

Rui Valadas
Paulo Salvador (Eds.)

LNCS 5464

Traffic Management and Traffic Engineering for the Future Internet

First Euro-NF Workshop, FITraMEn 2008
Porto, Portugal, December 2008
Revised Selected Papers

 Springer

Commenced Publication in 1973

Founding and Former Series Editors:

Gerhard Goos, Juris Hartmanis, and Jan van Leeuwen

Editorial Board

David Hutchison

Lancaster University, UK

Takeo Kanade

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Josef Kittler

University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

Jon M. Kleinberg

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Alfred Kobsa

University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Friedemann Mattern

ETH Zurich, Switzerland

John C. Mitchell

Stanford University, CA, USA

Moni Naor

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel

Oscar Nierstrasz

University of Bern, Switzerland

C. Pandu Rangan

Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, India

Bernhard Steffen

University of Dortmund, Germany

Madhu Sudan

Microsoft Research, Cambridge, MA, USA

Demetri Terzopoulos

University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Doug Tygar

University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

Gerhard Weikum

Max-Planck Institute of Computer Science, Saarbruecken, Germany

Rui Valadas Paulo Salvador (Eds.)

Traffic Management and Traffic Engineering for the Future Internet

First Euro-NF Workshop, FITraMEn 2008
Porto, Portugal, December 2008
Revised Selected Papers



Springer

Volume Editors

Rui Valadas

Instituto de Telecomunicações, Instituto Superior Técnico

Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

E-mail: rui.valadas@ist.utl.pt

Paulo Salvador

Instituto de Telecomunicações, Universidade de Aveiro

Campus de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

E-mail: salvador@ua.pt

Library of Congress Control Number: 2009934595

CR Subject Classification (1998): C.2, D.4.4, G.2.2, H.3.4, C.2.5, C.2.6

LNCS Sublibrary: SL 5 – Computer Communication Networks
and Telecommunications

ISSN 0302-9743

ISBN-10 3-642-04575-8 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York

ISBN-13 978-3-642-04575-2 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Violations are liable to prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

springer.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2009

Printed in Germany

Typesetting: Camera-ready by author, data conversion by Scientific Publishing Services, Chennai, India

Printed on acid-free paper SPIN: 12756650 06/3180 5 4 3 2 1 0

Preface

Designing the future internet requires an in-depth consideration of the management, dimensioning and traffic control issues that will be involved in the network operations of these networks. The International Workshop on Traffic Management and Traffic Engineering of the Future Internet, FITraMEn 2008, organized within the framework of the Network of Excellence Euro-NF¹, provided an open forum to present and discuss new ideas in this area in the context of fixed, wireless and spontaneous (ad hoc and sensor) networks.

The Network of Excellence Euro-NF “Anticipating the Network of the Future - From Theory to Design” is a European project funded by the European Union within the Seventh Framework Program. The focus of Euro-NF is to develop new principles and methods to design/dimension/control/manage multi-technology architectures. The emerging networking paradigms raise new challenging scientific and technological problems embedded in complex policy, governance, and worldwide standards issues. Dealing with the diversity of these scientific and social, political and economic challenges requires the integration of a wide range of research capabilities, a role that Euro-NF aims to fulfill.

This proceedings volume contains a selection of the research contributions presented at FITraMEn 2008. The workshop was held December 11–12, 2008 in Porto, Portugal, organized by Instituto de Telecomunicações².

The workshop was attended by a total of 44 participants, 12 external to the Euro-NF community. The technical program included, in addition to the paper presentations, two keynote speeches, one by Nandita Dukkupati of Advanced Architecture and Research at Cisco Systems, San Jose, on “Challenges in the Traffic Management of Future Networks” and the other by Andreas Kind, from IBM Zurich Research Laboratory, on “Monitoring the Future Internet.”

To participate in the workshop the authors submitted a full paper on their recent research work in the field of traffic management and traffic engineering. The 54 papers submitted to the workshop were carefully reviewed by at least 3 members of the Technical Program Committee. A total of 30 papers were selected for oral presentation at the workshop. From these, 15 revised papers incorporating the numerous referee comments and the suggestions made in the workshop were accepted for publication in this book.

The papers contained in this book provide a general view of the ongoing research on traffic management and traffic engineering in the Euro-NF Network of Excellence, and give a representative example of the problems currently

¹ <http://euronf.enst.fr>

² <http://www.it.pt>

investigated in this area, spanning topics such as bandwidth allocation and traffic control, statistical analysis, traffic engineering, and optical networks and video communications.

