AV1 adoption in a RT streaming platform

Richard Blakely - Millicast





AV1 for RT Broadcasting WHY??





Benefits/Cost of RT AV1 SVC

- Pro: Higher compression rate
 - Business model is mostly based on bandwidth consumption, the savings can either be passed through for competitive advantage or kept to increase margin (depending on market situation)
 - If recording, savings on storage cost (but it's marginal)





Benefits/Cost of RT AV1 SVC

- Pro: Higher compression rate
 - Business model is mostly based on bandwidth consumption, the savings can either be passed through for competitive advantage or kept to increase margin (depending on market situation)
 - If recording, save on storage cost (but it's marginal)
- Pro: SVC
 - Even more savings on the delivery
 - no storage cost related to ABR / multiple resolutions
 - Improved network resilience (handle higher packet loss)
 - Simplification of the media infrastructure (no mixing, no transcoding, relay only)





Benefits/Cost of RT AV1 SVC

- Pro: Higher compression rate
 - Business model is mostly based on bandwidth consumption, the savings can either be passed through for competitive advantage or kept to increase margin (depending on market situation)
 - If recording, save on storage cost (but it's marginal)
- Pro: SVC
 - Even more savings on the delivery
 - no storage cost related to ABR / multiple resolutions
 - Improved network resilience (handle higher packet loss)
 - Simplification of the media infrastructure (no mixing, no transcoding, relay only)
- Con: Increases CPU footprint
 - Less of a problem in live streaming, as
 - The broadcaster usually have powerful machines
 - Viewers will pull only one stream at a time





























- (Subscriber nodes) Load based
- Geographic distribution based
- Bandwidth cost based
- Topology based





Other Research Challenges





RT Advertising?





Real Time Server-Side Ad-Insertion (RT SSAI)







RT Content Protection?





Content protection beyond DRM

- RT AV1 E2EME (SRTP)
- RT AV1 Forensic
 Watermarking

Network Working Group Internet-Draft Intended status: Standards Track Expires: March 1, 2020 C. Jennings P. Jones R. Barnes Cisco Systems A. Roach Mozilla August 29, 2019

SRTP Double Encryption Procedures draft-ietf-perc-double-12

DIGITAL WATERMARKING OF VIDEO STREAMS: REVIEW OF THE STATE-OF-THE-ART

A PREPRINT

Romain Artru École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne CoSMo Software Pte., Singapore romain.artru@cosmosoftware.io Touradi Ludovic Roux CoSMo Software Pte., Singapore ludovic.roux@cosmosoftware.io

Touradj Ebrahimi École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne Multimedia Signal Processing Group (MMSPG) touradj.ebrahimi@epfl.ch

August 26, 2019





Real-Time Recording

- PCAP-based
- Like copy-on-write: replay or transcode on play
- E2EME support + encrypted at rest
- Dual intent: Debug format with Wireshark





"Real Time VMAF" - RT Video Frame Quality Assessment

- Goal: RT assessment
 - no reference / blind method
 - RT dataset (no netflix catalog)
 - Higher resolution (very sensitive)
 - Validate on common subset
- Use to e.g. adapt in real-time.



NARVAL, A No-Reference Video Quality Tool for Real-Time Communications, Augustin Lemesle, Alexis Marion, Ludovic Roux and Alexandre Gouaillard *in Proceedings of Human Vision and Electronic Imaging, Burlingame, California, USA, January* 2019





Questions?

