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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), the following conclusions can be drawn for the stereoscopic content delivery scenarios:

* HEVC simulcast:
	+ This 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.
	+ Does not exploit inter-view redundancy.
	+ Application addresses the needed signalling aspects to realize immersive viewing.
* HEVC frame packing:
	+ Reuses existing decoding hardware, albeit to achieve full resolution of the two views, a higher profile/level may be needed.
	+ Addresses signalling via SEI messages.
	+ For temporally interleaved frame packing, it could exploit inter-view redundancies for referenced frames, but not for non-referenced ones. However, the same frame packing scheme also results in a reduction of the available reference frames for each view given specified reference buffer constraints in the specification, which can impact coding performance.
* MV-HEVC:
	+ Reuses the same low-level decoding tools as single layer HEVC decoding.
	+ Better exploits inter-view redundancies by even allowing inter-view prediction from non-reference frames, without also additionally limiting the size of the reference buffer.
	+ When used on a non-3D capable device, the content can be played back using only the base view for a 2D presentation.
	+ Has better coding efficiency compared to either HEVC simulcast and HEVC frame packing.

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, and given the coding benefits it provides compared to alternative solutions, 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).

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 the 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 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.
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