March 2009

Rui Valadas
Paulo Salvador

Organization

Organizing Committee

Rui Valadas	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
Paulo Salvador	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
António Nogueira	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
Joel Rodrigues	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
Susana Sargento	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
Eduardo Rocha	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal
Sandra Corújo	Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal

Referees

Alvelos, Filipe	Kilpi, Jorma	Rodrigues, Joel
Antunes, Nelson	Krieger, Udo	Sabella, Roberto
Atmaca, Tulin	Mellia, Marco	Salvador, Paulo
Borst, Sem	Menth, Michael	Sargento, Susana
Brown, Patrick	Naldi, Maurizio	Sidi, Moshe
Casaca, Augusto	Nogueira, António	de Sousa, Amaro
Casetti, Claudio	Norros, Ilkka	Tassiulas, Leandros
Collange, Denis	Oliveira, Rosário	Valadas, Rui
Dotaro, Emmanuel	Oriolo, Gianpaolo	Vaton, Sandrine
Fiedler, Markus	Pacheco, António	Virtamo, Jorma
Garcia, Nuno	Pereira, Paulo	Zúquete, André
Jajszczyk, Andrzej	Pioro, Michal	
Johansson, Mikael	Roberts, James	

Sponsoring Institutions

EU-funded Euro-NF network of Excellence
Institute of Telecommunications, Portugal

Table of Contents

Bandwidth Allocation and Traffic Control

Models for Capacity Demand Estimation in a TV Broadcast Network with Variable Bit Rate TV Channels	1
<i>Zlatka Avramova, Danny De Vleeschauwer, Kathleen Spaey, Sabine Wittevrongel, Herwig Bruneel, and Chris Blondia</i>	
A Distributed Scheme for Value-Based Bandwidth Reconfiguration	16
<i>Åke Arvidsson, Johannes Göbel, Anthony Krzesinski, and Peter Taylor</i>	
A Fair and Dynamic Load-Balancing Mechanism	36
<i>Federico Larroca and Jean-Louis Rougier</i>	
The Impact of Congestion Control Mechanisms on Network Performance after Failure in Flow-Aware Networks	53
<i>Jerzy Domżał, Robert Wójcik, and Andrzej Jajszczyk</i>	

Statistical Analysis

On the Dependencies between Internet Flow Characteristics	68
<i>M. Rosário de Oliveira, António Pacheco, Cláudia Pascoal, Rui Valadas, and Paulo Salvador</i>	
Peer-Level Analysis of Distributed Multimedia Content Sharing	81
<i>Joana Gonçalves, Paulo Salvador, António Nogueira, and Rui Valadas</i>	
Volume Anomaly Detection in Data Networks: An Optimal Detection Algorithm vs. the PCA Approach	96
<i>Pedro Casas, Lionel Fillatre, Sandrine Vaton, and Igor Nikiforov</i>	

Traffic Engineering

Traffic Engineering of Telecommunication Networks Based on Multiple Spanning Tree Routing	114
<i>Dorabella Santos, Amaro de Sousa, and Filipe Alvelos</i>	
Local Restoration for Trees and Arborescences	130
<i>Paola Iovanna, Gaia Nicosia, Gianpaolo Oriolo, Laura Sanità, and Ezio Sperduto</i>	

Blind Maximum-Likelihood Estimation of Traffic Matrices in Long
Range Dependent Traffic 141
Pier Luigi Conti, Livia De Giovanni, and Maurizio Naldi

Optimizing Network Performance in Multihoming Environments 155
Nuno Coutinho, Susana Sargento, and Vitor Jesus

Optical Networks and Video Communications

Performance of Optical Ring Architectures with Variable-Size Packets:
In-Line Buffers vs Semi-synchronous and Asynchronous Transparent
MAC Protocols 169
*Thaere Eido, Tuan Dung Nguyen, Tülin Atmaca, and
Dominique Chiaroni*

A Priority-Based Multiservice Dynamic Bandwidth Allocation for
Ethernet Passive Optical Networks 185
Minh Thanh Ngo and Annie Gravey

High-Performance H.264/SVC Video Communications in 802.11e
Ad Hoc Networks 200
*Attilio Fiandrotti, Dario Gallucci, Enrico Masala, and
Juan Carlos De Martin*

Framework for Personal TV 211
André Claro, Paulo Rogério Pereira, and Luís Miguel Campos

Author Index 231

Models for Capacity Demand Estimation in a TV Broadcast Network with Variable Bit Rate TV Channels

Zlatka Avramova¹, Danny De Vleeschauwer², Kathleen Spaey³,
Sabine Wittevrongel¹, Herwig Bruneel¹, and Chris Blondia³

¹ SMACS Research Group, TELIN Department, Ghent University,
Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 41, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium
{kayzlat,sw,hb}@telin.ugent.be

