

# Could Skype be More Satisfying?

## A QoE-Centric Study of the FEC Mechanism in an Internet-Scale VoIP System

Te-Yuan Huang<sup>†</sup>, Polly Huang<sup>‡§\*</sup>, Kuan-Ta Chen<sup>††</sup>, Po-Jung Wang<sup>‡§</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Computer Science, Stanford University, CA, USA

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

<sup>§</sup>Graduate Institute of Communication Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

<sup>\*</sup>Graduate Institute of Networking and Multimedia, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

<sup>††</sup>Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica, Taiwan

### Abstract

The phenomenal growth of Skype in recent years has surpassed all expectations. Much of the application's success is attributed to its FEC mechanism, which adds redundancy to the voice streams to sustain audio quality under network impairments. Adopting the quality-of-experience (QoE) approach, i.e., measuring the Mean Opinion Scores (MOS), we examine how much redundancy Skype adds to its voice streams and systematically explore the optimal level of redundancy for different network and codec settings. This study reveals (1) Skype's FEC mechanism, not so surprisingly, falls in the ballpark, but (2) there is surprisingly a significant margin for improvement to ensure consistent user satisfaction.

### Index Terms

Skype, MOS, PESQ, FEC (Forward Error Correction), QoE (Quality of Experience),  
QoS (Quality of Service), VoIP

## I. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that Skype is the most popular VoIP service. At the end of 2009, there were 500 million users registered with Skype, and the number of concurrent online users regularly exceeds 20 million. According to TeleGeography, in 2008, 8% of international long-distance calls were made via Skype, making Skype the largest international voice carrier in the world. Skype's success is attributed largely to the quality of the voice calls. Users everywhere seem to be **happy** with the service, no matter (1) how great the distance between the two parties in the conversation, (2) how limited the bandwidth

The previous version of this paper has been published in the Proceeding of the IEEE INFOCOM'09, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

between the parties, and (3) how lossy the path the voice data traverses. Skype must be doing something right while sending the voice bits over the Internet.

This study is motivated by a simple question: How does Skype adapt its voice data to heterogeneous connection quality and still keep users happy? Let's flash back our experience designing multimedia systems over the years. The general tricks are two-fold: (1) in the presence of persistent data loss, i.e., the bandwidth along the path the data traverses is limited, a multimedia system adapts the sampling and compression rate at the codec level to reduce the amount of bits for delivery, while ensuring that the content is still perceptible; (2) in the presence of sporadic data loss, i.e., links along the path the data traverses over are lossy or the background traffic contains short-term bursts that occupy a router's buffer space temporarily, a multimedia system adapts the amount of redundant data, as well as the scheme for encoding such data, at the error concealment level. Hereafter, we refer to the redundancy-based error concealment function of the system as the Forward Error Correction (FEC) mechanism. There are two components in a general FEC mechanism: a *redundancy control algorithm* and a *redundancy coding scheme*. The control algorithm decides how much redundant FEC data should be added to the voice stream; and the coding scheme determines how redundant FEC data should be multiplexed and embedded.

For its PC-to-PC voice calls, Skype employs a voice codec that generates variable bit rate (VBR) voice streams depending on the available network bandwidth [2]. However, this is not the case for the PC-to-PSTN service, which actually creates revenue for Skype. The PC-to-PSTN service, also called "SkypeOut", enables users to make calls to traditional PSTN telephones, including fixed landline and mobile telephones. In some countries, Skype also allows users to have a local phone number to receive calls from traditional telephone users. The service is known as "SkypeIn". In 2008, Skype launched a monthly subscription program, which attracts more users to switch to Internet telephony completely. The program boosted Skype's quarterly revenue to US\$170 million in Q2 2009. For much of its commercial success, i.e., the SkypeIn and SkypeOut calls, Skype falls back to the ITU-defined fixed rate codec (CBR), G.729. The immediate implication is that Skype's FEC mechanism is in fact the major design that is holding up the revenue. On March 31 2009, Skype released an official version on iPhone and iPod Touch. Within ten days, there are two million downloads from the iTunes App Store. The codec used in the handheld version is also G.729. As Skype expands services for the wireless and mobile market, the role of the FEC mechanism becomes increasingly important.

