

Re: UPD better than TCP in streaming video/audio ?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.networks/2004-12/0199.html>

From: Dean Roddey (*droddey_at_charmedquark.com*)

Date: 12/09/04

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 2004 10:48:25 -0800

Most lossey video compression schemes probably will follow a similar form, because of the temporal compression nature. They periodically send a full frame, and then for some small period of time they send just the changes from that last full frame. That would mean that you could always re-sync, you just have to scan forward to the next full frame and pick up again. I don't think that any compression scheme for broadcast or streaming could be of the sort that requires you get every byte flawlessly from the beginning of the stream. It wouldn't be practical because one hiccup at 2 seconds into it and you'd lose the rest of the content from there on out. So the compression would have to be somewhat packet oriented to allow for recovery.

Dean Roddey
Chairman/CTO, Charmed Quark Systems
www.charmedquark.com

"Puzzolino" <puzzolino77@libero.it> wrote in message
news:qk%td.486410\$35.20795115@news4.tin.it...

- > *Hi Alun,*
- > *thanks a lot for your long reply.*
- > *The more I work on it, the more I find limitations on the use of UDP:*
- > *among*
- > *all, the maximum size of UDP packets and the use of compression on video*
- > *streams that makes consequent packets strictly dependant on each other*
- > *(this*
- > *becomes a problem when packets get lost).*
- > *What do you think ?*
- >