

AUTOSTEREOSCOPY AND MOTION PARALLAX FOR MOBILE COMPUTER GAMES USING COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE HARDWARE

Jens Ogniewski, Ingemar Ragnemalm
Information Coding Group, Linköpings University
581 83 LINKÖPING, Sweden
{jens|ingis}@isy.liu.se

ABSTRACT

In this paper we present a solution for the three dimensional representation of mobile computer games which includes both motion parallax and an autostereoscopic display. The system was built on hardware which is available on the consumer market: an iPhone 3G with a Wazabee 3Dee Shell, which is an autostereoscopic extension for the iPhone. The motion sensor of the phone was used for the implementation of the motion parallax effect as well as for a tilt compensation for the autostereoscopic display. This system was evaluated in a limited user study on mobile 3D displays. Despite some obstacles that needed to be overcome and a few remaining shortcomings of the final system, an overall acceptable 3D experience could be reached. That leads to the conclusion that portable systems for the consumer market which include 3D displays are within reach.

KEYWORDS

Mobile Games, Autostereoscopy, Motion Parallax, Usability,

1. INTRODUCTION

By offering a higher immersion, displays allowing stereoscopic vision are expected to play a major role in future entertainment devices. A few such displays are already available on the consumer market. Other important 3D cues like motion parallax can be implemented using readily available soft- and hardware solutions. In this paper we examine how far products available on the mass-consumer market have already come. For that, we chose a typical mobile phone (the iPhone 3G) which provides an optional autostereoscopic enhancement (the Wazabee 3Dee Shell)

Unlike most other papers on 3D displays, the work presented here concentrates on computer games rather than video. Computer games are widely considered to be at least as important as content for 3D enabled devices as three dimensional video. Also, since most computer games already include a detailed 3D description, it is possible to display them directly in stereoscopic vision without the need for alteration. We believe that due to this (and the fact that no three-dimensional video content is available to the customers yet) the first available stereoscopic devices on the market are and will be used mainly for gaming purposes.

The final version of the scene was presented to a few volunteering subjects in different test cases for a small subjective evaluation. The results are presented in this paper as well. Although the hardware used is not the best available, it is sufficient to deliver a solid 3D experience albeit for a few shortcomings.

2. RELATED WORK

Willner et al.[1] as well as Shi et al. [2] examined portable 3D devices. Both used a modified Nokia N800 Internet Table for their work, and both concentrated on 3D video coding aspects rather than computer games as in this paper. Also, the system used was a prototype system which was never available on the consumer market.

A good introduction to autostereoscopic displays and their advantages and shortcomings as well as some solutions to these is given by Konrad and Halle in [3]. Another good description on how to build an autostereoscopic display can be found in [4].

Jumisko-Pyykkö et al. give in [5] a good overview of user requirements on mobile 3D TV, while in [6] Cheng and Nahrstedt examined the properties of autostereoscopic displays. The results of both papers can be applied to mobile computer games using an autostereoscopic display.

Although many papers exist dealing with 3D videos and autostereoscopic displays, and most papers on 3D displays name computer games as a possible application, to our knowledge only one examines their application in computer games ([7]). It also concentrates on mobile games, however the study presented there takes a more theoretical approach and does not specify a system.

Mobile computer games have furthermore been evaluated in different publications. Callow et al. give a good overview on the topic in [8], including the 3D graphics system. Nadalutti et al. wrote a paper [9] which further emphasized the problems of designing software using the three dimensional graphic accelerator in a mobile device, while Chehimi and Coulton [10] concentrated on the usage of the motion sensor for mobile gaming.

Motion parallax as depth cue is described by Ono in [11]. Uehira et al. and Meesters et al. proved that display systems can be constructed that solely or mostly rely on motion parallax for depth cue [12][13].

Finally, in [14] it was shown that it is possible to use conventional games with 3D graphics and render them in stereoscopic vision without the need for their alteration.

3. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The hardware used for this project was an iPhone 3G. The iPhone platform has two main advantages which made it more suitable for this project than its competitors: it offers a good and easy to use development environment, thus allowing for a quick implementation, and (more importantly) to our knowledge it is the only mobile platform available that actually has a free purchasable enhancement that can be used to display three dimensional images on it, the Wazabee 3Dee Shell.

