#### Technologies and Prospects of a 'Next Generation Handheld' (DVB-NGH) System

Jukka Henriksson DVB AHG TMI-H chairman Nokia TUBS.city Symposium July 1-3, 2009

### Content

- History
- DVB study mission on NGH
- User needs & Commercial requirements
- Technology comments
- Challenges
- "Wild" guess
- Schedule



#### **Brief history of mobile TV**

- Nothing comes from vacuum
- DVB-T is the solid basis for mobile TV DVB-H and also (partly) DVB-SH
- Fairly long history exists



#### From DVB-T to DVB-H (Nokia view ⓒ)



**NOKIA** Connecting People

#### **History continues**

- DVB later produced DVB-SH (from satellite to handhelds)
   Published as ETSI standard July 2007
- DVB-T2 standard, successor of DVB-T, was created in DVB and published by ETSI in 2008

#### **SO**

#### Is there need for anything new? What is the reasoning?



### **DVB study mission on NGH**

- A study mission (NGH- next generation handheld) to probe these issues was launched in DVB June 2007
- SM Conclusions:
  - The new standard should address all relevant market segments (terrestrial, terrestrial-satellite hybrid) in order to avoid market fragmentation.
  - If significant capacity increase is needed, feasibility and available performance using multiantenna techniques (MIMO) in handheld terminals should be carefully assessed
  - The new standard NGH, among other things listed above, should be capable of using multiple bands of spectrum and have flexible spectrum use.



#### **Further comments from study mission**

- DVB-T2 includes a new Frame structure (Flexible Pilots structure, Preamples, PLP concept, MISO, Rotated constellations, etc) as well as a state of the art coding with LDPCs
- LDPCs and Turbo Codes have very similar performance a very close to Shannon Limits at low C/N.
- Taking the best from T2 and SH we can have a very good starting point for NGH.
- To obtain a "significant improvement" we should analyze mainly MIMO and Overhead reduction



#### **Compared capacity of SH and T2** against Shannon limit

Please be aware that only constellations and coding is considered for the simulations. Perfect channel estimation is used.



#### TU-6 @ 100 Hz

Please note this capacity simulations only consider Coding Rates, but no Guard Intervals, Preambles, TPS, Pilots ... overheads.

#### NOKIA

#### 2x2 MIMO promise vs. Alamouti 2x2

SIDSA, study mission have computed this capacity for a perfect MIMO 2x2 system, and for the Alamouti system used in diversity 2, which is a particular implementation of 2x2 MIMO.

	Capacity for Alamouti 2x2 (bit/cell)	Capacity for optimal MIMO 2x2 (bit/cell)
SNR = 0 dB	1.44	1.59 (+10.1 % )
SNR = 4 dB	2.36	2.73 (+15.6 %)
SNR = 8 dB	3.46	4.22 (+22.1 %)
SNR = 12 dB	4.68	5.04 (+29.2 %)
SNR = 16 dB	5.96	8.12 (+36.1 %)

Note: very preliminary, overview result

The result depends strongly on the channel model and actual implementation



#### **BBC channel model: overview of results**

- All results relative to SISO
- Sidsa +35% throughput at 10<sup>-4</sup> BER at 15dB SNR
- RAI with *modified BBC* model
- +100% 1% outage & +4-5dB indoor (K=0.1)
- +100% 1% outage & +2-3dB urban outdoor (K=1)
- +33-50% 1% outage rural outdoor (K=10)
- BBC + 57% in ergodic capacity @ 15dB SNR and + 45% @ 10dB SNR

#### Jury is still out!



### **But is there REAL need?**

- DVB set up CM group CM-NGH in 2008 to define commercial requirements
- The key findings
  - Technology has progressed and significant improvement in performance is available
  - Robustness and indoor reception are the main points
  - The business environment changes due to T2, LTE etc
- CM listed several general requirements (24.6.2009) like
  - NGH must be sufficiently flexible to deliver content types that match the varying amounts of attention a user might want to devote: e.g. radio, radio with slideshow, high quality (SD) TV
  - Must integrate with 'back channel' technologies to offer a truly immersive, two-way experience
  - Must be able to offer extended viewing sessions therefore extended battery life is important
  - Must offer fast access to services therefore *fast start up and channel switching* are important
  - Should be able to act as a 'second screen' by offering content that complements and synchronises with content on DVB-T(2) and other platforms
  - Should be possible to offer *location specific content*