Focusing on Skype's FEC mechanism, we investigate the relationship between the redundancy ratio and

the network loss rate. Our major findings are (1) *Skype increases the redundancy ratio as the network loss rate increases*; and (2) *Skype's control algorithm does not take the individual codec and packet loss patterns (burstiness) into consideration*. These findings indicate that, although Skype's FEC mechanism addresses the need to tune up the redundancy ratio when the network loss increases, there are yet discrepancies towards consistent user satisfaction. To address the problem, we adopt implementations of public domain codecs and systematically investigate how the user satisfaction, i.e. mean opinion scores (MOS), with voice calls is influenced by the levels of packet loss and burstiness, as well as the type of redundancy coding scheme. The results suggest that the FEC mechanism should be codec-, loss pattern-, and redundancy coding scheme-specific. Given the desired MOS level, codec, and redundancy coding scheme in use, our work leads to an FEC mechanism that ensures consistent quality of experience based on the measured loss rate and loss burstiness.

## II. SKYPE OVERVIEW

Launched in August 2003 and subsequently acquired by eBay in 2005, Skype was the brainchild of Estonia-based Ahti Heinla, Priit Kasesalu and Jaan Tallinn, who are also the founders of KaZaA, a well-known file sharing software. Similar to general VoIP services, the system consists of a control plane and a data plane. The directory service and signaling protocol are implemented in the control plane and the voice data transmission is implemented in the data plane. In the following subsections, we discuss Skype's control and data planes, as well as recent studies of Skype's mechanism in the data plane.

### A. Skype's Control Plane

Like its file sharing predecessor KaZaA, Skype's network architecture is a multi-tiered peer-to-peer system [1]. There are two types of Skype nodes in the overlay network: ordinary nodes and super nodes. Super nodes maintain an overlay network among themselves, while ordinary nodes pick one or some super nodes to associate with. All Skype users are by default ordinary nodes, but it has been shown that a publicly reachable ordinary node with sufficient resources has higher probability of being selected as a super node [5]. The main responsibilities of super nodes are call relaying and directory services. They serve as proxies between firewall-ed Skype clients. This allows Skype nodes behind most of firewalls and gateways to establish peer-to-peer calls without special configurations.

Super nodes also help perform directory services. According to [13], Skype implements a "Global index" algorithm on its overlay network, so that every node in the network has full knowledge of all

available users and resources through its associated super node. The only centralized component in Skype is the login server, which authenticates users with public key mechanisms. After authentication, all further signaling is performed in the peer-to-peer network.

### B. Skype's Data Plane

The major reason for Skype's popularity is its voice quality, which is the result of Skype's codec selection and application-level FEC mechanism. A list of the codecs used by Skype and their characteristics is provided in [3]. Like its proprietary protocol, how Skype selects a particular codec for a voice session is not publicly known. Even so, through observations, we have found that G.729 is always used in SkypeOut as well as in voice sessions involving Skype clients on handheld devices, such as iPhone. For voice calls between PCs, different versions of Skype use different codecs. The default audio codec for version 3.1<sup>1</sup> is iSAC, a product of Global IP Solutions; however, since version 3.2, Skype has adopted SVOPC [11], an in-house developed codec, as the default codec. Note that both iSAC and SVOPC are variable bit rate (VBR) codecs. In early 2009, Skype announced another in-house developed codec called SILK for its latest version (version 4.0). Skype claims that SILK achieves the same quality as SVOPC, while requiring only half of the bit rate. Despite this claim, a recent poll of Skype users showed that 46% of the respondent would rather revert to an earlier version<sup>2</sup>.