² Bell Labs, Alcatel-Lucent Bell, Copernicuslaan 50, B-2018 Antwerp, Belgium
danny.de_vleeschauwer@alcatel-lucent.be

³ PATS Research Group, IBBT-University of Antwerp, Middelheimlaan 1, B-2020
Antwerp, Belgium
{kathleen.spaey,chris.blondia}@ua.ac.be

Abstract. Mobile TV is growing beyond the stage of experimentation and evaluation and is (about) to become part of our daily lives. Additionally, it is being delivered through heterogeneous networks and to a variety of receiving devices, which implies different versions of one and the same video content must be transported. We propose two (approximate) analytic methods for capacity demand estimation in a (mobile) TV broadcast system. In particular, the methods estimate the required transport capacity for a bouquet of channels offered on request and in different versions (video formats or in different quality) over a multicast-enabled network, encoded in non-constant bit rate targeting constant quality. We compare a transport strategy where the different versions (of one channel) are simulcast to a scalable video encoding (SVC) transport strategy, where all resolutions (of one channel) are embedded in one flow. In addition, we validate the proposed analytic methods with simulations. A realistic mobile TV example is considered with two transported resolutions of the channels: QVGA and VGA. We demonstrate that not always capacity gain is achieved with SVC as compared to simulcast since the former comes with some penalty rate and the gain depends on the system parameters.

1 Introduction

The compression efficiency of the new codecs H.264/MPEG-4 AVC [1] with respect to the codecs MPEG-2 [2] and MPEG-4 Part 2 [3] makes that the former codecs are imposing more and more in digital (IP-based) multimedia delivery systems. An extension to the AVC codec, called SVC (Scalable Video Coding) [4], allows for scalable, multi-layer encoding. A base layer ensures some basic quality of experience (e.g., targets a small-resolution device) and is complemented by one

or several enhancement layers improving the video quality or targeting higher-resolution display screens. We consider a broadcast network where a number of channels are subject to multicast streaming to receivers of different classes of devices (resolutions) or different quality classes. The question arises which of the two following scenarios requires the least transport capacity. The first scenario simulcasts all resolutions (encoded in H.264 AVC) of all channels that are requested by at least one user. The second scenario exploits the scalability property of H.264 SVC that the bit stream of one particular resolution embeds all lower resolutions and transmits only the highest resolution that is requested by at least one user. Since all resolutions below that particular resolution piggy-back along in the stream, no other resolutions need to be transmitted in parallel in this scenario.

In [5], we demonstrated for constant bit rate (CBR) encoded video that the answer to the question formulated above is not straightforward. It is basically a trade-off between the fact that SVC encoding comes with a certain penalty rate and the fact that simulcast sends all the requested resolutions in parallel, while SVC has to transmit only one embedded stream. On the other hand, this embedded stream in the SVC case has to contain all the layers up to the highest requested resolution regardless of whether the lower ones are requested or not, while simulcast only sends the resolutions that are requested at least by one user. Whereas in our previous work [5] we considered that the channels are CBR encoded, here we describe the bit rate fluctuation of a channel stochastically by a given distribution based on real data. The extended model takes into account the fact that the required bit rates for the resolutions of a given channel are content dependent and correlated.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Sect. 2, we describe the system under study. We propose two analytic methods for capacity demand estimation in Sect. 3 and 4. Our simulation approach is presented in Sect. 5. Numerical results are discussed in Sect. 6, and finally the paper is concluded in Sect. 7.

2 System under Study

We aim at developing models to estimate the capacity demand on the aggregation link in a (mobile) TV broadcast system of digital (IP-transported) channels, where a bouquet of TV channels is offered to an audience of subscribers. Aggregation network may imply also the wireless radio interface depending on the particular network design. A bouquet of K TV channels are broadcast (multicast) to the (active) subscribers (users) on request. The bit rate of a streamed channel is not constant, since constant quality is aimed for by the operator. Moreover, a system with multi-resolution receiver devices is envisioned, requiring that the content of the streamed channels is encoded in L different resolutions, either by providing separate independent versions (simulcast scenario) or by encoding them in scalable embedded/multi-layered streams (e.g., in SVC). The bouquet of offered channels is characterised by a given channel popularity distribution from which the probability ρ_k with $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ that a certain channel is requested

for watching is drawn. Very often, e.g. in [6], this distribution is approximated by a Zipf law [7]:

$$\rho_k = dk^{-\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

where d is a normalisation constant ensuring that the sum of all the probabilities ρ_k is 1, and α is the parameter of the Zipf distribution, ranging typically between 0.5 and 1.

