Architectur 00000 Decision Model 0000 Evaluation 00000000 Conclusion 00000

# mCast: An SDN-based Resource-Efficient Live Video Streaming Architecture with ISP-CDN Collaboration



Ahmed Khalid, Ahmed H. Zahran and Cormac J. Sreenan



Mobile and Internet Systems Laboratory (MISL) Department of Computer Science University College Cork (UCC), Cork, Ireland The 42nd IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN) October 9-12, 2017, Singapore

Presented by: Ahmed Khalid



October 10, 2017

This publication has emanated from research conducted with the financial support of Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) under Grant Number: 13/IA/1892.

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

## 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## 5 Conclusion

Introduction $\bullet 00000$	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

## 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## 5 Conclusion

Introduction $\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$	Architecture 00000	Decision Model 0000	Evaluation 00000000	Conclusion 00000
In a Nutshell				

IP unicast is used to deliver live video streams to thousands of clients

IP Multicast can save resources but can not pass through the Internet

Our architecture mCast enables inter-domain multicast and saves network and system resources for both ISPs and CDNs

LCN'17

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Introduction} \\ \circ \bullet \bullet \circ \circ \circ \end{array}$	$\operatorname{Architecture}$ 00000	Decision Model 0000	Evaluation 00000000	Conclusion 00000
Why Is IP M	ulticast Not	Used?		

Lacks features essential for a business model of a CDN, such as:

- Billing policies and client authorization
- Group management
- Data and user privacy

#### Near impossible for ISPs to manage inter-domain IP multicast:

- Hard to achieve traffic and admission control
- Rigid and static routing algorithms
- High CAPEX/OPEX



Introduction $\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
	00000	0000	00000000	00000
What abou	t P2P?			

- Peer-to-Peer systems use Application Layer Multicast (ALM)
- Peers form an overlay topology and share streams



• Reduces the load on content servers but increases start-up delays

#### Further deteriorates situation for ISPs:

- Additional inter-domain and intra-domain unicast flows
- Even more bandwidth consumption than IP unicast
- Better solution needed





## Software-Defined Network (SDN):

#### Separates the control plane from the data plane

The global view of SDN can make the delivery of traffic very efficient

The flexible control of SDN solves the deployment issues of IP multicast



#### The centralized control of SDN:

Can help ISPs manage the traffic flows across their domain

Introduction $00000$	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Contribution	of Paper			

An Internet architecture for live streaming that provides:

- Reduced inter-domain and intra-domain traffic for ISPs and CDNs
- A dynamic and scalable mechanism for multicast tree construction
- Transparent delivery of video streams to clients

## A framework for:

- Communication between SDN controllers of ISPs and CDNs
- Maintaining full control of CDNs over their clients
- A cost-based decision model to help CDNs decide when switching to mCast will be profitable
- An evaluation platform to compare the performance of SDN-based multicast architectures or algorithms

Introduction	Architecture $\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000		0000	00000000	00000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

## 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## 5 Conclusion









#### mCast ISP Agent

- Plays a passive role and does not trigger mCast
- Interfaces with CDN to receive session aggregation requests
- Orchestrates multicast operations
- Creates identifier for the mCast stream

#### mCast CDN Agent

- Gathers information from Standard Request handler
- Identifies clients that can be served with mCast
- Performs multicast management functions
- Triggers mCast based on the output from decision model





#### mCast ISP Routing Module

- Probes Topology Manager to get a graph of network
- Creates multicast trees

#### mCast Flow Manager

- Installs mCast entries with higher priority than IP unicast
- Installs transparency rule on egress switches

#### mCast CDN Routing Module

- Forwards content requests of clients to the request handler for authentication
- Consults mCast CDN Agent before proceeding with the default routing

 Introduction
 Architecture
 Decision Model
 Evaluation
 Conclusion

 coccoo
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco

 An Example of Message Exchanges
 Coccusion
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco







 Introduction
 Architecture
 Decision Model
 Evaluation
 Conclusion

 coccoo
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco

 An Example of Message Exchanges
 Coccusion
 cocco
 cocco
 cocco



Introduction Architecture Decision Model Evaluation Conclusion 000000 An Example of Message Exchanges