### **Highlights of the commercial requirements**

7	The DVB-NGH specification shall be optimized for outdoor and deep indoor portable and slow mobile reception (pedestrian <15 km/h).	Keep mobility
8	The DVB-NGH specification shall also be optimized for in-vehicle and outdoor mobile vehicular reception (15 to 350 km/h).	
11	The DVB-NGH specification shall be designed to operate at least in the frequency bands III, IV and V, L-band and S-band.	New bands & bandwidths
12	DVB-NGH shall be designed to operate in RF channel bandwidths of <b>1.7</b> , 5, 6, 7,and 8, <b>10</b> , 15 and <b>20</b> MHz.	
		Avoid market
15	The system shall be designed for terrestrial use and it may also contain <i>a satellite component.</i>	fragmentation!
18	The system should support for the transport of the whole stream to transmitters over non synchronous networks such as <b>IP</b> .	
19	Individual quality for service components should be possible.	IP support and
22	The NGH standard should allow for a NGH service to be offered in different qualities. The lower quality being more robust, e.g. based on the use of <b>scalable video coding</b> .	service quality; possibly SVC
Sec.		
24	The video, audio or data <b>net throughput shall be maximized</b> for a given reception condition (e.g. C/N), i.e. overheads such as packet headers and metadata should be minimized, without losing functionality.	Reduce overheads!

NOKIA

### **Highlights of the commercial requirements 2**



Notes & disclaimers:

1) based on draft document from CM (accepted by DVB SB 2.7.2009)

2) Selection of certain requirements here does not mean any preference or indication of importance; purely personal interest <sup>(3)</sup>



#### **Technology comments**

#### Overhead reduction

- DVB-H has several layers of coding + IP overhead
- Changing the base code (like in DVB-T2) to LDPC (or equivalent), significant reduction is available
- IP overhead can be reduced (e.g. header compression)

#### Performance increase

- Changing coding ; RS => LDPC
- Additional low code rates for robustness (e.g. rate ¼ ...)
- Longer interleaving
  - Beware zapping time, maybe solutions like MPE-IFEC could be used
- Two tuner approach
  - Use 2x2 or (distributed) 4x2 MIMO (probably in crosspolarized form)
  - Use diversity (polarization or spatial?)
  - Or even TFS (time-frequency slicing)?!!
- Rotated constellations (from T2)

### **Technology comments 2**

#### New bands

- MIMO probably not feasible in VHF, UHF still unclear
- VHF requires external antennas
- Above 1 GHz MIMO is feasible
  - However: No feedback info about the channel to the Tx is available => MIMO is not as efficient as in p-t-p connections
- Satellite option requires very long interleavers (ca 10 s!) => large memory needed

- Big uncertainty in MIMO performance and feasibility in UHF
  - Measurement campaign was run in Helsinki may 2009
  - Sponsored by 10 "NGH Hero" companies
  - Analysis of the data started
  - New channel model expected by the end of 2009



## Goals for channel modelling

- To obtain channel models representative of MIMO delivery to a handheld device (or laptop)
- Terrestrial and Satellite
- VHF,UHF, L-Band; dimensionality up to 4x2
- Probably cross-polar receive antennas (+ wired headset)



Thanks for slide to P Moss, BBC

### **Challenges for NGH system**

- How to deal with MIMO question?
  Obligatory for UHF and above or optional (e.g. in UHF)?
  Receiver complexity and cost issue
  Can we always assume two tuners?
- ۰
- How to tackle adaptivity MIMO vs Diversity in BC environment
  Any reasonable solutions? (diversity seems to be more beneficial at low SNR than MIMO)
- How to deal with long interleaver issue?
  - Zapping time & delay
  - Memory
  - Cost how to support satellite services without unreasonable burden to all receivers?
- How to build a good solution to include SCV (via physical layer pipes (PLP) or...?)
- How to share T2 & NGH in one RF channel?

  - Using Future extension frames (FEF) of T2?
    Defining suitable method to use different physical layer pipes?
    Something else? Or all of these?
- How to handle upper layer issues? TS, IP etc transport

  - Seamless/easy service handover via various bearers
- How to increase signaling robustness and capacity?
- How to simplify not only adding features??!! •



#### What could it be?

Wild, (educated?) guess – very personal view

- T2 based system with some additions/modifications
  - More (and less!) coding rates
  - Long time interleaving (at least as option)
  - At least some support for 2x2 and possibly 4x2 MIMO
  - Less overhead
  - Streamlined to allow various service handover
  - Scalable video coding playing some role
  - Allowing flexible use together with T2 and within T2

# Hope that this does not disturb anybody nor block innovations!



### NGH work scheduling (draft)

- CM approval CM 1062 24June 2009 •
- SB approval 2 July 2009 •
- Start of technical work (CfT) Sept 2009 •
- Draft Specification Sept 2010 •
- Draft IG and other documents June 2011
- Publication of Specification(s) End 2011



Draft

ETS



#### **Thank You!**

