**VQEG notes: Tuesday AM, June 12, 2012**

Thanks to Glen Van Wallendael (Ghent University) for taking notes.

Hybrid (chaired by Chulhee and Jens)

The following presentation is used during this hybrid discussion:

<ftp://vqeg.its.bldrdoc.gov/Documents/VQEG_Rennes_Jun12/MeetingFiles/VQEG_HYBRID_2012_023_LEE_Hybrid%20Projects%202012-6.ppt>

A completed version will be made available in the meeting files directory.

Four proponents: DT, OPTICOM, SwissQual, Yonsei

1. Source selection:

Margaret described the new source sequences including the secret source sequences. Categories of content vary between sports (boxing), underwater footage, news sequences, … about 500GB.

1. Test design (full matrix, number of sources, number of HRCs, common sets)

* Number of subjective tests:

Proponents: DT (1), OPTICOM (1), SwissQual (1), Yonsei (3)

Kjell indicates that the following ILGs received part of the participant’s fee to run subjective tests.

ILGS: Ghent University (1), Acreo (1), AGH (1), FUB (1), University of Nantes (1)

* PVS generation

PVS generation will be done by 3 organizations: Ghent University, FUB, RT-RK

Jens suggests that proponents should be able to provide PVSs as well.   
Silvio mentions that test vectors are provided and that new PVSs are not checked on the models. Chris replies that test vectors should not be limiting the PVS creation.

Undecided

* Resolution of subjective tests:

Silvio proposes to change HD 5 ; WVGA 3 ; VGA 3 to HD 6 ; WVGA 2 ; VGA 3

Agreed on HD 6 ; WVGA 3 ; VGA 2.

DT: HD

Opticom: any

SwissQual: WVGA, VGA

Yonsei: any

Ghent University: HD

Acreo: any

AGH: HD

FUB: HD

University of Nantes: HD

As a result, resolutions are divided as follows:

HD: DT, Ghent University, AGH, FUB, Nantes, Yonsei

WVGA: SwissQual, Acreo, Yonsei

VGA: Yonsei, Opticom

Jens indicates that when proponents can make the PVS, they can introduce scenarios which work well with their model. This could happen undetected by the others. As a solution, Chulhee proposes that a lab should not generate, and subjectively evaluate more than 50% of its PVS. This proposed compromise is already in the testplan.

* number of sources

10 -> 16

* number of HRCs

10 -> 15

* common sets

24

Margaret: Previous tests did not have enough good source sequences. With this test, more sequences are available which could improve the test.

1. Encoder and decoders

Agreed: Different decoders than the ones used in the test vectors can be used.

1. Transport protocol
2. Schedule

* Dates are fixed on the schedule in the presentation.
* It is suggested that the draft final report should be scheduled during the next VQEG meeting, because face to face discussion is more productive when drafting the final report. Therefore, the date of the next meeting should be chosen such that the hybrid project is able to get to that stage. Arthur suggests discussing the date of the next meeting later this week after this schedule is fixed.
* Margaret suggests a subgroup can meet to draft the final report at any time. The draft can then be sent over the reflector for approval.
* In general, the schedule is shortened to 9 months

Next is a discussion of the following checklist: EvalDatabase\_CheckList.doc sent by Matthias Obermann. All the information given in this document will be made available in the test plan.

Bitstream demuxer:

PCAPtoTS may be used until AnnexBExtractor is able to handle all the required transport protocols.