3.1 The iPhone 3G

The iPhone 3G is based on a 32bit ARM 11 processor, clocked at 412 MHz. For graphics, it is accompanied by a PowerVR MBX Lite graphics accelerator. Both share 128 Mbytes SDRAM. This configuration and its performance is comparable to many other contemporary advanced phones. The computational power is limited and the software designer should be aware of that. Additionally, the MBX Lite only supports OpenGL ES 1.1, which uses a fixed graphics pipeline, instead of Open GL ES 2.0 which offers more flexibility (due to the availability of shaders). Although the new iPhone 3GS has much more computational power and possibilities (including OpenGL ES 2.0) which would have made this project easier, it was decided to use the slower 3G since work on this project had already started when the 3GS became available.

3.2 The Wazabee 3Dee Shell

The Wazabee 3Dee Shell consists mainly of a lenticular sheet and a special iPhone case holding the sheet. The Sheet itself can be removed from and reinsert into the case, even while the iPhone is wrapped in it. The sheet does not cover the whole screen of the phone, but leaves a little room at its bottom to allow the implementation of a few buttons on the touchscreen (the touchscreen under the sheet is inaccessible).

The lenticular sheet works like in other autostereoscopic devices. It diffracts the light of the pixel under it in different directions (see also figure 2a)). Thus, if the phone is hold at the right angle, each eye will receive a different image. Using a special stereo rendering procedure it is possible to use this to produce stereoscopic images.

Each lenticule of this sheet is approximately 4 pixel wide and tilted by an angle of approximately 30 degrees to the left to avoid picket fence effect[15], which consists of black vertical lines which are induced by an alignment of the borders of the lenticules and the borders of the pixel on the screen.

The 3Dee Shell differs from other autostereoscopic devices in that it might change its position and alignment to the screen between usages since it is removable. A calibration is therefore needed every time the sheet is attached, or otherwise crosstalk will occur. Crosstalk describes the effect if a pixel which should belong to one view influences the other view as well, i.e. that pixels (or some of their color components) can be seen by the wrong eye.

4. SOFTWARE SOLUTIONS

On the hardware described in Section 3, an animation has been implemented which is shown in figure 1a). It is composed of a background image (which shows a town), a track and a futuristic vehicle along with its shadow. This might be a scene of e.g. a racing game. This scene has been enhanced to include both motion parallax and autostereoscopic filtering, as described in the following.




Figure 1: Screenshots from the scene. a) (left) original image, b) (right) after tilting the phone to the left and with distortion as introduced by the stereoscopic mask

4.1 Motion Parallax

As pointed out earlier, motion parallax is generally considered to be one of the most important depth cues. In fact, it is possible to build three dimensional display systems which solely or in great parts rely on it (see also [11][12][13]). In general, motion parallax is the effect of changing the perspective of a scene according to the movement of its beholder, i.e. the possibility to go around a scene and look at it from different perspectives. In this paper however, it means the changing of the perspective according to the angle the phone is tilted by the user. This is in line with some of the first papers on this effect. According to [11], Herschel stated 1833 that the perceived motion could either be attributed to the observer or the observed object. A more general definition of motion parallax could therefore be the change of the perspective in accordance to the occurring movement. Normally headtracking should be used to implement this effect, but unfortunately the iPhone does not include a camera which could be used for that.

However, the iPhone (like many other contemporary phones) includes an accelerometer which (among other things) can be used as an input device for computer games (see also [10] on this topic). Moreover, its resolution and accuracy are sufficient to implement a motion parallax effect as well. Normally the perspective change should be calculated using a translation, however this proved to be not feasible in realtime. Through empirical tests it was found though that a simple geometric function with the z-coordinate of the point and the measured value from the accelerometer as inputs works nearly as well to calculate how a point should be shifted to introduce the motion parallax effect. This shifting was implemented in both the x and the y direction. In fact, the implementation was so easy that it is surprising that very few games include such an effect.

Figure 1b) shows how the image looks like after the user tilted the phone to the left. Note that this image has also been distorted in a way similar to using the stereoscopic filter mask (as explained later).




