
A Network-based Method for Measurement of Internet Video Streaming Quality

ITG-FG 5.2.3 - Next Generation Networks
24. Sitzung am 17.03. 2011 – Darmstadt

Telefonica O2 Germany
Engineering Department
Stefan Rugel

Chemnitz University of Technology
Communication Networks
Thomas Bauschert
Thomas Martin Knoll
Marcus Eckert

Outline

1. Motivation
2. Related Work
3. Measurement Procedure
4. Measurement Evaluation
5. Results

2 / 12

A Network-based Method for Video QoE Measurement - 17.3.2011 - TU Chemnitz, Th. M. Knoll

[Motivation](#) Rel. Work Measurement Procedure Evaluation Results

Motivation

Video streaming influences the Internet

- Video streaming services contribute a **major portion of today's Internet** traffic mix
- Increasing number of **video enhanced web pages**
- **Smart phones and USB sticks** cause a fast increase in video download usage in mobile networks
- Increased **network capacity** (e.g. HSPA+) enable **higher quality video** services

Video streaming measurement becomes vital

- **Video network transport quality** needs to meet the video play out **quality requirements**
- But how do you know?
- **Measurement results** provide insight into the actually achieved quality
→ can be used for **network planning and traffic engineering**

A Network-based Method for Measurement of Internet Video Streaming Quality

3 / 12

A Network-based Method for Video QoE Measurement - 17.3.2011 - TU Chemnitz, Th. M. Knoll

Motivation [Rel. Work](#) Measurement Procedure Evaluation Results

Related Work

Video quality measurement

- Video quality in terms of delay, loss, jitter robustness
- Quality of Experience measurement still an area of research
- Unsolved problem of QoE estimation based on packet transport characteristics

Video quality estimation based on network throughput

- Video streaming services can be **monitored by DPI devices** within the network, which provide **insight into round trip time, packet retransmission rate** and **network provided throughput**

Video quality estimation based on play out buffer level

- Most **precise QoE estimates** can be achieved by **end device play out buffer level** measurements.
- No video impairment is expected, if play out buffer depletion is avoided
- **Fill level thresholds** provide early warnings about **pending buffer depletion**


4 / 12

A Network-based Method for Video QoE Measurement - 17.3.2011 - TU Chemnitz, Th. M. Knoll

Measurement Procedure

Network based Measurement

- Platform and end device independent measurement
- Observation of video packet flow between the e.g. Youtube server and the watching/evaluating client
- Notebooks with HSPA-Sticks (up to 20Mbps)
- Point of Measurement at Gi-interface within the network of Telefonica O2 Germany
- PCAP traces of different video streams (360p ... 1080p resolution) for offline processing
- User experience protocols for initial buffering time, total re-buffering time and number of re-buffering events




5 / 12

Measurement Evaluation

Play out buffer estimation

- PCAP trace processing
- Flow identification
- TCP segment and associated ACK tracking
- Video payload decoding (.flv & .mp4)
- Extraction of play out time and ACK timestamp
- Deduce play out buffer fill level as QoE KPI
- Special handling of buffer depletion events and re-buffering behaviour




6 / 12

Measurement Evaluation

Observations

- Take ACK timestamp for better timing precision (relative timing to first video payload segment)
- Consider TCP's accumulated ACK behaviour
- Consider TCP retransmit for timestamps and video decoding
- Differences in FLV and MP4 play out encoding
- Modelling of buffer depletion events (playing mode / buffering mode)



7 / 12

Results

Evaluation of Youtube video downloads

- Video resolution: 360p (typical), 480p, 720p (HD), 1080p (HD)
- Video encoding: Flash Video (.flv); increasingly MPEG4 (.mp4) (HD videos are mp4 encoded)
- Youtube's streaming behaviour varies over time (e.g. throttle parameter)


Number	Resolution	Throughput required [kbps]	Playout Time [sec]	Container file format	Numer of tests	Number of test with re-buffering
1	320x240	431	280	flv	3	0
2	480x320	515	357	mp4	2	1
3	640x360	799	163	flv	1	0
4	854x480	1216	163	flv	2	0
5	854x480	1066	203	flv	1	0
6	450x360	845	221	flv	1	0
7	1280x720	2026	152	mp4	3	1
8	1280x720	2893	236	mp4	2	2
9	1280x720	2017	262	mp4	2	0
10	1280x544	2103	135	mp4	2	2
11	1920x1080	3567	235	mp4	2	2
12	1920x1080	3427	262	mp4	1	1
13	1920x1072	3644	254	mp4	3	3

8 / 12

Results

360p FLV video example

- Steep initial buffering phase followed by a more moderate constant increase of buffered video data
- No depletion
- In conformance with recorded QoE




9 / 12

Results

1080p MP4 video example

- Steep initial buffering phase followed by a fluctuating increase of buffered video data
- one re-buffering event of 6.9 sec duration
- In conformance with recorded QoE (~ 6 sec outage)




10 / 12

Results

Comparison of re-buffering simulation and client experience

- Comparison in terms of estimated outage time in seconds




11 / 12

Results

Comparison of re-buffering simulation and client experience

- Comparison in terms of the estimated number of outage events



12 / 12

Results

Throughput vs. Play out buffer based measurement

- Throughput relevant information was extracted from the traces by access of header information or the use of common procedures:
 - total size of the video,
 - video play out time and
 - total time of transmission of the video file.
- Test 2: average required throughput of 2.1Mbit/s. → 2.28Mbit/s achieved
- 3 major throughput fluctuations observed; only one resulted in buffer depletion
- Accumulated throughput measurement could get close to play out buffer based measurement precision

Conclusion

- Detailed network based play out buffer measurement provides reliable QoE estimates.
- More detailed investigations whether the increased effort compared to average throughput measurements really pays off.

13 / 12

Thank you

Marcus Eckert
Chemnitz University of Technology
Communication Networks
Email marcus.eckert@s2003.tu-chemnitz.de

Thomas Martin Knoll
Chemnitz University of Technology
Communication Networks
Phone +49 371 531 33246
Email knoll@etit.tu-chemnitz.de