

# Priority-based Transmission Scheduling for Delivery of Scalable Video Coding over Mobile Channels

Thomas Schierl<sup>1</sup>, Yago Sanchez de la Fuente<sup>1</sup>, Cornelius Hellge<sup>2,1</sup> and Thomas Wiegand<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fraunhofer HHI  
Image Processing Department  
Einsteinufer 58  
10587 Berlin, Germany  
+49 30 31002 227

<sup>2</sup>Technische Universität Berlin  
Image Communication Group  
Department of Telecommunication Systems  
10587 Berlin, Germany  
+49 30 314 28777

## Abstract

The media, especially the video delivery over mobile channels may be affected by link outages and transmission bit rate variations due to the actual channel condition and the used wireless interface. In this paper we present the use of Priority-based Transmission Scheduling of SVC media data to overcome link outages and reduction in channel bit rate in mobile networks. The Priority-based Transmission Scheduling framework aims to use the same transmission bit rate and the same overall buffer size as a traditionally streaming approach would require. In order to overcome outages and phases with reduced bit rate, a priority scheduling is used to pre-buffer larger amounts of more important data for longer playout than data with less importance for the resulting video playout quality. We compare the use of SVC with Priority-based Transmission Scheduling against H.264/AVC using temporal scalability with Priority-based Transmission Scheduling and H.264/AVC without Priority-based Transmission Scheduling. We show the benefits of using SVC in terms of received quality during outage and re-buffering time. We present a quality optimization approach for the Priority-based Transmission Scheduling and show results for different outage times.

## Keywords

H.264/AVC, SVC, Scalable Video Coding, Priority based scheduling, Mobile channels, outages, transmission rate variation.

## 1. Introduction

The video delivery over cellular mobile channels may be affected by link outages and bit rate variations due to the changing channel condition. These effects mainly depend on the used wireless interface.

In this paper we present the use of H.264/AVC Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS) for SVC media data to overcome link outages and reduction in channel bit rate in mobile networks. This approach has been already discussed and evaluated for H.264/AVC over 3GPP Packetized Streaming Service (PSS) in [1] and [2].

The Priority-based Transmission Scheduling framework aims to use the same transmission bit rate and the same overall buffer size as a traditionally streaming approach would require. To a traditionally streaming approach, we refer to as earliest deadline first (EDF) transmission scheduling, where each NAL unit is transmitted depending on the decoding time of the video access

unit. In order to overcome outages and phases with reduced bit rate, a priority scheduling algorithm is used to pre-buffer larger amounts of more important data for longer playout than data with less importance for the resulting video playout quality. In [1], this was achieved using the temporal scalability feature of H.264/AVC. The approach in [1] aimed to reduce the video frame rate down to a slide show during outage and re-buffering phase after the outage. The priority based transmission requires some means of client buffer occupation as discussed in [1], [2] which is only possible over a point-to-point connection with feedback about the buffer filling level. In the 3GPP PSS standard [4], there are means for a feedback-based transmission rate control [3] which may need to be extended to perform the priority based scheduling.

In this paper, we focus on the use of the new scalability features of H.264 Scalable Video Coding (SVC) [6][7]. Since there is currently an ongoing activity in 3GPP on improved video support including SVC [5], we show the benefits of using SVC instead of H.264/AVC temporal scalability for PBTS to overcome link outages and phases with reduced bit rate. SVC has the handy advantage to allow bit rate reduction using SNR fidelity or spatial scalability instead of relying on pure temporal scalability as shown in [1].

We compare the use of SVC with PBTS against H.264/AVC using temporal scalability with PBTS as shown in [1] and H.264/AVC without PBTS. We show the benefits of using SVC in terms of received quality during outage and re-buffering time, where we take PSNR as a measure for perceived quality. Here, we assume that the video is transmitted at maximum rate equal to the video rate both during pre-buffering and transmission phases. We present a quality optimization approach for the PBTS and show results for different outage times for the three different methods.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the PBTS approach. In section 3, we present the model for the PBTS approach using SVC and present the optimization for different buffer outage scenarios. We present the results for our experiments in section 4 and we conclude in section 5.