Introduction Architecture Decision Model Evaluation Conclusion 000000 An Example of Message Exchanges



 Introduction
 Architecture
 Decision Model
 Evaluation
 Conclusion

 0000●
 0000
 0000
 000000
 00000

 An Example of Message Exchanges
 0000
 00000
 00000



Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	●000	00000000	00000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

### 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## 5 Conclusion

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	o●oo	00000000	00000
Importance	of the Decis	sion Model		

- Complimentary contribution to mCast architecture
- ISPs and CDNs are economically driven:
  - ISPs will charge CDNs for availing mCast service
  - CDNs would want to minimize the cost to serve a stream to clients

#### The decision model:

- Identifies various cost factors
- Presents the cost factors in quantifiable mathematical equations
- Informs CDNs when switching to mCast will reduce the total cost to serve a stream

	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
		0000		
Cost Facto	rs			

Power Consumed to serve a stream to N clients:

$$P(N) = P_{max} \left( 0.7 \left\lceil \frac{N}{N_o} \right\rceil + 0.3 \frac{N}{N_o} \right)$$

 $P_{max}$  = power consumed by a server when fully utilized  $N_o$  = maximum number of clients that a server can serve

Bandwidth Consumed to serve a stream to N clients:

$$B(N) = max\left(\alpha NB_iS_T, \frac{V_CS_CNB_i}{\sum X_iB_i}\right)$$

 $\alpha$  = factor to avoid large queuing delays

 $B_i$  = average bit-rate of channel i,  $X_i$  = a client watching channel i

 $V_{\rm T}$  = transit volume;  $V_{\rm C}$  = commit volume

 $S_T$  = unit price for  $V_T$ ;  $S_C$  = unit price for  $V_C$ 

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	000●	00000000	00000
Problem F	ormulation			

#### Cost to server N clients with IP Unicast:

$$U(N) = P_{max} \left( 0.7 \left\lceil \frac{N}{N_o} \right\rceil + 0.3 \frac{N}{N_o} \right) + \frac{V_C S_C N B_i}{\sum X_i B i}$$

#### Cost to server N clients with mCast:

$$M(N) = U(1) + C\frac{1 - r^{N}}{1 - r}$$

 ${\rm C}=$  initial cost that ISP charges CDN for providing mCast service  ${\rm r}=$  ratio for decreasing cost of every new client

#### Find Number of clients for which:

M(N) < U(N)

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	$\mathbf{Evaluation}$	Conclusion
000000	00000	0000		00000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

## 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## Conclusion

	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
			0000000	
Tosthod				



#### JSVM to encode videos and SVEF to stream and receive

- Two videos: Big buck bunny (bbb) and Sita sings the blue (sstb)
- 1920x1080 HD resolution, 9 minutes, GOP = 8, frame rate = 25 fps
- Number of clients: 200, 400, 600, 800, 1000

#### Ryu for SDN controllers and Mininet for network emulation

• Results are averaged over 5 runs of experiment



#### STAR topology

Introduction 000000	Architecture 00000	Decision Model 0000	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Evaluation} \\ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \end{array} $	Conclusion 00000
Performan	ce Metrics			

#### Network performance

- Total link utilization in the ISP network
- Percentage of packets dropped in the network

#### Video quality

- Average start-up delays
- Amount of lost video frames

#### Overhead

• Number of OpenFlow rules

000000	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Understand	ding the Resu	ilts		

- Less than 600 clients: The system (Open vSwitch, Servers) is not overloaded
- More than 600 clients: mCast continues to work fine whereas IP Unicast overloads the system

Number of client-connection failures due to system overload

Clients	STAR Topology		MESH Topology	
	Unicast	mCast	Unicast	mCast
200	0	0	0	0
400	0	0	0	0
600	56	0	191	0
800	470	0	677	0
1000	844	0	938	0