We denote the *capacity demand* \mathbf{C} under a simulcast scenario by \mathbf{C}_{SIM} , and under the SVC scenario by \mathbf{C}_{SVC} . Remark that these are random variables, since there is randomness in a user's behaviour: a user watches television or not, he selects a TV channel (respectively streamed video content) among K available channels, he is requesting it in a given resolution. We also assume that if the multicast channels are scalably encoded, only the layers up to and including the highest requested one are multicast, since otherwise, it would result in a waste of network resources.

Once a user is tuned in to a particular channel, and in contrast to [5], we assume that the required bit rate of this channel is fluctuating. We only consider fluctuations associated with the succession of scenes of programmes transported over that (selected) channel (because we assume that fluctuations associated with frame type are smoothed by the shaper in the encoder [8]). In the general case, we assume that there are no dependencies between the bit rates of the different channels but there is a dependence between the rates of the different resolutions of one channel. Under resolution we mean the different versions under simulcast (SIM) streaming or the different layers in scalable encoding of a channel under SVC streaming. This correlation between the different resolutions accounts for the fact that if a high bit rate is produced in one scene, this is probably the case for all versions/layers of a channel transporting the same content. With this assumption, a multicast channel's resolution generates with rate \mathbf{r}_ℓ , where ℓ stands for the resolution and $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. Remark that for simulcast (SIM) each resolution ℓ has its own specific bit rate \mathbf{r}_ℓ , while for SVC to subscribe to resolution ℓ all layers up to the streamed layer ℓ need to be received, i.e., in the SVC case we denote by \mathbf{r}_ℓ the total bit rate of all layers 1 to ℓ . The channel's versions/layers have a joint distribution $\Pi_{\{\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_\ell, \dots, \mathbf{r}_L\}}(r_1, \dots, r_\ell, \dots, r_L)$ with L marginal distributions $\{\pi_{\mathbf{r}_\ell}\}$ corresponding to the distribution associated to resolution ℓ from which its rate is drawn. In this work, we assume that all the channels behave statistically the same, hence have the same joint distribution (and resulting marginal distributions). In the first analytical method we will consider, we will only need the vectors of the resolutions' average rates and the covariance matrices. In the second analytical approach, a recursive method, the distribution of the rates of the resolutions is approximated by a discrete histogram in order to be able to calculate the convolutions of histograms (marginal distributions) numerically approximating probability density functions.

Furthermore, we assume that in all offered resolutions the channel popularity distribution (the Zipf distribution) is the same, i.e., a user associated to a given resolution selects which channel to watch according to the popularity law given in [1] irrespective of the resolution.

2.1 Capacity Demand under Simulcast

We define the random variables $\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}$, where $1 \leq k \leq K$, $1 \leq \ell \leq L$, as the number of users watching channel k in resolution ℓ . Because with simulcast every channel is encoded in L independent versions, and a channel is streamed in version ℓ if at least one user watches that channel in resolution (version) ℓ , we can express \mathbf{C}_{SIM} in the following way:

$$\mathbf{C}_{SIM} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{r}_\ell 1_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0\}}, \quad (2)$$

where $1_{\{m\}}$ is the indicator function of the event m , expressing that there is a contribution to \mathbf{C}_{SIM} from a channel k if it is watched by at least one user in resolution ℓ .

2.2 Capacity Demand under SVC

With scalable video encoding, in order to watch a channel in resolution ℓ , all layers 1 until ℓ of that channel are needed for decoding, because they are all interrelated (in this paper we do not consider scalable encoding such as e.g., multiple description coding, MDC). Thus, layer 1 until ℓ of channel k need to be transported if there is at least one user watching channel k in resolution ℓ , and if there is no user watching channel k in a higher resolution than ℓ . Therefore, \mathbf{C}_{SVC} can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{C}_{SVC} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{r}_\ell 1_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,L}=0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1}=0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0\}}. \quad (3)$$

2.3 Channel Viewing Probabilities

We assume that a user (with his receiving device) is associated only to a given resolution. The group of N users (subscribers) is divided in L fixed sets. Within a set, all clients use a terminal capable of receiving resolution ℓ , and there are N_ℓ users of type ℓ so that the sum of all N_ℓ over all L resolutions/sets is N .

The TV channels are assumed to have independent probabilities ρ_k of being watched, which are proportional to the popularity of the channels, drawn as explained above from a Zipf distribution.

We calculate the following probability generating function for the joint probability of the channels being watched by a given set of users:

$$F(z_{k,\ell}; \forall k, \ell) = E \left[\prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{\ell=1}^L z_{k,\ell}^{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} = \mathbf{n}_\ell \leq N_\ell$.