Figure 2: View separation with a lenticular sheet. a) (left) With the phone in its original position, b) (right) after tilting to the left. Note that pixel P2 is assigned to the right view in a), but to the left view in b)

4.2 Autostereoscopy

It was decided early in the project not to use the software development kit (SDK) provided by the manufacturer of the sheet, since it was too inflexible for this project. However, it was used to get a rough estimate for a filter mask to divide the pixels between the two views. This mask was refined to one which more resembled the exact sheet that was used during the project. In the end two alternative masks were implemented, one with an optimal resolution i.e. which divided all pixels evenly between the two views, and one optimized for crosstalk, i.e. which sets a few pixel to black which lay exactly between both views.

Using an autostereoscopic screen as small as the one on a mobile phone has the disadvantage that the perceived maximal depth is smaller than the one achievable on a bigger screen. However, it has the advantage of being a more controlled environment. For instance, since the phone is held at approximately the same distance by most users, it is easier to find a place where the “sweet spot” should be, i.e. the point where the image quality and the stereo effect are optimal. Unfortunately, the optimal viewing distance of the Wazabee 3Dee Shell seems to be a bit too far away from the screen.

Another advantage is that it is possible to concentrate on a single user, i.e. that the generation of 2 images (one for each eye) simultaneously should be enough. Multiview lenticular sheets, which would decrease the resolution enormously, could therefore be avoided. This also allows to use user tracking to widen the possible viewing angle. Normally this is done by moving the filter mask (see [16] for an example), which is not possible for the system used. But instead, pixels can be dynamically assigned by the software to either view. For instance, in figure 2 pixel P2 belongs to the right image in 2a), but to the left one in 2b). Knowing the position of the eyes of the beholder and the angle the phone is held in, it becomes possible to adjust the filter mask accordingly. Again, due to the lack of camera the motion accelerator was used (assuming that the distance to the beholder is constant and thus the angle the phone is holding in is the only variable), and a quite simple approximation instead of a computational more expansive full translation. This is called tilt compensation in the following.

As already pointed out, the graphic chip only supports OpenGL ES 1.1, i.e. a static graphics pipeline. The limited resources meant also that it was not possible to implement subpixel resolution for the filter mask and the tilt compensation, as is normally done when rendering for an autostereoscopic display. Since each pixel consists of different LEDs with different color, it can happen that one or more colors of a pixel should be associated with one view, while the others should be associated with the other view (see also [3]). A lot of papers have been published on the topic on how these subpixels should be distributed among the different views. However, such elaborate algorithms are not feasible on the chosen hardware. Also, anti-aliasing, which normally should be applied on each view separately, is out of reach. (See [17] and [18] for examples on how these functions are normally implemented.) Furthermore, since the mask used has a quite irregular structure (due to the 30 degrees angle of the lenticulars), artifacts were introduced into the images. The view presented to each eye looks therefore more like the one in figure 1b) than the original in 1a).

Three different configuration parameters were included: mask position, view distance and depth. Mask position was used to align the used mask with the current position of the sheet. Since the texture used for the mask is bigger than the screen size, it is possible to let it start at different points, thus allowing this calibration. The sheet may also sit at slightly different angles. However, in these cases it is easier to adjust the sheet instead of trying to turn the mask.

View distance describes the distance between the two views. It is included to compensate different eye distances as well as (slightly) different distances in which the phone might be held. Finally, depth was included since it was found in [5] that being able to control the level of depth and to switch it off completely is one of the key features that customers expect from a three dimensional display system.

5. EVALUATION

Our evaluation procedure was based on the recommendations on assessment methods for multimedia applications [19]. However, a few changes had to be applied due to some practical reasons and to adapt the experiment to the system. The exact setup will be described in the following.

The test was divided in three parts: part 1 dealt with comparison of the two different filter masks, part 2 with a comparison of different 3D solutions and part 3 concluded with a short questionnaire.

Before each test which utilized the autostereoscopic extension of the phone the subject was asked to adjust the mask position so that the subject could see the scene at the best possible image quality and with the best possible stereoscopic effect. It was chosen not to let the subject choose the depth or the view distance since then the setup phase would have become too complicated. Furthermore, it made the tests a little more comparable, and a few pre-experiments showed that only the calibration of the mask position is actually needed to allow each subject to configure the phone to get an overall optimal image quality and stereovision effect.