## 2. H.264/AVC Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS)

The idea of Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS) for H.264 in streaming scenarios is to pre-buffer a larger amount of more important NAL units and pre-buffer smaller amounts of less important NAL units in the streaming receiver's buffer. This allows for graceful quality degradation during outage or bit rate variation phases. In such cases, the pre-buffering level cannot be

---

The work of Fraunhofer HHI has been funded by the European Commission under contract number FP7-ICT-214063, project SEA.

kept due to the fact that more data is consumed than new data arrives in the buffer per time interval. In case of having a buffer filled with a priority scheduling algorithm, the high quality data in the buffer runs out earlier than lower qualities (most important data). Compared to the use of earliest deadline first (EDF) transmission scheduling, the highest quality runs out even faster with the PBTS approach. Nevertheless, the priority based scheduling allows for keeping the playout alive during longer outages than in the EDF case. In Figure 1, we show a streaming receiver's priority buffers for three different qualities as also used in [1]. The priority based transmission scheduling achieves, that a first buffer of the lowest quality  $Q1$  (e.g. intra frames) is built up to a data amount equivalent with a playout time of  $t_1+t_2+t_3$ . The quality  $Q1$  corresponds to a constant bit rate  $r_1$ . After that a second buffer for  $Q2$  is built up which pre-buffers a playout time of  $t_2+t_3$ , where the constant rate of  $Q2$  corresponds to  $r_1+r_2$ . The same procedure is applied to  $Q3$  NAL units, where the constant rate of  $Q3$  corresponds to  $r_1+r_2+r_3$  and the buffer is filled up to a playout time amount of  $t_3$ .



**Figure 1 – Streaming receiver buffer for three qualities within the same media using Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS)**

After reaching the playout time values for the quality  $Q_i$  in the priority re-buffering phase, the transmission scheduling algorithm switches to the buffering phase, where each quality  $Q_i$  is filled up with its playout rate  $r_i$ . This behavior is shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2 –Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS) with priority re-buffering (Prio/Reb) and buffering phases**

After the occurrence of an outage, the PBTS scheduling algorithm refills the buffer once the connection is back. Note that we assume a mobile service with a maximum transmission bit rate equal to the constant bit rate of the video. Hence, during a re-buffering phase the quality still needs to be degraded. In the case of using EDF scheduling, during re-buffering the playout has to be stopped.

For PBTS, it is required to send data in an interleaved fashion, which is supported by both the RTP payload format for H.264/AVC as well as the RTP payload format for SVC [8].

### 3. Optimized SVC Priority-based Transmission Scheduling

In this section, we discuss the model for PBTS using SVC with SNR fidelity scalability, H.264/AVC with temporal scalability as well as H.264/AVC EDF.


First we will discuss the re-buffering scenarios on which we focus in this paper. Therefore in our model, we assume that each quality of the media is encoded at a constant bit rate as denoted in section 2. We further assume that the bit rate for transmission is limited to the bit rate of the video  $R = r_1+r_2+r_3$ . Furthermore, the outage time,

which is the time interval without transmission rate, is always less than the maximum outage time  $t_{outage_{max}} = t_1+t_2+t_3$ , which allows for continuous playout at least at lowest quality for the PBTS cases. For comparison of EDF and PBTS, we use the same total buffer amount as well as the same time for re-buffering.

We assume a PBTS with three quality buffers, which are filled to the corresponding playout time values for  $Q1$ ,  $Q2$  and  $Q3$ :  $t_1+t_2+t_3$ ,  $t_2+t_3$ , and  $t_3$ . Using PBTS for the receiver buffer two cases can be distinguished:

- A. During re-buffering, the quality is degraded to the lowest quality  $Q1$
- B. During the re-buffering, the quality is degraded to a medium quality  $Q2$


This is due to the assumption, that available transmission rate for re-buffering and playout after the outage is at maximum the video rate  $R$ . Therefore, at least one quality has to be dropped in order to obtain additional rate to re-buffer the lower qualities, while continuously playing out the lower qualities at the same time.