Inside a set of N_ℓ users associated to layer ℓ , a user has an activity grade a_ℓ , the probability of being active watching a channel, which is the average fraction

of the time that a user of type ℓ watches television. We then have that the sample space corresponding to the vector of random variables $(\mathbf{n}_{1,1}, \mathbf{n}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{K,L})$ is constituted by all tuples $(n_{1,1}, n_{2,1}, \dots, n_{K,L})$ for which $\sum_{k=1}^K n_{k,\ell} = n_\ell \leq N_\ell$ (note that the random variables are expressed in Bold typeface, unlike the values they assume). The probability corresponding to a realisation of the variable, expressed by the tuple $(n_{1,1}, n_{2,1}, \dots, n_{K,L})$, is given by:

$$\Pr \left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{n}_{1,1} = n_{1,1}, \mathbf{n}_{2,1} = n_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{K,1} = n_{K,1}, \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{n}_{1,\ell} = n_{1,\ell}, \mathbf{n}_{2,\ell} = n_{2,\ell}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{K,\ell} = n_{K,\ell}, \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{n}_{1,L} = n_{1,L}, \mathbf{n}_{2,L} = n_{2,L}, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{K,L} = n_{K,L} \end{array} \right] \\ = \prod_{\ell=1}^L \left[\frac{N_\ell!}{(N_\ell - n_\ell)!} (1 - a_\ell)^{N_\ell - n_\ell} a_\ell^{n_\ell} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{(\rho_k)^{n_{k,\ell}}}{n_{k,\ell}!} \right], \quad (5)$$

to which corresponds the following probability generating function:

$$F(z_{k,\ell}; \forall k, \ell) = \prod_{\ell=1}^L \left[1 - a_\ell + a_\ell \sum_{k=1}^K \rho_k z_{k,\ell} \right]^{N_\ell}. \quad (6)$$

The channel viewing probabilities associated to other user models can be calculated by first deriving the probability generating function corresponding to the model.

3 Capacity Demand – A Gaussian Approximation Approach

We assume first that the aggregate capacity demand is a Gaussian variable, thus, provided its average and variance (standard deviation) are known, the distribution can be found. For practical reasons we express it in the form of the complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF), also referred to as tail distribution function (TDF). This is the probability that the required bandwidth exceeds a certain value C_{avail} , i.e., $\Pr\{\mathbf{C}_{SIM}, \mathbf{C}_{SVC}\} > C_{avail}$.

3.1 Average of the Aggregate Flow

The average of the aggregate flow \mathbf{C} from multicast channels in L resolutions is the sum of the averages of the contributions of all the resolutions in both simulcast (SIM) or scalable encoding (SVC) scenarios.

Simulcast. In the simulcast case, the mean of the aggregate traffic \mathbf{C}_{SIM} is:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}] &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K E[\mathbf{r}_\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0\}}] = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K E[\mathbf{r}_\ell] E[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0\}}] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_\ell] \sum_{k=1}^K \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $E[\mathbf{r}_\ell]$ is the average rate of resolution ℓ . Here we have used the property that the average of an indicator function is the probability of its event. $\Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0]$ expresses the probability that a given channel k is requested in the given resolution ℓ by at least one user (hence the channel is multicast streamed).

SVC. In the SVC case, the mean of the aggregate traffic is:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\mathbf{C}_{SVC}] &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K E[\mathbf{r}_\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,L}=0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1}=0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}>0\}}] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K E[\mathbf{r}_\ell] E[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,L}=0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1}=0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}>0\}}] \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_\ell] \sum_{k=1}^K \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1} = 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $E[\mathbf{r}_\ell]$ stands for the average contribution of a scalable flow of up to and including layer ℓ .

3.2 Variance of the Aggregate Flow

In order to obtain the variance, first the second-order moments of the aggregate traffic under the SIM and SVC scenarios (respectively of \mathbf{C}_{SIM} and \mathbf{C}_{SVC}) are derived below. With the index k for the probabilities that a channel k is watched by a given number of users $\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}$, we make distinction between the channels, as there is correlation between the rates of the versions/layers of one and the same channel, but there is no correlation between those of different channels.

Simulcast. The second-order moment of \mathbf{C}_{SIM} is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}^2] &= \sum_{k_1=1}^K \sum_{k_2=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\ell_2=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1}>0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2}>0\}}] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_\ell^2] E[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}>0\}}] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\substack{\ell_2=1 \\ \ell_2 \neq \ell_1}}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] E[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_1}>0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_2}>0\}}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{k_1=1 \\ k_2 \neq k_1}}^K \sum_{k_2=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\ell_2=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}] E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] E[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1}>0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2}>0\}}] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_\ell^2] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}>0] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\substack{\ell_2=1 \\ \ell_2 \neq \ell_1}}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_2} > 0] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{k_1=1 \\ k_2 \neq k_1}}^K \sum_{k_2=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\ell_2=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}] E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2} > 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In (9) we accounted for the fact that the probabilities of the bit rates are independent from the probabilities of requesting a channel, and also for the fact that the rates of the different resolutions of one and the same channel are correlated. The following relation holds for the covariance: $\text{Cov}[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] = E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] - E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}] E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}]$. The terms $E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}]$ in (9) are thus directly related to the covariance terms $\text{Cov}[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}, \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}]$ which compose a covariance matrix, the main diagonal of which is formed by the variance terms $\text{Var}[\mathbf{r}_\ell]$ related to $E[\mathbf{r}_\ell^2]$.

