

Video Working Group

RIPE54 EIX-WG Tallinn, 8th May 2007 cara.mascini@ams-ix.net

Agenda



- Background
- Models
- Chosen direction
- Current situation

Problem definition



- Exponential growth of (video) content online, both live and on-demand (in NL)
- Maximum capacity PO reached in Q2
 2007 others to follow
- Market parties requested shared solution

Timeline



- Session 17/05/06
 - Workshop Streaming: What's next?
- AMS-IX GM 24//5/06
 - Formation of Video Working Group (VWG)
- Session 30/08/06
 - Interactive session, formation of subgroup
- Several Subgroup sessions
 - Development, prototyping



Subgroup

- Why
 - Development of 2 proposed scenario's from the session of 30th of August 2006
- Who
 - RTL, PO, XS4all, SURFnet, Solcon, KPN, AMS-IX

Model 1 Centralized platform amsix amsterdam internet exchange

- Mutually owned platform centralized investments
- Centrally operated video storage and play-out
 - Multiple and redundant servers for live and ondemand and multiple 10GE ports at AMS-IX
 - Multiple formats/codecs and several qualities

Model 1 -Pro's & Con's



Pro's

- Hassle free
- Cheaper with more participants
- Predictable costs
 (fixed monthly fee)

Con's

- Organisational challenge
- Set-up time
- One provider
- No technology control

Model 2 - Caching and redistribution



- Caching and redistribution inside ISP networks on the basis of standard protocol
- Open for anybody who adheres to the protocol
- Automated registration and distribution

Model 2 -Pro's and Con's



Pro's

- Agreement only on protocol
- Freedom of technology choice
- Multiple providers possible or self implementation
- Cheaper than centralized (depends on own implementation)
- Unlimited capacity

Con's

- Less predictable costs
- Protocol (set of rules and technical implementation)
- to be developed
- Technical knowledge by parties necessary (if self)

Current situation



- Model 2 was chosen in November 2006
- Subgroup further developed the premise & protocol
 - ready for prototyping in 2 weeks

Premise



- Open protocol working on any IP network
- Business deals are outside the scope of this WG
 - Participant distributors get better quality from participant contributors (main driver for ISP's)
- Not limited to encoding and streaming video formats.
- Varying quality options
 - PO 100k non-participants, 500k standard, optional high
 1.8 Mb
 - Commercial broadcasters 2Mb up to
- Both live and on demand/Both streaming and downloads (On demand/downloads priority)
- Open to third party streaming providers (for 'small' ISPs)
- RFC-proof

What's next?



- Prototyping
- Further development
- Deployment
- RFC process





