International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences

IJETMAS

www.ijetmas.com April 2015, Volume 3 Issue 4, ISSN 2349-4476

Next Generation Video Coding Systems (H.265/ HEVC) and its Comparison from H.264/AVC Video Codec

Imran Ullah Khan [1] S.Kumar [2] ,S.Hasan Saeed [3] ,N.R.Kidwai [4]
[1], [2],[3],[4] Dept. Electronics & Comm. Eng.,
Integral University, India

Abstract - This paper deals with the overview of next generation video coding systems High-Efficiency Video Coding (HEVC) or H.265. Also this work presents a comparison of the video coding standards H.264/AVC and H.265/HEVC . According to the experimental results, which were obtained for a particular test set of video sequences , H.265/MPEG-HEVC provides significant average bit-rate savings of around 40% .
Keywords— Bit Rate, H.264/AVC**,** HEVC, Network Abstraction Layer and PSNR .

I. INTRODUCTION

H.264/AVC, Advanced Video Coding and MPEG-4 part 10 are generally maintained jointly because of their identical technical content [1]. It is block- oriented motion compensation based video compression standard. There are several Advanced Features of H.264/AVC video Codec which distinguish it from the previous video compression standards such as H.261, MPEG-1,2 and H.263 etc.[1, 2].

The H.265/MPEG-HEVC standard was designed to be applicable for almost all existing H.264/MPEG-AVC applications, while putting emphasis on high-resolution video coding. Since the development process of H.265/MPEGHEVC was also driven by the most recent scientific and technological achievements in the field of video coding, dramatic bit-rate savings were achieved for substantially the same visual quality, when compared to its predecessor like H.264/MPEG -AVC [3-5].

In parallel with the open video coding standardization processes of ITU-T and ISO/IEC, a few companies individually developed their own video codecs, which often were based partly on their own secretly kept technologies and partly on variants of the state-of-the-art technologies used in their standardized counterparts, available at that time. One of these kind of proprietary video codecs is the VP8 codec [6-8], which was developed privately by On2 Technologies® Inc. that in turn, was later acquired by Google® Inc. Based on VP8, Google® Inc. started the development of its successor VP9 [6,7] in 2011, which was recently announced to be finalized [8].

II. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF H.264

The H.264 design supports the coding of video (in 4:2:0 chroma format) that contains either progressive or interlaced frames. Generally a frame of video contains two interleaved field.

The VCL, which is described in the following section, is specified to represent, efficiently, the content of the video data. The Network Abstraction Layer (NAL)is specified to format that data and be responsible for header.

The video coding layer of H.264 is similar in script to other standards such as MPEG-2 video. It consists of a hybrid temporal and spatial predictions, in conjunction with transform coding. Figure-2 shows the H.264 encoder. In common with earlier coding standards, H.264 does not explicitly define a Codec but rather defines the syntax of an

encoded video bit stream together with the method of decoding this bitstream [9].
A digitized video signal consists of a periodical sequence of images called frames. Each frame consist of a two dimensional array of pixels. Each pixel consist of three color components R, G and B. Usually, pixel data is converted from RGB to another color space called YUV in which U and V components can be sub-sampled. A block-based coding approach divides a frame into macroblocks (MBs) each consisting of say 16x16=256 Y components. Each of three components of a MB, a hybrid of three techniques is used: prediction, transformation & quantization and entropy coding. This procedure works on a frame of video [10-12].



Fig. 1. Block diagram of H.264/AVC encoder



Fig.2 Video coding Progress [12]

III. OVERVIEW OF HEVC

Main Features of HEVC are as follows;

1. High throughput (Ultra---HD 8K @ 120fps) and low power.
2. Achieves 2x higher compression compared to H.264/AVC.
3. Implementation friendly features (e.g. built-in parallelism).
4. Easier streaming of HD video to mobile devices.
5. Reduce the burden on global networks.

HEVC is based on the same structure as prior hybrid video codecs like H.264/AVC but with enhancements in each coding stage [13,14]. HEVC includes a prediction stage composed of motion compensation and spatial intra-prediction, an integer transform applied to prediction residuals, and an entropy coding stage that uses either arithmetic coding or variable length coding. Also, as in H.264/AVC, an in-loop deblocking filter is applied to the reconstructed frame. Fig. 3 depicts a general diagram of the HEVC decoder and its coding stages.

An important difference of HEVC compared to H.264/AVC is the frame coding structure. In HEVC each frame is divided into Largest Coding Units (LCUs) that can be recursively split into smaller Coding Units (CUs) using a generic quad tree segmentation structure. CUs can be further split into Prediction Units (PUs) used for intra- and inter-prediction and Transform Units (TUs) defined for transform and quantization.



Fig.3 General diagram of HEVC Decoder [13]

IV. SIMULATION, IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

For evaluating H.264/MPEG-AVC, an open H.264/MPEGAVC encoder implementation - the x264 encoder was selected [15-18]. The first version of the x264 encoder was released in 2006, and since then, it has proven to be very fast, efficient, and reliable. Particularly, due to its flexible trade-off between coding efficiency and computational complexity, it was widely adopted in many network-based applications. Currently, the x264 video encoder is considered to be one of the most popular encoders for H.264/AVC based video coding [15].

