

Adaptive Video Streaming: a Survey and Case Study

HU, Pili

December 20, 2011

Abstract

In the past decade, Internet traffic has seen a significant change from web browsing to video viewing. The ongoing trend raises a challenging problem: how to stream data to heterogeneous peers?

The designer of such data streaming architecture should bear the following considerations in mind: QoE, server load, network resource efficiency, scalability, etc. The heterogeneous peer network condition makes the design more complicated. The underlying codec ranges from Multi Description Coding to Multi Layer Coding. The data deliver architecture ranges from unicast, multicast, to P2P network. Researchers have focused on different system settings and optimization objectives.

This paper will first sum up several works in the context of adaptive video streaming. At the same time, we do a case study on a commercial adaptive video streaming system, which combines Multilayer Codec and P2P technology. Possible improvements on this system are proposed with reasoning. Some of the conjectures are verified through a corresponding simulation platform based on NS2.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	General Model	3
3	Problem Scope	3
3.1	Codec	3
3.2	Networking	3
4	Design of Adaptive P2P VoD System	3
4.1	Codec Choice	3
4.2	Transmission Protocol Choice	3
4.3	Overlay Construction	3
4.4	Peer Selection	3
4.5	Buffer Management	3
4.6	Chunk Selection	3
4.7	Playback Decision	4
4.8	User Model	4
5	A Case Study	4
5.1	Baseline Description	4
5.2	Chunk Selection Architecture Reconstruction	4
5.3	Priority Based Upgrade	4
5.4	Scalable Window Size	4
5.5	Performance Optimization	4
5.6	Introduce Randomness in Second Window Section	4
5.7	Conclusion of the Case Study	4
6	Conclusion	4
7	Future Works	4
	Acknowledgements	4
	Appendix	5
	References	6

1 Introduction

- User perceived experience.
- Vendor cost.
- User cost.
- System cost.

2 General Model

3 Problem Scope

3.1 Codec

3.2 Networking

4 Design of Adaptive P2P VoD System

4.1 Codec Choice

4.2 Transimission Protocol Choice

4.3 Overlay Construction

4.4 Peer Selection

4.5 Buffer Management

4.6 Chunck Selection

MMKP, Knapsack

MCMF, Network Flow

4.7 Playback Decision

4.8 User Model

5 A Case Study

5.1 Baseline Description

5.2 Chunk Selection Architecture Reconstruction

5.3 Priority Based Upgrade

5.4 Scalable Window Size

5.5 Performance Optimization

5.6 Introduce Randomness in Second Window Section

5.7 Conclusion of the Case Study

6 Conclusion

7 Future Works

Acknowledgements

Appendix

References

- [1] J. Apostolopoulos, T. Wong, W. Tan, and S. Wee. On multiple description streaming with content delivery networks. In *INFOCOM 2002. Twenty-First Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Proceedings. IEEE*, volume 3, pages 1736–1745. IEEE, 2002.
- [2] J.G. Apostolopoulos. Reliable video communication over lossy packet networks using multiple state encoding and path diversity. In *Visual Communications and Image Processing*, volume 1. Citeseer, 2001.
- [3] S. Bhattacharyya, J.F. Kurose, D. Towlsey, and R. Nagarajan. Efficient rate-controlled bulk data transfer using multiple multicast groups. In *INFOCOM’98. Seventeenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Proceedings. IEEE*, volume 3, pages 1172–1179. IEEE, 1998.
- [4] J. Byers, M. Luby, and M. Mitzenmacher. Fine-grained layered multicast. In *INFOCOM 2001. Twentieth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Proceedings. IEEE*, volume 2, pages 1143–1151. IEEE, 2001.
- [5] Y. Cui and K. Nahrstedt. Layered peer-to-peer streaming. In *Proceedings of the 13th international workshop on Network and operating systems support for digital audio and video*, pages 162–171. ACM, 2003.
- [6] L. Dai, Y. Cui, and Y. Xue. Maximizing throughput in layered peer-to-peer streaming. In *Communications, 2007. ICC’07. IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1734–1739. IEEE, 2007.
- [7] M. Eberhard, T. Szkaliczki, H. Hellwagner, L. Szobonya, and C. Timmerer. Knapsack problem-based piece-picking algorithms for layered content in peer-to-peer networks. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM workshop on Advanced video streaming techniques for peer-to-peer networks and social networking*, pages 71–76. ACM, 2010.
- [8] S.K. Kasera, G. Hjalmtusson, D.F. Towsley, and J.F. Kurose. Scalable reliable multicast using multiple multicast channels. *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, 8(3):294–310, 2000.
- [9] S. Khan, K.F. Li, E.G. Manning, and M.D.M. Akbar. Solving the knapsack problem for adaptive multimedia systems. *Stud. Inform. Univ.*, 2(1):157–178, 2002.
- [10] J. Liu, B. Li, and Y.Q. Zhang. Adaptive video multicast over the internet. *Multimedia, IEEE*, 10(1):22–33, 2003.

