

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION FOR STANDARDISATION
ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE DE NORMALISATION
ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11
CODING OF MOVING PICTURES AND AUDIO**

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 MPEG2016/M39933
January 2017, Geneva, CH**

Source **Telecom ParisTech**
Status **For consideration during MPEG #117**
Title **On Part-12 Defect Report**
Author Jean Le Feuvre, Cyril Concolato

1 Overview

This contribution reviews the defect report, proposes some DCOR text for some items in the report and identifies new defects.

2 Defect report review

2.1 Overview

The current defect report contains quite a large number of items. Some of them may require deep review of the specification, while some others can be easily fixed or have proposed correction text.

The attached documents provide:

- 16696-12 - Proposed DCOR text
- 16696-12 - Updated Defect Report with items not implemented in the proposed text

The rest of this section describes the items that were not or only partially integrated in the proposed DCOR text.

2.2 Editorial

The general editing section, the timeline section, the presentation terms section and duplicate file structure sections have not been handled.

2.3 Producer Reference Time

Review of proposed text is needed: there was no clear decision on what time should be documented (capture, segment production, ...), the text proposed capture time.

2.4 Clarification on negative composition offsets

2.5 Exact audio length

Not sure if any action is needed here.

2.6 MIME-related issues

A lot of edits are needed without text provided, not handled yet.

2.7 Meta-data and meta box issues

A lot of edits are needed without text provided, not handled yet.

2.8 Replacement rule for user-data in fragments

Not sure there is any defect here, it relates more to storage of changing meta-data not carried in tracks in unfragmented movies (cf DASH emsg & co).

2.9 Opus-in-MP4 author

2.9.1 first_offset

We need to discuss this with DASH

2.9.2 Raw audio/visual formats

No further action needed, unless we want to add sample entries for these, in which case this is an amendment.

2.10 Audio Sample Entry V1

Needs further discussions. Why do we mandate stsd version=1 for this box ? What if a mix of AudioSampleEntry and AudioSampleEntryV1 are in the track ? We need clear resolutions on this to implement.

2.11 Conflict with Part 15 on Sync samples

Handled by COR on part 15, should be removed

2.12 Item Identifiers in URL Fragments

To be handled with meta-data issues

2.13 On 8.3.1.1, incompletely addressed

The first two items are already addressed, the third one should be handled with the generic editing since it refers to "presentation"

2.14 Leading samples

Not sure there is anything to do here.

3 Defects on MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox

The box has a field called size, which conflicts with the size field of the base class Box. The field should be renamed content_size

The definition states:

“The `MovieFragmentRandomAccessOffsetBox` provides a copy of the length field from the enclosing `MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox`.”

This is wrong since there is no length field defined for `mfra`. This should be replaced with:

“The `MovieFragmentRandomAccessOffsetBox` provides a copy of the size field from the enclosing `MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox`.”

The definition says

“It is placed last within that box ”

This should be a shall statement

“However, neither the presence of the `MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox`, nor its placement last in the file, are assured.”

However, if the box is not place last in the file it is useless, since one has to parse all top-level boxes to locate the mfra. We suggest recommending that, when present, the mfro should be the last box in the file or in the segment.

The semantics states:

“This field is placed at the last of the enclosing box to assist readers scanning from the end of the file in finding the `MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox`.”

this should be replaced with

“This field is located in the last bytes of the enclosing box to assist readers scanning from the end of the file in finding the `MovieFragmentRandomAccessBox`.”

4 Defects on CleanApertureBox

The box does not forbid any food to be non 0, which should be the case for a fractional number

Proposed change:

In 12.1.4.1 Replace

“We refer to the pair of parameters `fooN` and `fooD` as `foo`.”

with

“We refer to the pair of parameters `fooN` and `fooD` as `foo`. The denominator value (`food`) shall not be 0.”

5 Conclusion

We suggest starting a DCOR text at this meeting with the items for which enough text is provided in the DCOR or can be provided during the editing period, including the new defects raised in this contribution.