The square of the average of \mathbf{C}_{SIM} can be also expressed as three types of terms corresponding to the three types of terms in (9). The variance of the aggregate traffic \mathbf{C}_{SIM} is $\text{Var}[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}] = E[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}^2] - E[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}]^2$. Under simulcast, the variance of \mathbf{C}_{SIM} has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}] &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0] \left(E[\mathbf{r}_\ell^2] - E[\mathbf{r}_\ell]^2 \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\substack{\ell_2=1 \\ \ell_2 \neq \ell_1}}^L \left(E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1} \mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_2} > 0] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}] E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_1} > 0] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_2} > 0] \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1=1}^K \sum_{\substack{k_2=1 \\ k_2 \neq k_1}}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\ell_2=1}^L E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_1}] E[\mathbf{r}_{\ell_2}] \left(\Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2} > 0] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1} > 0] \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2} > 0] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

If we denote by $\mathbf{R}_{k\ell}$ the variable $\mathbf{r}_\ell 1_{\{\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0\}}$, we can rewrite more concisely and meaningfully the equation above. The terms in the first double sum in the equation above correspond to the sum of the variances of the contribution of resolution ℓ of channel k to the aggregate flow, $\text{Var}[\mathbf{R}_{k\ell}]$. Similarly, the second type of terms correspond to the covariance between two resolutions of a channel, and the third type of terms correspond to the contribution of the covariance between channels. The equation above can be replaced by the more elegant one given below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\mathbf{C}_{SIM}] &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell=1}^L \text{Var}[\mathbf{R}_{k\ell}] + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\substack{\ell_2=1 \\ \ell_2 \neq \ell_1}}^L \text{Cov}[\mathbf{R}_{k\ell_1}, \mathbf{R}_{k\ell_2}] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1=1}^K \sum_{\substack{k_2=1 \\ k_2 \neq k_1}}^K \sum_{\ell_1=1}^L \sum_{\ell_2=1}^L \text{Cov}[\mathbf{R}_{k_1\ell_1}, \mathbf{R}_{k_2\ell_2}]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

SVC. The formula for the variance of \mathbf{C}_{SVC} is the same as (10) but with the following substitutions:

$$\Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0] \text{ replaced by} \\ \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1} = 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} > 0]; \quad (12)$$

$$\Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell_2} > 0] \text{ (where } \ell_1 \neq \ell_2) \text{ replaced by } 0; \quad (13)$$

$$\Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1} > 0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2} > 0] \text{ (where } k_1 \neq k_2) \text{ replaced by} \\ \Pr[\mathbf{n}_{k_1,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1+1} = 0, \mathbf{n}_{k_1,\ell_1} > 0, \\ \mathbf{n}_{k_2,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2+1} = 0, \mathbf{n}_{k_2,\ell_2} > 0]. \quad (14)$$

3.3 Calculation of the Probabilities

In Sect. 2.3, the channel viewing probabilities were defined. If the probability generating function $F(z_{k,\ell}; \forall k, \ell)$ associated to a certain user behaviour model is known, then the probability that some of the $\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell}$ are equal to 0 is obtained as follows: those $z_{k,\ell}$ corresponding to $\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} = 0$ are set to 0, the rest of the arguments $z_{k,\ell}$ are set to 1. Let $\mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} = 0$ be the event A ; let $\mathbf{n}_{k,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1} = 0$ be the event B and $\mathbf{n}_{k,L} = 0, \dots, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell+1} = 0, \mathbf{n}_{k,\ell} = 0$ be the event C . Additionally, we put a subscript 1 or respectively 2 if ℓ (and k) has a subscript 1 or respectively 2. The following relations are taken into account to derive the probabilities appearing in equations (7)–(14):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\bar{A}] &= 1 - \Pr[A], \\ \Pr[\bar{A}_1 \cap \bar{A}_2] &= 1 - \Pr[A_1] - \Pr[A_2] + \Pr[A_1 \cap A_2], \\ \Pr[\bar{A} \cap B] &= \Pr[B] - \Pr[C], \\ \Pr[\bar{A}_1 \cap \bar{A}_2 \cap B_1 \cap B_2] \\ &= \Pr[B_1 \cap B_2] - \Pr[C_1 \cap B_2] - \Pr[B_1 \cap C_2] + \Pr[C_1 \cap C_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