### C. Recent Studies

Bonfiglio et al. [2] analyzed how Skype adapts its traffic to different network conditions. They found that when the available bandwidth decreases, the bit rate and payload size of Skype traffic are also decreased. On the other hand, when packet loss is detected, Skype mitigates its impact by sending voice packets with redundancy. The authors also proposed a source traffic model of Skype. Based on the model, Skype's traffic is decided by three parameters: 1) the bit rate used by the codec; 2)  $\Delta T$ , the framing time of human speech; and 3) the redundancy factor, which is the number of previous blocks that Skype retransmits with the current encoded block. Following Bonfiglio et al., in [6], we conducted experiments with the iSAC codec and found that the first two parameters, i.e., the encoding bit rate and the speech framing time, are controlled by the codec, while the amount of redundancy is controlled by the Skype program.

<sup>1</sup>Note that the version number is based on the Windows<sup>®</sup> version of Skype.

<sup>2</sup><http://skypenumerology.blogspot.com/2009/03/satisfaction-of-new-skype-40.html>




Fig. 1. The impact of the network loss rate on the payload size and the bit rate of Skype packets for three different codecs.

In this work, we (1) provide a more complete understanding of Skype’s FEC mechanism, and (2) present a methodology for deriving the optimal FEC mechanism for general VoIP system design towards *consistent quality of experience*.

### III. SKYPE’S FEC MECHANISM

To observe how Skype copes with lossy networks, we collected Skype VoIP traces in a controlled network environment. We set up a FreeBSD box as a layer-2 bridge to connect a Skype caller and a callee, and controlled the VoIP traffic passing through with the `dummynet` [12] kernel module. Although Skype can transmit its voice packets through UDP or TCP, we focus on UDP flows in this article and leave the study of the effect of TCP/UDP protocols in the future work.

#### A. Observations on Skype Traces

We collected Skype VoIP traces for both PC-to-PSTN (G.729) and PC-to-PC (iSAC and SVOPC) voice calls. In each experiment, we increased the network loss rate from 0% to 10% in 1% increments every 180 seconds.

1) *G.729*: Fig. 1(a) shows the scatter plot of the payload sizes of the packets in a SkypeOut (G.729) session. Since the bit rate and framing time of the G.729 codec are constants, the size of all G.729 voice

frames should be the same. However, from the figure, we can observe that the payload size changes as the network loss rate increases. When the loss rate is 0%, i.e., between 0 and 180 seconds, the payload size remains around 30 bytes; however, as the loss rate increases, we find there are more packets with a payload of about 60 bytes. Furthermore, when the loss rate reaches 10%, i.e., between 1800 and 1980 seconds, the majority of packets have a payload of approximately 60 bytes. Interestingly, when the loss rate returns to 0% after 1980 seconds, the payload size drops back to around 30 bytes. Meanwhile, the bit rate of this voice session almost doubles when the payload of the majority of the packets is 60 bytes, as shown in Fig. 1(d). Thus, the increment in the payload size is not the result of Skype adjusting the inter-packet gap and including a higher number of voice frames in each packet. Instead, it indicates that Skype changes the proportion of packets with redundant FEC data based on the network loss rate.

2) *iSAC*: The *iSAC* trace exhibits similar behavior. However, the *iSAC* codec's bit rate is variable, so the size of its voice frames fluctuates within a range. When the loss rate is 0%, the payload size is within the range of (0, 160) bytes, as shown in Fig. 1(b). As the loss rate increases, we find more packets with a payload in the range of (160, 320) bytes; and when the loss rate reaches 10%, the majority of the packets have a double-size payload. Moreover, the bit rate almost doubles when the traffic encounters a significant amount of network loss, as shown in Fig. 1(e).