Table-1depicts the Performance Comparison of HEVC with H.264/AVC for a particular video sequence.

TABLE I. BIT RATE VS PSNR FOR VIDEO SEQUENCE TRAFFIC

S.No.	**Bit Rate(KBPS)**	**PSNR-YUV(dB){HEVC}**	**PSNR-YUV(dB){x264}**
1	500	34.8	34.5
2	1000	35.9	34.9
3	2000	37.6	35.8
4	5000	39.5	37.6
5.	7000	40.2	39.4
6.	10000	40.7	40.1
7.	12000	41.3	40.4
8.	15000	42.1	41.1
9.	18000	42.8	41.5
10.	20000	43.5	42.0



Fig.4 Performance Comparison of HEVC & H.264/AVC

V. CONCLUSION

Basics of High Efficiency Video Codec are discussed along with the Technical overview of H.264/AVC.

Also performance comparison of H.265/HEVC, and H.264/AVC encoders was presented. According to the experimental results, there is significant improvement in the PSNR of the order of 1.9dB or so.

REFERENCES

[1] "D.Marpe, T.Wiegand and G.J.Sullivan, "The H.264/MPEG -4 Advance video coding standard and its applications", IEEE Communications Magazine, vol.44, no.8, pp.134-144, Aug.2006.

[2] T.T. Shih, C.L. Yang, Y.S. Tung, "Workload Characterization of the H.264/AVC Decoder," Proc. 5th IEEE Pacific-Rim Conf. Multimedia, Japan, November 2004, pp. 957-966.

[3] J. Ohm, G.J. Sullivan, H. Schwarz, T.K. Tan, and T. Wiegand, "Comparison of the coding efficiency of video coding standards—including High Efficiency Video Coding (HEVC)," Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, IEEE Transactions on , vol. 22, no.12, pp.1669-1684,Dec. 2012.

[4] B. Li, G. J. Sullivan, and J. Xu, "Comparison of compression performance of HEVC Draft 9 with AVC high profile and performance of HM9.0 with temporal scalability characteristics,"JCTVC-L0322, 12th JCT-VC meeting, Geneva, Switzerland, Jan. 2013.

[5] M. Horowitz, F. Kossentini, N. Mahdi, S. Xu, H. Guermazi, H. Tmar, B. Li, G. J. Sullivan, J.Xu, "Informal subjective quality comparison of video compression performance of the HEVC and H.264/MPEG-4 AVC standards for low-delay applications," Proc. SPIE 8499, Applications of Digital Image Processing XXXV, 84990W, Oct. 15, 2012.

[6] Chromium® open-source browser project, VP9 source code, Online:http://git.chromium.org/gitweb/?p=webm/libvpx.git;a=tree;f=vp9;hb=aaf61dfbcab414bfacc3171501be17d191ff8506

[7] J. Bankoski, R. S. Bultje, A. Grange, Q. Gu, J. Han, J. Koleszar, D. Mukherjee, P. Wilkins, and Y. Xu, “Towards a next generation open-source video codec,” Proc. SPIE 8666, Visual Information Processing and Communication IV, Feb. 21, 2013, pp. 1-13.

[8] Paul Wilkins, Google® Groups "WebM Discussion", Online:https://groups.google.com/a/webmproject.org/forum/?fromgroups#!topic/webmdiscuss/UzoX7owhwB0.

[9] http://www.vcodex.com/h264.html - Overview of H.264

[10] Video Coding for Very Low Bit Rate Communication, ITU-T Recommendation H.264, May 2003.

[11] Y. Wang, J. Ostermann, Y. Q. Zhang, “Video processing and communications”, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2001.

[12] T. Wiegand, G. J. Sullivan, G. Bjontegaard, and A. Luthra, “Overview of the H.264/AVC video coding standard”, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology, Vol.13, No.7, pp.560-576, Jul. 2003.

[13] G. J. Sullivan and J.-R. Ohm. Recent developments in standardization of high efficiency video coding (HEVC). In Applications of Digital Image Processing XXXIII. Proceedings of SPIE Volume: 7798, 2010.

[14] Iain E. G. Richardson, “H.264 and Video Compression”, John Wiley and Sons,2003.

[15] Projects from VideoLAN™, x264 software library and application, Online:http://www.videolan.org/developers/x264.html

[16] x264 free library/codec, 32-bit, 8-bit depth version r2334 (May 22, 2013), Online:http://www.divx-digest.com/software/x264.html x264Settings, Online: http://mewiki.project357.com/wiki/X264_Settings x264 Codec Capabilities Analysis, x264 Codec Parameters Comparison, YUVsoftCorp.,Online:http://www.yuvsoft.com/pdf/x264_parameters_comparison.pdf