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\* \* \* First Change \* \* \* \*

7 Conclusions and proposed next steps

7.1 Conclusions for scenario #1.1, #1.2:

Comparing solution #1.1 (HEVC simulcast), solution #1.2 (HEVC frame packing) and solution#1.3 (Multiview HEVC coding), following conclusions can be drawn for the stereoscopic content delivery scenarios:

* HEVC simulcast:
	+ It is the most basic solution to address the stereoscopic HEVC delivery scenario.
	+ It adds no new signalling.
	+ Uses 2x HEVC encode/decode chains to provide stereoscopic video.
	+ Exploits no inter-view redundancy.
	+ Application addresses the needed signalling aspects to realize the immersive viewing.
* HEVC frame packing:
	+ Reuses the decoding hardware,
	+ Addresses signalling via SEI messages.
	+ Exploits inter-view redundancy for referenced frames.
* MV-HEVC:
	+ Reuses the same lower-layer decoding tools.
	+ Exploits maximum inter-view redundancy by even allowing inter-view prediction from non-reference frames.
	+ When used on a non-3D capable device, the content can be played back using only the base view for a 2D presentation.

Based on the assessment, MV-HEVC and HEVC frame packing are suitable solutions for addressing scenario#1.1 and #1.2 for stereoscopic content delivery, where MV-HEVC represents a more versatile tool. With HEVC simulcast and HEVC frame packing already included in SA4 specifications, it is recommended to add support for stereoscopic MV-HEVC to the related specifications.

7.2 Conclusions for scenario #2:

Solution #2.3 (native 4:4:4 coding) and solution #2.4 (derived 4:4:4 coding) can achieve better visual quality than the baseline solution #2.1 (HEVC 4:2:0 coding). Solution #2.4 (derived 4:4:4 coding) however can achieve this improvement by reusing existing hardware support, without a need for a specialised hardware (as is needed for solution #2.3). However, a higher profile/level may be needed for Solution #2.4. Currently, there are no documented performance enhancements achieved by Solution #2.2 (HEVC 4:2:2 coding).

At the time of drawing the conclusions, MPEG continues to work on solution #2.4 (derived 4:4:4 coding), and the need to do specification work can be revisited at a later point in time based on progress in MPEG.

7.3 Conclusions for scenario #3:

Solution #3.1 (scalable HEVC coding) shows improvement potential for enhancing the adaptive streaming experience by allowing more switchable representations to be made available, while optimising the storage overhead for this purpose. Scalable HEVC is also supported by MPEG specifications such as CMAF. The need to do normative work will be driven by industry interest in this direction.

\* \* \* End of Changes \* \* \* \*