- [11] Z. Liu, Y. Shen, S.S. Panwar, K.W. Ross, and Y. Wang. P2p video live streaming with mdc: Providing incentives for redistribution. In *Multimedia and Expo, 2007 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 48–51. IEEE, 2007.
- [12] Z. Liu, Y. Shen, S.S. Panwar, K.W. Ross, and Y. Wang. Using layered video to provide incentives in p2p live streaming. In *Proceedings of the 2007 workshop on Peer-to-peer streaming and IP-TV*, pages 311–316. ACM, 2007.
- [13] Z. Liu, Y. Shen, K.W. Ross, S.S. Panwar, and Y. Wang. Layerp2p: using layered video chunks in p2p live streaming. *Multimedia, IEEE Transactions on*, 11(7):1340–1352, 2009.
- [14] N. Magharei and R. Rejaie. Adaptive receiver-driven streaming from multiple senders. *Multimedia Systems*, 11(6):550–567, 2006.
- [15] S. McCanne, V. Jacobson, and M. Vetterli. Receiver-driven layered multicast. In *Conference proceedings on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications*, pages 117–130. ACM, 1996.
- [16] V.N. Padmanabhan, H.J. Wang, P.A. Chou, and K. Sripanidkulchai. Distributing streaming media content using cooperative networking. In *Proceedings of the 12th international workshop on Network and operating systems support for digital audio and video*, pages 177–186. ACM, 2002.
- [17] V. Pai, K. Kumar, K. Tamilmani, V. Sambamurthy, and A. Mohr. Chainsaw: Eliminating trees from overlay multicast. *Peer-to-peer systems IV*, v:127–140, 2005.
- [18] M. Qin and R. Zimmermann. Improving mobile ad-hoc streaming performance through adaptive layer selection with scalable video coding. In *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Multimedia*, pages 717–726. ACM, 2007.
- [19] R. Rejaie, M. Handley, and D. Estrin. Quality adaptation for congestion controlled video playback over the internet. In *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, volume 29, pages 189–200. ACM, 1999.
- [20] R. Rejaie and A. Ortega. Pals: peer-to-peer adaptive layered streaming. In *Proceedings of the 13th international workshop on Network and operating systems support for digital audio and video*, pages 153–161. ACM, 2003.

- [21] T. Szkaliczki, M. Eberhard, H. Hellwagner, and L. Szobonya. Piece selection algorithm for layered video streaming in p2p networks. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 36:1265–1272, 2010.
- [22] X. Xiao, Y. Shi, and Y. Gao. On optimal scheduling for layered video streaming in heterogeneous peer-to-peer networks. In *Proceeding of the 16th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 785–788. ACM, 2008.
- [23] X. Xiao, Y. Shi, Y. Gao, and Q. Zhang. Layerp2p: A new data scheduling approach for layered streaming in heterogeneous networks. In *INFOCOM 2009, IEEE*, pages 603–611. IEEE, 2009.
- [24] X. Xiao, Y. Shi, B. Zhang, and Y. Gao. Ocal: A novel overlay construction approach for layered streaming. In *Communications, 2008. ICC'08. IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1807–1812. IEEE, 2008.
- [25] J. Zhao, F. Yang, Q. Zhang, and Z. Zhang. On improving the throughput of media delivery applications in heterogeneous overlay network. In *Proc. IEEE Globecom*. Citeseer, 2006.
- [26] Youtube, Demo of User Controlled Adaptation, <http://www.youtube.com/>