**Figure 3 – Impact of outage which requires graceful quality degradation to the lowest quality – case A**

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the two possibilities A and B. The length of the outage determines whether during the re-buffering phase  $t_{rebuf}$  the quality is degraded to the medium quality or the lowest quality.

Note, that the re-buffering process in our model is carried out in the fastest possible way. Although it would be possible to increase the quality already during the refill phase of the buffer to a medium quality, such a re-buffering phase would take more time and would therefore reduce the overall quality.



**Figure 4 – Impact of outage which requires graceful quality degradation to the medium quality only – case B**

In Figure 3, case A is depicted. The here grey bars on the right for  $Q1$ ,  $Q2$  and  $Q3$  represent the state of the buffer when no outage happens. If an outage occurs (grey shaded box), the data of the

buffer is played and thereafter the re-buffering process is started. PBTS aims to ensure that at least data for a video quality  $Q1$  is available. The green box represents additional data, necessary to keep on playing at  $Q1$  until the buffer is fully re-buffered.

If the outage length is short enough, that the re-buffering could be finished before the  $Q2$  buffer runs out, case B occurs as depicted in Figure 4. The dashed boxes for  $Q1$  and  $Q2$  in Figure 4 show the initial state of the buffer. It can be noticed, that in case B less data has to be sent during the re-buffering phase. In order to find the buffer structure, which maximizes the quality for a given outage length, the two possible cases A and B are studied in the remainder of this section.

Therefore, we first discuss the bounds for  $toutage$  which differentiates between the two cases A and B, with the following definitions. The time  $T = toutage + t_{rebuf}$  is the time it takes to get back to the highest quality after begin of the outage. The condition for case B is fulfilled, if eq.(1) is true.

$$T = toutage + t_{rebuf} \leq t_2 + t_3 \quad : \text{case B} \quad (1)$$

That means during the outage and the re-buffering phase in case B, still the medium quality  $Q2$  can be played out. Taking further into account the video rate being  $R = r_1 + r_2 + r_3$ , and the amount of re-buffered data being  $t_{rebuf} * R = r_3 * t_3 + (r_2 + r_1) * (toutage + t_{rebuf})$ , the amount of re-buffered data can be calculated. Then the amount of re-buffered data is equal to the sum of data played out at quality  $Q1 + Q2$  during  $t_{rebuf}$ , the data to be re-buffered for  $Q1$  and  $Q2$  played during  $toutage$  and the data to completely re-buffer  $Q3$ . With the aforementioned conditions, eq. (1) can be transposed to eq. (2), which is the condition for being in case B.

$$t_2 \geq toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \quad : \text{case B} \quad (2)$$

The fixed buffer size  $B$  is calculated in eq. (3), with  $toutage_{max} = t_1 + t_2 + t_3$  (compare Figure 4).

$$B(t_2, t_3) = toutage_{max} * r_1 + (t_2 + t_3) * r_2 + t_3 * r_3 \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, eq. (3) gives a direct connection for  $t_2$  and  $t_3$ , with  $toutage_{max}$ ,  $B$  and  $r_1, r_2, r_3$  being fixed as follows:

$$t_2(t_3) = \frac{B - toutage_{max} * r_1 - t_3 * (r_3 + r_2)}{r_2} \quad (4)$$

Since the quality of the video typically depends on a single rate-distortion function,  $Q1$ ,  $Q2$  and  $Q3$  are derived as  $q(r_1)$ ,  $q(r_1 + r_2)$  and  $q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)$  respectively in the following.