Introduction 000000	$\operatorname{Architecture}$ 00000	Decision Model 0000	Evaluation $000000000$	Conclusion 00000
Link Utiliz	ation and Pa	cket Losses		
By avoiding a	any unnecessary p	packet duplication,	mCast:	
A Reduces	link utilization			

- Avoids network congestion
- Eliminates network losses



Clients	STAR Topology		MESH Topology	
	Unicast	mCast	Unicast	mCast
200	0.33	0	0.37	0
400	3.41	0	5.62	0
600	23.56	0	13.02	0
800	1.33	0	5.61	0
1000	0.64	0	1.15	0

Percentage of network packet loss (%)



#### When using mCast:

- No lost, delayed or un-decodable frames
- Decreased start-up delays
- Clients experience better quality of video delivery



Percentage of Video Frame Loss (%)

CDF of start-up delays for 600 clients

Introduction 000000	Architecture 00000	Decision Model 0000	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Evaluation} \\ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \bullet \end{array} \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Conclusion} \\ \text{00000} \end{array}$
Overhead Du	ie to mCast			

### • Each stream adds only one rule per switch participating in mCast



Number of OpenFlow rules vs Number of clients

• Number of OpenFlow messages can increase in mCast depending on user behavior and frequent channel switching or clients leaving

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	0000	00000000	●0000
Overview				

- Motivation
- Proposal

## 2 Architecture

- Design and Components
- Functional Description

## 3 Decision Model

## 4 Evaluation

- Testbed
- Results

## **5** Conclusion

	Architecture	Decision Model		Conclusion
000000	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Related VV	ork I hat Util			

- Improving mechanism of IP Multicast
  - Example: Fast failure recovery for IP multicast trees [SAINT'12]
  - Issues such as handling inter-domain traffic remain unaddressed

## SDN-based frameworks and architectures

- Least [EJCN'14]: creates a router overlay to connect hosts across domains
- SDM [JNSM'15]: enables ISPs to support resource-efficient P2P streaming
- Elaborate multicast routing algorithms
  - The SDN controller receive network statistics from all network nodes and construct efficient paths [TNSM'15]
  - Complimentary to our work and can be implemented in mCast

Introduction	Architecture	Decision Model	Evaluation	Conclusion
000000	00000	0000	00000000	00000
Summary				

- IP multicast cannot handle inter-domain traffic and lacks features essential for the business model of CDNs
- We proposed a novel architecture for live streaming that merges the flexibility and control of SDN with efficiency of multicast to save resources for both ISPs and CDNs
- We proposed a decision model that can help CDNs to choose when switching to mCast can save resources
- We implemented mCast on an evaluation platform and showed its feasibility, robustness and gains against IP unicast

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Introduction} \\ \text{000000} \end{array}$	Architecture 00000	Decision Model 0000	Evaluation 00000000	Conclusion 00000
Future and	On-going W			

• Designing algorithms and mechanism for quick and efficient channel switching

- Supporting reliable mCast using forward error correction (FEC) or a reliable UDP protocol
- Designing a mechanism for optimizing and reconstructing multicast tree with clients joining and leaving dynamically
- Handling personalized advertisement
- Stretching mCast in wireless networks from the core, to the access and on to the clients

Architecture	Decision Model	Conclusion
		00000

## Questions??

#### Ahmed Khalid

An Internet Infrastructure for Video Stream Optimization (iVID) Project

Mobile and Internet Systems Lab University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

## Check out the iVID datasets and software

mCast:	Evaluating SDN-based multicast architectures
MiniNAM:	A network animator for Mininet
D-LiTE:	A platform for evaluating DASH in a simulated LTE network
D-LiTE- ful:	A platform for DASH SDN offloading in LTE
DASH Datasets:	Trace and stream-based, AVC $(H.264)$ and HEVC $(H.265)$ . QoE metrics: PSNR and VQM
SAP:	Stall-Aware Pacing for DASH in Cellular Networks

#### a.khalid@cs.ucc.ie

http://www.cs.ucc.ie/misl/research/current/ivid/

#### Please come see my demo in the next session "Prototyping and Evaluating SDN-based Multicast Architectures for Live Video Streaming"