The room in which the experiments were made was held at low illumination to allow the subjects to better see the image on the iPhone. The brightness of the phone was set to maximum for the test as well. The exact light levels in the room or the phone were not measured, but judged to be comparable in all experiments.

5.1 Part I: Filter Masks

This test was designed using the pair comparison method described in [19]. The subject was shown the animated scene described in section 4, rendered using the autostereoscopic sheet and one of the two filter masks. The scene was shown for 10 seconds. Then, after a 2 second break, the subject was shown the same scene but rendered using the other mask, again for 10 s. Then the subject had 10 s to evaluate the masks in three different aspects: image quality, stereo vision effect, and stress factor, i.e. which of the two images was easier to look at.

The test was replicated three times with each subject to be able to remove insubject variation. The subject was not told in advance which mask were which, not even the number of used masks or that the test would be repeated several times. Which mask was shown first in each sequence was determined randomly before each test.

The subject was asked to hold the phone as still as possible in order not to change the viewing angle and distance during these test sequences.

5.2 Part II: 3D Solutions

For practical reasons, this test was divided in two different phases: one using the stereoscopic sheet and one without it to avoid reattaching and calibrating the sheet several times, although this meant that the order of sequences of the different tests in this round could not be completely randomized. However, each phase was randomized in itself (i.e. in which order the different sequences of each phase were shown was determined by random in advance), and it was also chosen at random with which phase to begin this part.

For this part of the experiment, it was chosen to use an absolute rating of the different sequences. The rating was done in two different categories (image quality and stereovision effect), and the rating scale ranged from 1 (bad) to 9 (excellent). Each sequence was shown 10 s, then the subject had 10 s to do the actual rating. For this test, the subject was told to tilt the phone as well to capture the effects of motion parallax and the tilt compensation for the autostereoscopic sheet as described in section 4.2.

The sequences with the autostereoscopic sheet included all possible combinations: with and without the tilt compensation as well as with and without motion parallax, altogether 4 sequences. The filter mask used during this phase was the one that the subject liked best in the first part of the experiment.

The sequences without the autostereoscopic display included the normal image and an image which was rendered to include the same distortion as are introduced by the filter mask (see also figure 1b)), both with and without motion parallax (which made 4 sequences as well). The reason to introduce test sequences which were distorted was to be able to make a more objective comparison with the sequences using the lenticular sheet. Since this part already included 8 sequences it was decided to do no replication in this part.

5.3 Part III: Questionnaire

To set the results into a better perspective and get some additional informations, a third part was included which consists of a few questions. In the first question the subjects were asked to rate their experiences with 3D displays so far on a scale from 1 (none at all) to 9 (very much). They were then asked if they would buy a device including a display like the 3Dee Shell, and if, what price they would be willing to pay (not more than for a similar device with a 2D display, a little more or a lot more etc.). They were then asked the same questions, but for a device which would include a display with very good image and 3D quality.

The test then finished with questions on which services the subjects are using on portable devices at the moment respectively would use if they were available, and for which of these they would choose to use a 3D display if possible. The categories were partly chosen based on the results given in [5], plus a few other ones which are widely used in mobile devices nowadays.

As a last point the subjects were given the opportunity to share all other thoughts that they might have about the experiment or 3D displays in general.

Optimized for:	Crosstalk	Resolution
Image quality	15	21
3D effect	18	18
Stress factor	13	23

Table 1: The number of votes (crosstalk vs resolution) for each mask in the three categories

6. TEST RESULTS

Altogether 12 subjects participated in the experiment. Although it was attempted to get a varied test group, most of the participations were male students of a technical program.

6.1 Part I: Filter Masks

The tests of the filter masks was included to see which kind of trade-off was better – less crosstalk or less resolution loss. Alas, in this perspective the result are not that clear. Most people clearly preferred one mask over the other, and over all, the mask with the higher resolution fared better, at least in the categories image quality and stress factor. In 3D effect, it is a tie. However, it is an open question if and how these results may be used for other systems, since the crosstalk optimized mask introduced visible artifacts by discarding pixels at more or less irregular positions (see also figure 1b)). These artifacts may have reduced both the subjective image quality and risen the stress factor of images rendered using this mask. In our opinion the result of this test can therefore not be easily projected to other systems. The results are shown in table 1.