In eq. (5) and eq. (6), the time for re-buffering  $t_{rebuf}$  respectively the time of quality degradation  $T$  are calculated.

$$t_{rebuf}(t_2, t_3) = \begin{cases} \frac{toutage * r_1 + B - toutage_{max} * r_1}{R - r_1}, & t_2 < toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \\ \frac{toutage * (r_2 + r_1) + t_3 * r_3}{r_3}, & t_2 \geq toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

For case A (upper part) in eq. (5), we summed first the amount of data played at lowest quality during the outage (which needs to be re-buffered to  $toutage_{max}$ ) and second the amount of data, which needs to be re-buffered for the two other qualities to fill up the priority buffer, divided by the bit rate available for re-buffering (while playing quality  $q(r_1)$ ).

For case B (lower part) in eq. (5), we summed first the amount of data played at lowest+medium quality during the outage (which needs to be re-buffered to  $toutage_{max}$  and  $t_2 + t_3$  respectively) and

second the amount of data, which needs to be re-buffered for the highest quality  $q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)$  to fill up the priority buffer, divided by the bit rate available for re-buffering (while playing quality  $q(r_1)$  and  $q(r_1 + r_2)$ ). From eq. (1) and (5), eq. (6) is concluded as follows:

$$T(t_2, t_3) = \begin{cases} \frac{toutage * R + B - toutage_{max} * r_1}{R - r_1}, & t_2 < toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \\ \frac{toutage * R + t_3 * r_3}{r_3}, & t_2 \geq toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The aim is to ensure continuous playout during and after the outage, at least at minimum quality  $q(r_1)$ . Therefore, we set  $(t_1 + t_2 + t_3)$  equal to a fixed  $toutage_{max}$ . The lengths  $t_2 + t_3$  and  $t_3$  of the buffers for  $q(r_1 + r_2)$  and  $q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)$  are the variables for which the optimal solution is searched, since  $q(r_1)$  needs to be played continuously during  $T$ .

For case B, where the length of the outage is small enough to meet the condition in eq. (2), the time  $T$  after which the playout is back at highest quality depends on  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  compare eq. (6). For the optimizations, we use the largest possible value of  $T(t_2, t_3)$  in case B, which corresponds to the smallest value  $t_{2min}$  of  $t_2$  and to the highest value  $t_{3max}$  of  $t_3$  respectively, which fulfill  $toutage = t_{2min}(t_{3max}) * r_3 / R$ , compare eq. (2). For higher values of  $t_2$ ,  $T$  is smaller, thus for the additional time  $T(t_{2min}) - T$  the highest quality  $q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)$  could be play out, in case B. Thus, the playout time with highest quality is  $t_3 + (T(t_{2min}) - T)$ , compare eq. (7).

For case A, since  $T$  does not depend on  $t_2$  and  $t_3$ , the average quality calculation is straight forward following Figure 3. All qualities need to be re-buffered, but only quality  $q(r_1)$  needs to be continuously played out.

The average quality for both cases A and B is shown in eq. (7).

$$Q = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{T} * [(T - t_2 - t_3) * q(r_1) + t_2 * q(r_1 + r_2) + t_3 * q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)], & t_2 < toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \\ \frac{1}{T(t_{2min})} * [(T - t_3) * q(r_1 + r_2) + (T(t_{2min}) - T + t_3) * q(r_1 + r_2 + r_3)], & t_2 \geq toutage \frac{R}{r_3} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

In order to calculate the maximum quality for each of the two cases, eq. (7) has to be optimized with respect to  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  respectively as shown in eq. (8).

$$\arg \max_{t_2, t_3} (Q(t_2, t_3)) \quad (8)$$

Solving eq. (8) results in  $t_2=0$  for the selected qualities and rates of the test sequence shown in section 4. This means that for the selected rate points the use of only two quality buffers does make sense.

We keep for future work or the final paper, the additional optimization of the rate points of the qualities for graceful degradation  $r_1$  and  $r_2$ , having a fixed highest video quality  $R$ .