3) *SVOPC*: The effect of the network loss rate on the payload size and the bit rate of the *SVOPC* trace are shown in Fig. 1(c) and 1(f) respectively. Again, we find that the trace pattern is similar to those of *G.729* and *iSAC*. Like *iSAC*, *SVOPC* has a variable bit rate; thus, the size of its voice frame also fluctuates within a range. When there is no network loss, the payload size is within the range of (90, 140) bytes; however, as the network loss rate increases, the number of packets with a double-size payload also increases along with the bit rate.

In summary, to mitigate the impact of packet loss on PC-to-PSTN (*G.729*) and PC-to-PC (*iSAC* and *SVOPC*) calls, Skype seems to piggyback redundant FEC data to a number of packets based on the observed network loss rate.

## B. Understanding Skype's FEC Mechanism

To understand Skype's FEC mechanism, we attempt to quantify the amount of redundant FEC data added to Skype voice traffic. We define the *redundancy ratio* as the percentage of packets that carry redundant voice data, i.e., packets that have a double-size payload. If all packets carry redundant data, the




Fig. 2. Comparison of Skype's FEC mechanism for the G.729, iSAC and SVOPC codecs, and under different levels of network loss burstiness for SVOPC.

redundancy ratio would equal to 1. Conversely, if none of the packets carry redundant data, the redundancy ratio would be 0.

1) *Deriving Redundancy Ratio:* In the following, we present our method for inferring the redundancy ratio used by Skype based on the traces collected in the above experiments. We take the three codecs as examples, though the method can be generalized to other codecs supported by Skype.

It is easier to deal with the SkypeOut (G.729) traces since the size of G.729 voice frames is constant. As shown in Fig. 1(a), there is a clean cut, in payload size, between packets with and without redundant FEC data. To do so, we use a simple threshold method with the threshold set at 40 bytes to derive the redundancy ratio. Thus, if 30% of packets have a payload larger than 40 bytes, then the redundancy ratio will be 0.3.

Dealing with iSAC and SVOPC traces is more difficult because they have variable bit rates and variable framing times. First, we need to determine the framing time of a packet based on the observed inter-packet gap. Then, the payload size must be normalized to the determined framing time before we can apply the same threshold method. The steps are described in detail in [6]. In this study, the thresholds for iSAC and SVOPC traces are set at 160 bytes and 150 bytes respectively. We repeated the above experiment five times for each codec. Fig. 2(a) shows the average redundancy ratios and their 95% confidence intervals for the three compared codecs under various network loss settings.

2) *Skype's FEC Mechanism for Different Codecs:* The results in Fig. 2(a) demonstrate that, for all three codecs, the redundancy ratio increases gradually when the loss rate is between 1% and 2%, and it increases dramatically between 2% and 4%. The redundancy ratio remains above 0.9 when the loss rate

is higher than 4%. In other words, more than 90% of packets carry redundant FEC data when there is a large amount of packet loss. Furthermore, in the figure, the 95% confidence intervals of the three curves largely overlap. This suggests that Skype applies the same FEC mechanism for different codecs, even though it leads to different levels of user perception, as we will show in the next section.

3) *Skype's FEC Mechanism under Bursty Loss*: As the network loss over the Internet is often bursty, it would be interesting to learn how Skype's FEC mechanism works under different levels of network loss burstiness. To quantify the burstiness of network loss, we adopt the *burst ratio* metric, defined in ITU-T G.107 [7] as the ratio of the average length of consecutive losses under bursty loss to the one under random loss. By definition, the burst ratio is equal to 1 when packet loss is purely random; and it is greater than 1 when packet loss is bursty. Specifically, a burst ratio equal to 2 indicates that the average length of consecutive losses is twice as long as that of purely random losses. Again, we conduct the experiments by increasing the network loss rate from 0% to 10% in 1% increments every 180 seconds. However, this time, the packet loss is bursty rather than uniformly distributed. We implemented the Gilbert model [4] to emulate the burst ratio in `dummysnet`. Details of the implementation can be found in [6].