6.2 Part II: 3D Solutions

The average results are given in table 2a and 2b, along with their standard deviations. It could be puzzling that the normal and the artificial distorted images vary in 3D effect as well, and that the tests with the lenticular sheet vary not only in 3D effect, but also in image quality. It seems that image quality and the 3D effect positively influence each other. A high image quality rises the perceived 3D effect and vice versa. That would explain these deviations.

The three following comparisons are of main interest: 1. using the autostereoscopic enhancement vs not using it, 2. using motion parallax vs not using it, and 3. using the tilt compensation as described in 4.3. vs not using it.

For the first one, we compared the distorted image without the lenticular sheet with the image using the autostereoscopic sheet and tilt compensation. This yields an average improvement of the 3D effect of 1.88 (with a standard deviation of 2.25) if using the autostereoscopic enhancement and tilt compensation.

For the second one, comparing the sequences using motion parallax with the ones which don't use it, an average difference in 3D effect of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.92 is received.

It is interesting that motion parallax gives a higher increase in the 3D effect than the autostereoscopic sheet. However, if the issues with the autostereoscopic sheet could be fixed, the difference might be not that high or even the other way around.

Finally, comparing the sequences using the autostereoscopic sheet and tilt compensation to the sequences using only the autostereoscopic sheet gives an improvement of 1.08 in average (standard derivation 1.33) in quality and of 1.13 in average (standard derivation 1.44) in 3D effect if using tilt compensation.

auto-stereo-scropy	tilt compen-sation	motion parallax	distorted image	mean	std. derivat.	auto-stereo-scropy	tilt compen-sation	motion parallax	distorted image	mean	std. derivat.
				7.83	1.11					4.25	2.18
		x		7.83	1.40			x		6.58	1.93
			x	3.67	2.35				x	3.00	1.86
		x	x	4.08	1.83			x	x	5.08	2.19
x				3.75	1.48	x				3.17	1.19
x		x		4.5	1.78	x		x		4.58	1.88
x	x			4.91	1.62	x	x			6.42	1.08
x	x	x		5.5	1.83	x	x	x		7.25	1.14

Table 2a: Results from the 3D solutions test (image quality); ratings range from 1 (bad) to 9 (excellent)

Table 2b: Results from the 3D solutions test (3D effect); ratings range from 1 (bad) to 9 (excellent)

6.3 Part III: Questionnaire

Not surprisingly, most subjects had only limited experiences with 3D systems, with the exception of three which rated their experience level at 5 or 6. Most rated the system used in the test quite low and would not be willing to pay extra for it. However, four out of the twelve subjects would be willing to pay a little more if the quality of the image and the 3D effect would be better, and 3 would even pay a lot more for it.

An overview of the applications is given in table 3. Interestingly enough, not many would want to watch 3D video on their mobile devices, whether it be movies, series, news, documentations, live stream from events or any form of tv. However, gaming fared very well in comparison. It reached nearly 100% more acceptance as 3D application than the next highest ranking applications. In fact, eight of the twelve subjects (100% of the ones which are currently using their mobile devices for gaming) would choose a 3D display system if they had the choice.

Another interesting fact is that the subjects also showed a comparably high interest in stereoscopic versions of location based services.

The comments given by the subjects where mainly that the system at hand suffered from low resolution, and that the motion parallax effect / the tilt compensation should have a finer resolution. Both issues are shortcomings of the used hardware.

Application	games	taking pictures / movies	live streams from events	watching movies / tv series	watching documentaries / news	tv (other)	videophone	location based services	social networks
use / would use in 2d	9	12	3	8	6	5	4	5	5
would use in 3D	9	5	2	4	1	1	5	4	0

Table 3: Results from the applications questionnaire

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper a 3D system for mobile gaming purposes was presented. The implementation of autostereoscopy and motion parallax used in this system were described. Furthermore, an experiment has been conducted where several subjects assessed the system and its different possible implementations.

Overall, the subjects showed interest in the system, but also pointed out its shortcomings. Their answers also indicate that gaming will be the most used application for portable devices with 3D displays. It was further showed that a very high 3D effect can already be achieved by the usage of motion parallax, which can be introduced quite easily in most modern phones. We propose that more games capitalize on this effect.