## 4. Results


For the simulations a buffer of 5 seconds at rate  $R$  was used, which is equivalent to  $B = 125$  KB of the used H.264/AVC and SVC streams as shown in Figure 6, which are a concatenation of the ITU-T test sequences City, Crew, Foreman and Soccer. The streams have a Group of Picture (GOP) size of 16 plus a preceding IDR picture for each GOP, i.e. the stream has a random access interval of 0.57s. The resolution is QVGA at 30 frames per second. A rate control has been used to keep the bit rate in a +/- 2.5%-window of the average value per IDR+GOP16 picture chunk. The stream length is about 40 seconds. The bitrate for the H.264/AVC

stream is 395 kbps and the bit rat for the SVC stream is 400 kbps. The SVC stream uses MGS fidelity scalability with one enhancement layer, where the base layer has about 160 kbps. The hierarchical prediction structure with GOP 16 + a preceding IDR per chunk allows a temporal scalability with up to six levels for the H.264/AVC stream.

The distribution function for the outages considered for the evaluations is a uniform distribution for outages between 2 and 10 seconds. In all evaluations, the three methods


- I. SVC-PBTS – SVC with three quality levels and PBTS, where after an outage the priority buffer is always re-buffered.
- II. AVC-PBTS – H.264/AVC with three quality levels and PBTS, where after an outage the priority buffer is always re-buffered.
- III. AVC-EDF – H.264/AVC with EDF, where re-buffering is applied only in case of an empty buffer.

have been used.



**Figure 5 – Two outage examples over time with the resulting quality as PSNR**

In Figure 5, we show as an example the resulting video quality over time for two different outages of 3 and 8 seconds using the three different methods.




**Figure 6 – The three test stream qualities - SVC using MGS scalability and H.264/AVC using temporal scalability.**

Figure 6 shows the three quality levels for the H.264/AVC and the SVC streams used for PBTS, where the SVC rate-distortion points are derived dropping MGS NAL units in the enhancement layer

only and the H.264/AVC rate-distortion points are achieved using temporal scalability.

In Figure 7, we present the average PSNR video quality in terms of dB for the three methods over the time  $T$  for different lengths of outages. For the AVC-EDF method we show the curve assuming a full buffer at begin of the outage. For the AVC-EDF case, it can be noticed that full quality can be played out until the buffer is empty, at 5 sec. For the SVC-PBTS case, it can be noticed that SVC outperforms the AVC-PBTS method as well as the AVC-EDF method with outages greater than 5 seconds. Furthermore, it can be noticed that the method using H.264/AVC temporal scalability is even worse than the method without PBTS (AVC-EDF). This is due to the fact, that the PSNR is calculated for missing frames as freeze-frame PSNR. Although the overall quality for H.264/AVC with EDF is better, the user perception might be worse due to the fact that the video is completely frozen where the H.264/AVC approach with temporal scalability (AVC-PBTS) still allows playing out a video “slide show” at very low frame rate.



**Figure 7 – Results for PSNR quality during interval  $T$  (outage and re-buffering phase) over the average outage length in seconds using the three methods**

In Figure 8 and Figure 9, the performance of the proposed SVC PBTS is analyzed for different outage fractions and compared with the two other methods. Figure 8 shows the average PSNR quality over the whole sequence against different outage fractions. The outage fraction value is detailed in the following. Figure 9 shows the average playable framerate against the outage fractions.


Due to the fact, that an outage decreases the quality of the video not only during the outage, but also in the re-buffering phase, the calculation of the average PSNR for a given outage fraction is applied as follows:

$$Avg.PSNR = E[Q] * p + Q3 * (1 - p) \quad (9)$$

where  $E[Q]$  with  $Q$  taken from eq. (7), is the expected value of the quality during outage and re-buffering phase, i.e. during time  $T$ .  $p$  is the possibility of being in the lower quality state, with  $Q3$  being the highest quality.  $p$  is calculated as follows:

$$p = \frac{E[T]}{E[toutage]} * e = \frac{E[toutage + t_{re-buffering}]}{E[toutage]} * e \quad (10)$$

Where the outage fraction  $e$  is the quotient of time being in outage state over the simulation time.  $E[T]$  and  $E[toutage]$  are the expected values for the time  $T$  and time  $toutage$  respectively.