4 Capacity Demand – A Recursive Analytical Approach

Enumerating every possible outcome of the random variable of the capacity demand and calculating its associated probability would lead to a combinatorial explosion. Therefore, we use a recursive approach in this section (an extension of the “divide and conquer approach” in [5]) in order to calculate the CCDF (TDF) of the capacity demand. Since the bit rate of a resolution of a channel is no longer deterministic as in [5], but described by a probability density function (pdf), we will need to approximate this pdf by a discretely binned histogram, which has as consequence that this approach is, in contrast to [5], no longer exact. We define for every $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ the random variables \mathbf{w}_ℓ and \mathbf{c}_ℓ , where \mathbf{w}_ℓ represents the number of users that watch a channel in resolution ℓ ; in the simulcast case \mathbf{c}_ℓ denotes the number of channels that need to be provided in version ℓ , while in the SVC case \mathbf{c}_ℓ denotes the number of channels for which layers 1 until ℓ need to be transported, but no layers higher than ℓ . Let \mathcal{C} , respectively \mathcal{W} , denote the set of all possible values the vector of random variables $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_L)$, respectively $(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L)$, can take. In [5], an exact recursive method was presented to calculate the

probabilities $\Pr[(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_L) = (c_1, \dots, c_L) | (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L) = (w_1, \dots, w_L)]$ for all $(c_1, \dots, c_L) \in \mathcal{C}$ and all $(w_1, \dots, w_L) \in \mathcal{W}$.

Then by the theorem on total probability, we obtain for all $(c_1, \dots, c_L) \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_L) = (c_1, \dots, c_L)] &= \\ \sum_{(w_1, \dots, w_L) \in \mathcal{W}} \Pr[(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_L) = (c_1, \dots, c_L) | (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L) = (w_1, \dots, w_L)] & \\ \cdot \Pr[(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L) = (w_1, \dots, w_L)]. & \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Note that \mathcal{W} and $\Pr[(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L) = (w_1, \dots, w_L)]$ depend on the considered user model.

With all $(c_1, \dots, c_L) \in \mathcal{C}$, there corresponds a probability distribution of the bandwidth required for providing the channels in the desired resolutions:

$$\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}(c_1, \dots, c_L)}\} = \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{c_1} \{\pi_{r_1}\} \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{c_2} \{\pi_{r_2}\} \right) \otimes \dots \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{c_L} \{\pi_{r_L}\} \right), \quad (17)$$

where \otimes denotes the convolution operation. If we then weigh these distributions with the probabilities calculated in (16), the overall probability distribution of the required capacity is obtained:

$$\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}\} = \sum_{(c_1, \dots, c_L) \in \mathcal{C}} \{\pi_{\mathcal{C}(c_1, \dots, c_L)}\} \Pr[(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_L) = (c_1, \dots, c_L)]. \quad (18)$$

Note that convolution of two probability distributions containing both n outcomes gives a new probability distribution with n^2 outcomes (less in case some combinations of outcomes result in the same outcomes). This means that the probability distributions $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}(c_1, \dots, c_L)}\}$ in (17) have approximately $n^{c_1 + \dots + c_L}$ outcomes, assuming each $\{\pi_{r_\ell}\}$ contains n outcomes. So, it is clearly not realistic to calculate the exact distribution $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}\}$ as described above. Therefore, in practice we do not work in (17) with the exact probability distributions $\{\pi_{r_\ell}\}$, but rather with histograms derived for them. For the numerical examples presented further on in this paper, we first calculated the maximal possible capacity value $maxC$ corresponding to the considered scenario. We then divided the capacity range $[0, maxC]$ in bins of a certain width. The width of the bins, which we denote by *unit*, was chosen in such a way that $[0, maxC]$ is divided in a predefined number of intervals. We then constructed histograms for the $\{\pi_{r_\ell}\}$'s by dividing their range in intervals of type $[m \cdot unit, (m + 1) \cdot unit[$, $m = 0, 1, \dots$. After applying first formula (17) on these histograms, and then formula (18), we end up with a histogram $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^*\}$ for $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}\}$. Of course, the use of histograms will cause the resulting $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^*\}$ to be an approximation of the exact $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}\}$. The smaller *unit* is chosen, the better the approximation of $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}\}$ will be, since the histogram of $\{\pi_{\mathcal{C}}^*\}$ will consist of more bins.