The next step for research in this area might be to implement a system overcoming the shortcomings of the system used in this paper, including a higher resolution display, an OpenGL ES 2.0 capable graphics accelerator and a camera which can be used for headtracking instead of the motion accelerator.

REFERENCES

- [1]K. Willner, K. Ugur, M. Salmimaa, A. Hallapuro, and J. Lainema. Mobile 3D Video Using MVC and N800 Internet Tablet. 3DTV Conference: The True Vision - Capture, Transmission and Display of 3D Video, pages: 69 - 72, 2008.
- [2]S. Shi, K. Nahrstedt, and R. H. Campbell. View-dependent real-time 3d video compression for mobile devices. Proceeding of the 16th ACM international conference on Multimedia, pages: 781-784, 2008.
- [3]J. Konrad, and M. Halle. 3-D displays and signal processing: an answer to 3-D ills? IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 24(6): 97 - 111, 2007.
- [4]W. Matusik, and H. Pfister. 3D TV: a scalable system for real-time acquisition, transmission, and autostereoscopic display of dynamic scenes. ACM SIGGRAPH - International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, pages: 814 - 824, 2004.
- [5]S. Jumisko-Pyykkö, M. Weitzel, and D. Strohmeier. Designing for user experience: what to expect from mobile 3d tv and video? ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, Vol. 291, pages 183-192, 2008
- [6]R. Cheng, and K. Nahrstedt. Empirical study of 3D video source coding for autostereoscopic displays. Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Multimedia, Pages: 573 - 576, 2007.
- [7]J. Häkkinen, M. Liinasuo, J. Takatalo, and G. Nyman. Visual comfort with mobile stereoscopic gaming. Proceedings of the SPIE, 6055: 85-93, 2006.
- [8]M. Callow, P. Beardow, and D. Brittain. Big Games, Small Screens. Queue 5(7): 40-50, 2007.
- [9]D. Nadalutti, L. Chittaro, and F. Buttussi. Rendering of X3D Content on Mobile devices with OpenGL ES. Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on 3D web technology, pages 19-26, 2006.
- [10]F. Chehimi, and P. Coulton. Motion controlled mobile 3D multiplayer gaming. Proceedings of the 2008 International Conference on Advances in Computer Entertainment Technology, pages 267-270, 2008.
- [11]Ono, H. Perception of Depth, Motion, and Stability with Motion Parallax. Second International Symposium on Universal Communication, pages 193 - 198, 2008.
- [12]T. Suenaga, Y. Matsumoto, and T. Ogasawara. 3D display based on motion parallax using non-contact 3D measurement of head position. Proceedings of the 17th Australia conference on Computer-Human Interaction: Citizens Online: Considerations for Today and the Future, pages 1-4, 2005.
- [13]K. Uehira, M. Suzuki, and T. Abekaw. 3-D Display using Motion Parallax for Extended-Depth Perception. IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo, pages 1742 - 1745, 2007.
- [14]Joel de val. Intercepting OpenGL calls for rendering on 3D display. LiTH-ISY-EX-05/3748-SE, 2005.
- [15]L.M.J Meesters, W.A. IJsselsteijn, and P.J.H. Seuntjens. A survey of perceptual evaluations and requirements of three-dimensional TV. IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology 14(3): 381- 391, 2004.
- [16]T. Peterka, R.L. Kooima, J. I. Girado, J. Ge, D. J. Sandin, A. Johnson, J. Leigh, J. Schulze, and T. A. DeFanti. Dynallax: Solid State Dynamic Parallax Barrier Autostereoscopic VR Display. Proceedings of Virtual Reality Conference 2007, p. 155 - 162, 2007.
- [17]J. Konrad, and P. Agniel. Subsampling models and anti-alias filters for 3-D automultiscopic displays. IEEE Transactions on Image Processing, 15(1): 128 - 140, 2006.
- [18]A. Vetro, S. Yea, M. Zwicker, W. Matusik, and H. Pfister. Overview of Multiview Video Coding and Anti-Aliasing for 3D Displays. ICIP IEEE International Conference on Image Processing, pages I-17 - I-20, 2007.
- [19]International Telecommunication Union (ITU). Subjective video quality assessment methods for multimedia applications. ITU-T Recommendation P.910, 1999.