**Figure 8 – Average PSNR quality for different occurrences of outages (outage fraction) for the three methods**

The results in Figure 8 show that SVC outperforms the two H.264/AVC based methods starting with error rates above approx. 6%. Although SVC imposes a PSNR penalty of about 0.8dBs for the test sequence, this penalty may be further reduced using encoder optimizations as proposed in [9], which have not been used for the test stream generation.

The results in Figure 9 show even better the potentiality of SVC to overcome link outages with the full video framerate. Both AVC approaches introduce the reduction of framerate, where the AVC-EDF approach results in complete playout interruptions depending on the outage length, which seems to be not acceptable from a service point of view.

SVC using the PBTS algorithm achieves much better results in terms of received video quality and playable framerate than with other methods over a wide range of operation points. The higher the probability for outages is, the more benefits are achieved by using SVC with PBTS. In the end it is a question of being able to guarantee service continuity under all channels conditions or not being able.


The PBTS approach could be also applied to bit rate variation scenarios as well as on Internet streaming scenarios with transmission rates higher than the video rate. We keep evaluation of such scenarios for future work.

The proposed approach can be also applied in scenarios, where playout is started with a minimum buffer that allows for playing the minimum quality. That would result in a streaming approach with nearly immediately playout while increasing the pre-buffer as well as the quality during playout. Thus the approach would also allow for reduced start-up times.

## 5. Conclusion

We presented an optimization of Priority-based Transmission Scheduling (PBTS) for SVC and H.264/AVC scalability. We showed the benefits of using SVC in point-to-point streaming scenarios with the possibility of occurrence of link outages as possible in cellular mobile networks. Although SVC imposes a penalty in maximum video quality, the results show that SVC allows overcoming much higher outages than the actual pre-buffer

time, which makes it suitable for scenarios with constrained bit rate and a potentiality of link outages as well as transmission rate variations.



**Figure 9 – Average playable frame rate for different occurrences of outages (outage fraction) for the three methods**

## 6. References

- [1] T. Schierl, M. Kampmann, and T. Wiegand: H.264/AVC Interleaving for 3G Wireless Video Streaming, IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME'05), Amsterdam, The Netherlands, July 2005.
- [2] J. Kritzner, U. Horn, M. Kampmann, J. Sachs: Priority Based Packet Scheduling with Tunable Reliability for Wireless Streaming”, HSNMC 2004, Toulouse, France, July 2004.
- [3] N. Baldo, U. Horn, M. Kampmann, and F. Hartung: "RTCP Feedback Based Transmission Rate Control For 3G Wireless Multimedia Streaming”, PIMRC, September 2004
- [4] 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Transparent end-to-end Packet-switched Streaming Service (PSS); Protocols and codecs (Release 8), V8.3.0, June 2009
- [5] 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Improved Video Support for PSS and MBMS Services (Release 9), April 2009
- [6] ITU-T, ISO/IEC, ITU-T recommendation H.264(2008), Advanced video coding for generic audiovisual services. ISO/IEC 14496-10:2008 Information technology—Coding of audiovisual objects—part 10: Advanced Video Coding, fourth ed., 2008.
- [7] H. Schwarz, D. Marpe, and T. Wiegand, *Overview of the scalable video coding extension of the H.264/AVC standard*, IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol., vol. 17, no. 9, Sep. 2007
- [8] S. Wenger, Y.-K. Wang, T. Schierl, A. Eleftheriadis (eds.): RTP payload format for SVC video, IETF AVT, March 2009, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-avt-rtp-svc>
- [9] H. Schwarz and T. Wiegand, Further results for an rd-optimized multi-loop SVC encoder, JVT Meeting, April 2007