

JCTVC-M0182

COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS OF SHM1.0

J. Dong, Y. Ye, Y. He

InterDigital Communications Inc.

13th JCT-VC meeting, April 2013

Introduction

- AHG17 “SHVC complexity assessment” was established at the 12th JCTVC meeting
 - Study memory bandwidth, memory usage and computational complexity of scalable tools and methodologies to evaluate them
- After meeting, a group of companies worked together to provide complexity assessment data for SHM1.0 anchors
 - Released in JCTVC-L0440 in Feb
 - Used by SCE3 and SCE4 to assess complexity of individual coding tools
- JCTVC-L0440 package includes complexity data for the following solutions:
 - SHM1.0 ref_idx: PU-based and Picture-based
 - SHM1.0 IntraBL
 - HM8.1 simulcast
- This contribution provides complexity analysis summary of SHM1.0 based on JCTVC-L0440

AHG17 complexity assessment methodologies

- Complexity is measured considering the following:
 - Temporal MCP in BL and EL, and inter layer prediction
 - Memory bandwidth: 8b/8b (pure), 64b/256b (DDR-2), 64b/512b (DDR-3)
 - Computational complexity: adds, mults
- SHM1.0 Refldx solution supports two types of implementations:
 - Picture based: upsample and store inter layer reference in DPB, minimal re-design of EL decoder
 - PU based: on-the-fly upsampling
- SHM1.0 IntraBL solution supports one type of implementation:
 - Block based: on-the-fly upsampling
- Average complexity tallied by decoding the actual bitstreams
- Worst case complexity calculated based on peak memory access

Summary of Average Complexity (RA/LDP/LDB)

Average complexity for RA/LDP/LDB test cases, compared with **HM8.1 simulcast**

		Memory bandwidth			# calculations	
		8b/8b	64b/256b	64b/512b	Mults	Adds
IntraBL		92%	94%	93%	94%	94%
RefIdx	PU-based	92%	93%	92%	95%	95%
	Pic-based	103%	101%	101%	144%	144%

1. PU-based RefIdx implementation very similar complexity as IntraBL ($\pm 1\%$)
2. Pic-based RefIdx implementation higher complexity than block based implementation
 - Upsampling performed for all blocks regardless of whether they are used by EL
 - Complexity increase related to spatial ratios: $2x > 1.5x > \text{SNR}$

Summary of Average Complexity (AI)

Average complexity for AI test cases, compared with SHM1.0 IntraBL

	Memory bandwidth			# calculations	
	8b/8b	64b/256b	64b/512b	Mults	Adds
PU-based RefIdx	91%	89%	89%	98%	98%
Pic-based RefIdx	56%	42%	43%	98%	98%

1. HM8.1 Simulcast not suitable as reference in AI test cases
 - No temporal MCP in BL and EL
2. PU-based RefIdx implementation somewhat lower complexity than IntraBL
3. Pic-based RefIdx implementation significantly lower complexity in terms of memory bandwidth
 - Picture-based upsampling has fixed memory bandwidth overhead
 - In AI, more blocks in EL use inter layer prediction
 - Reduced average complexity

Worst case complexity

	HM8.1	IntraBL		PU-based RefIdx		Pic-based RefIdx	
	MC @ EL	Upsampling	% of HM8.1	Upsampling	% of HM8.1	Upsampling	% of HM8.1
Mult	74	37	50%	37	50%	24	32%
Adds	63	32	51%	32	51%	21	33%
MemBand (2D:4x2)	18	9	50%	12	67%	4	22%
MemBand (2D:8x2)	27	14	52%	18	67%	5	19%

1. Only includes spatial scalability (2x and 1.5x)
2. Anchor is temporal MCP in HEVC
3. PU-based RefIdx has higher memory bandwidth
 - PU based rather than CU-based inter layer prediction
4. Pic-based RefIdx has lower complexity
 - No peak complexity, whole picture always upsampled
 - Calculated assuming 16x16 blocks

Conclusion

- IntraBL can be implemented as block-based
- RefIdx can be implemented either as block-based, or as picture-based
 - Picture-based implementation allows to re-use single layer codec design for the EL
- Block based RefIdx and IntraBL have similar complexity characteristics
 - Average complexity and worst case complexity
- Picture-based RefIdx implementation has very different complexity characteristics:
 - Average complexity: lower for AI, higher (esp computation) for RA/LDP/LDB
 - Worst case complexity: lower complexity

		Average Complexity		Worst case complexity
		AI	RA/LDP/LDB	
IntraBL			X	
RefIdx	PU-based		X	
	Pic-based	X		X