Notice that in this section we did not take into account the correlation between the bit rates associated with the different resolutions of the same channel. In the SVC case it does not matter that all layers are correlated as all layers associated

with the highest resolution that is demanded need to be transported. Only the fluctuations of the totality of all transported layers matter. For the simulcast transport mode, the correlation between bit rates of various resolutions does matter, and as such this recursive method neglects it. Due to the nature of the recursive method, it is very hard to take this correlation into account.

5 Simulation Approaches

We wrote an event-driven C-based simulator, which can simulate both simulcast and SVC streaming transport modes. This simulator generates a number of realisations of the variable *capacity demand* \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{C}_{SIM} under simulcast and \mathbf{C}_{SVC} under SVC). For every realisation, a user is either tuned into a given channel k and resolution ℓ or is inactive (governed by the user model and activity grade). According to the selected transport mode (simulcast (SIM) or SVC), the activity grade of the users, and the popularity distribution of the multimedia content (i.e., the Zipf parameter α), we measure the TDF of the variable \mathbf{C} , over a sufficiently large number of realisations, depending on the required accuracy. The random number generating function interpreting the activity grade of users follows a uniform distribution.

A multivariate Gaussian variable for the rates of a channel's resolutions is generated at every simulation step, drawn from a distribution defined by the input average vector and covariance matrix. In this paper, we refer to this simulator as *Gaussian simulator*.

We constructed another (C-based) simulator too. The difference with the previous one is that the channel's resolutions rates are drawn randomly from a list of the average rates of real movies. We refer here to this simulator as *histogram simulator*. Were this list of movies' average rates long enough (sorted and possibly with assigned probabilities to every rate realisation or in a histogram form), the rates' probability distribution would have been reasonably well approximated.

6 Results

In this section we will estimate the capacity demand in a realistic mobile TV example by the four approaches described above (two analytical and two simulation ones). In this way we will validate the different approaches and will point out their advantages and their drawbacks.

6.1 Mobile TV Example Settings

For a mobile TV case, we take as guidelines the mobile TV example proposed in the DVB standardisation body [9]. All K channels are encoded in the same number of resolutions L , every resolution corresponding to a certain spatial/temporal format or quality level which is the same (or varies slightly) for all the channels from the bouquet of channels. In the mobile TV example, a channel is encoded in two spatial resolutions (with possible temporal scaling too) with a QVGA base

resolution (version, layer) with bit rate in the range 250–400 kbps and a VGA resolution of 750–1500 kbps. In a simulcast scenario, two versions of a channel are encoded and transmitted, while in an SVC scenario, the VGA resolution is encoded from which either a QVGA resolution is streamed or if the VGA resolution is requested, the spatial enhancement layer is transmitted too.

We start from experimental data for 20 movies encoded in two resolutions (QVGA and VGA), both single-layered in AVC mode and multi-layered in SVC mode (encoded in baseline profile and in SVC layered mode). The two resolutions are: base resolution QVGA 320x240@15Hz for some of the movies or 12.5Hz for the other, and its spatial and temporarily scaled resolution VGA 640x480@30Hz for some of the movies or respectively 25Hz for the other. The rates are taken such that delivering a resolution in either of the transport modes (simulcast or SVC) provides the same video quality (Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio, PSNR). Moreover, there are two encoding experiments and hence sets of input data, we refer to as SET1 and SET2. SET1 targets a low picture quality (i.e., a PSNR of approximately 32 dB), while SET2 targets a higher quality (approximately a PSNR of 34 dB) for both resolutions. Normally, the base layer of an SVC encoded video is encoded in AVC; however in the experimental data we use, the QVGA resolution in SVC has some 8% higher bit rate (for the same quality) as compared to the lowest resolution of simulcast. An SVC VGA resolution of the channel has some 21% higher bit rate than the corresponding AVC VGA version, which we refer to as “penalty rate of SVC”. Note that the values specified above (8% and 21%) are the averages over all the movies. The penalty values of each movie differ.

The vectors of the resolutions’ averages and covariance matrices for the two experimental sets and the two H.264 coding modes (AVC and SVC) are given in Table [1](#).

We set the network parameters as follows. Two cases are considered: with $K = 20$ and $K = 50$ channels. The case with a bouquet of 20 channels is representative of the currently deployed mobile TV trials and commercial deployments (as e.g., in [\[10\]](#)); the case of 50 channels is representative of enhanced services

Table 1. Vectors of the average bit rates and covariance matrices

Data	AVC (simulcast)		SVC	
SET1	QVGA	VGA	QVGA	VGA
Average	259	934	277	1110
Covariance	14423	49721	16274	65208
matrix	49721	176543	65208	261328
Data	AVC (simulcast)		SVC	
SET2	QVGA	VGA	QVGA	VGA
Average	436	1559	474	1899
Covariance	45924	154047	54040	216475
matrix	154047	528443	216475	867215