VQEG/AVHD and ITU-T SG12 Q14 P.NATS Proposal for increasing visibility and clarity between activities

M.-N. Garcia (TU Berlin/T-Labs), A. Raake (TU Ilmenau/T-Labs)

AVHD and P.NATS: Scopes

P.NATS scope:

- Track 1: **NR bitstream** audiovisual quality models for adaptive streaming, for encrypted and non-encrypted streams
- Track 2: „short-term" video quality module of Track 1 **replaced by FR perceptual model**
    - will be standardized only if outperforming track 1
    - „short-term" = +/- 10s measurement window
- Sequences: up to **5 min** , **H.264**
- Training and validation phases

AVHD benchmarking activity scope:

- FR/RR/NR perceptual and hybrid video quality models for adaptive streaming services
- Contrary to PNATS, no restriction on video model inputs
- Sequences: up to 5 min, H.264, H.265 and VP9
- Validation phase only

AVHD and P.NATS: Timelines

P.NATS: timeline

- Training databases (18) already shared
- Model submission : 28th October 2015
- Submission of validation databases (16): 9th February 2016
- Winning model(s) selection: 8th March 2016

AVHD timeline:

- Model submission: after this meeting but exact date to be agreed.
- Submission of validation databases: to be decided.
- Benchmarking results: to be decided

Visibility and clarity concerns (1/3)

Concern description: AVHD benchmarking call was not made public

Proposal: make the call open

- using VQEG reflector (Margaret Pinson? Christian Schmidmer?)
- using ITU-T/SG12 Q14 mailing list (Alexander Raake)

Visibility and clarity concerns (2/3)

Concern description:

- PNATS training databases are already available

- If AVHD project is delayed, PNATS validation databases may also be available before AVHD model submission

Proposal:

- Clarify with participants of both PNATS and AVHD that, according to NDA, they are not allowed to use others' PNATS databases for re-training their model

Open points:

- Shall we find a procedure to check whether NDA-protected PNATS databases have been used for training AVHD models?

- T-Labs will bring this issue to Q14 to check whether this is a widely shared concern or not

Visibility and clarity concerns (3/3)

For the sake of clarity and if both P.NATS track 2 and FR perceptual AVHD are standardized:

- shall we compare P.NATS track 2 and FR perceptual AVHD performances, or
- shall we instead clarify in both standards for which purpose they should be used in comparison to the other standard?