36 for subjective assessment. And do we really need 7 CIF sequences for the MC analysis tests?

Ajay, Sherman, do the yellow fields in the test sequence table (news and mobile) have a meaning?

And does anyone already have a tool for generating butterfly sequences, so that we do not have to re-implement it several times?

Best regards,

Ulrich

P.S.: Bosch will not be able to contribute to the special position tests, only to the MC analysis related to D-106.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Shun-ichi Sekiguchi [mailto:koufum@isl.melco.co.jp]
> Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 6:16 AM
> To: Luthra Ajay-MGI1164
> Cc: Jvt-Experts (E-mail)
> Subject: [jvt-experts] Re: Special (Funny) position + MC memory
> analysis adhoc group
>
>
> Dear Ajay, experts,
>
> Thank you for summarizing the latest status.
>
> We, Mitsubishi, will do the experiment on MC memory access regarding

> D110, and try to contribute to providing further results on Special
> Position experiment. Ajay, could you please add my name to the
> participant list of MC memory access experiment?
>
> And, do we have to do experiments on 5 Qp values? I personally think
> that Qp=40(old Qp=28) could be deleted from the test condition since
> it may result in terrible quality. As for the software, if the release
> timing of official JM4.1 is too late(when and who will judge? ^^);, I
> recommend to use JM4.0d (this is the latest official software).
>
> In addition, I'd like to revisit the following issues regarding MC
> memory access experiment that have been addressed in my previous
> emails.
> All of them are related to the running cost of experiments.
> Ajay, please deal with these comments for the finalization of the test
> condition.
>
> 1) Do we really need to evaluate 6 interlaced materials? Do all
> experimenters agree with this? I have requested to reduce the
> number of sequences(for example, football for random motion and
> bus for rather uniform motion). I think Suzuki-san agreed with
> this point.
>
> 2) Do we need to provide IPPP based coding results? For example,
> Nokia's
> proposal does not care about this structure. In this sense, can we
> evaluate all related proposals by I/P/B coding result only?
> Suzuki-san also presented his opinion that I/P/B result would be
> sufficient. My opinion is the same.
>
> 3) As for the HHR content, do we need to set the number of reference
> frames to more than 2?
>
> 4) Which Qp should be used for subjective assessment in the case of
> interlaced materials? Sato-san has commented to this point,
> however,
> I beleive that was for objective test.
> And do we have to generate subjective demo for all test cases, or
> is it enough for experts to prepare the demo using the pre-defined
> Qp
> recommended for subjective test?
>
> Best regards,
> Shun-ichi Sekiguchi
>
> Luthra Ajay-MGI1164 <aluthra@motorola.com> wrote:
>
>>> Dear experts,
>>> I am back from my trip and now connected. As I went
> through the trails of emails related to this adhoc group's activities,
> I sense the following consensus,
>>>

> > > For MC memory analysis (D029, D080, D106, D110) use the
> same test conditions as for Special position except to also use (as
> suggested by Ulrich, Yagasaki-san and Suzuki-san, my apologies if I
> missed other emails on this) Interlace video
> (HHR) in addition to CIF. At this stage, I do not know if we will have
> the capabilities to view ITU-R 601 video in Geneva or not. Let us wait
> few more days and see what is the situation in this regard.
> > >
> > > For Special position related experiments, so far, I did
> not see strong requests to use Interlace material for testing to
> decide whether to keep or not to keep the Special Position, but did
> see strong opinions to cover the test conditions that were used when
> Special position was added.
> Looks like we will be comfortable in making the decision about the
> Special Position based on CIF size pictures.
> Therefore I have flagged HHR as "optional" for the Special Position
> experiments.
> > >
> > > Based on what I have seen in the emails, I have created
> two documents (attached here) that describe test conditions for
> Special position and MC memory analysis experiments. I think we can
> get the Special position testing started with
> 3.9 as that is stable and working (one bird in hand is better than two
> in bush). For MC memory analysis experts wanted to wait for 4.1.
> Hopefully that will stabilize soon, otherwise we may revert back to
> 4.0c or 3.9.
> > >
> > > Please review these files and let us know if there is a
> disagreement or any other issue or I misunderstood some of the
> discussion. It will be good to finalize this by the end of this week.
> > >
> > > Also, may I have the names of the individuals from
> Tandberg, TI, Conexant and Bosch who will be doing the experiments and
> presenting the results corresponding to Special Position experiments.
> > >
> > > Thanks.
> > >
> > > With regards,
> > >
> > > Ajay
> > >
> > > > <<Special Position.doc>> > > <<MC memory analysis.doc>>
>
>
> ---
> The use of the jvt-experts list is intended only for the video coding
> standardization work conducted by the Joint Video Team (JVT) of
> ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 (MPEG) and ITU-T
> SG16 Q.6 (VCEG).
>
> You are currently subscribed to jvt-experts as:
> ulrich.benzler@de.bosch.com

> To unsubscribe send a blank email to
> %%email.unsub%%
>

The use of the jvt-experts list is intended only for the video coding standardization work conducted by the Joint Video Team (JVT) of ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 (MPEG) and ITU-T SG16 Q.6 (VCEG).

You are currently subscribed to jvt-experts as: suehring@hhi.de

To unsubscribe send a blank email to leave-jvt-experts-12909W@mail.imtc.org