Fig. 2(b) shows the observed redundancy ratio of SVOPC when its traffic experiences packet loss with different burst ratios. In the figure, each curve corresponds to a burst ratio setting, and the curves' 95% confidence intervals overlap with each other. We have the same observation on the redundancy ratios of iSAC and G.729 under different levels of burstiness.

In summary, our experiment results suggest that Skype only adjusts redundancy ratios based on the network loss rate. In other words, Skype does not consider the difference of each codec or network loss burstiness in its FEC mechanism.

#### IV. QOE ANALYSIS OF FEC MECHANISMS

Having shown that Skype adjusts its redundancy ratio based on the observed network loss rate only, we now consider the question: Does the applied redundancy ratio provide good quality of experience? To address this question, we evaluate the performance of FEC mechanisms in terms of quality of experience (QoE) in order to derive an optimal FEC design for general VoIP services.

In the following subsections, we first present our methodology for deriving the optimal redundancy ratio given a desired voice quality. Then, we systematically investigate how the ratio might vary depending on (1) the audio codec, (2) the loss pattern, and (3) the FEC coding scheme.




Fig. 3. The flow chart of our emulation methodology and two examples of the Reed Solomon FEC coding schemes

### A. Emulation Methodology

Fig. 3(a) illustrates the flow chart of our emulation methodology. First, we encode an audio clip into voice frames, and then emulate network loss by dropping voice frames based on the Gilbert model. Depending on the applied redundancy ratio, some of the dropped voice frames would be recoverable from the redundant data at the receiver side. We then decode the resulting voice stream into a degraded audio clip and evaluate the clip's voice quality by PESQ [9], which compares the degraded audio clip with the original version and outputs a Mean Opinion Score (MOS) [8]. MOS is a commonly used indicator of users' perceived quality. The MOS value ranges from 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest perceived audio quality and 5 is the highest.

We repeat the above emulation for a range of redundancy ratios and a range of network loss rates. The redundancy ratio with the desired MOS score is considered as the optimal redundancy ratio. For example, if the desired MOS score is 3.5, the optimal redundancy ratios are those that are rated exactly 3.5 under each network loss rate.

### B. Optimal Redundancy Ratios for Different Codecs

First, we consider whether the optimal redundancy ratios would be the same for different audio codecs. To address this issue, we conduct emulations using two publicly available codecs: (1) G.711, the most widely used codec in digital speech systems; and (2) G.729, the codec used by SkypeOut. Unfortunately, having no access to the encoders and decoders, we are not able to derive the optimal redundancy ratios for proprietary codecs such as iSAC and SVOPC.

The optimal redundancy ratios derived by our methodology for G.711 and G.729 are shown in Fig. 4(a)




Fig. 4. The contour plots of audio quality scores under three burst ratio settings.

and 4(b) respectively. On each graph, the contour curve labeled with a number, say 3.5, represents the combinations of loss rates and redundancy ratios that yield the same MOS score, 3.5. Thus, each contour curve represents the optimal redundancy ratios for the associated MOS value. We observe that, for a certain loss rate, higher redundancy ratios yield higher MOS scores. On the other hand, for a fixed redundancy ratio, higher loss rates lead to lower MOS scores. Comparing the contour plots of the two codecs, we find that the optimal redundancy ratios required to maintain a certain MOS score for each codec are very different. For example, assuming the network loss rate is 4% and the desired MOS score is 3.5, the redundancy ratio should be set at 0.2 for G.711. In contrast, we can achieve the same audio quality by setting the redundancy ratio at 0.8 if G.729 is used.

### C. Optimal Redundancy Ratio for Different Loss Patterns

We repeat the emulations, except that we now infer the optimal redundancy ratios for different burst ratios. In Fig. 4(a) and Fig. 4(b), the optimal redundancy ratios for three burst ratio settings, 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0, are plotted with black solid lines, red dashed lines, and green dotted lines respectively. The results show that the redundancy ratio should be increased more aggressively if we wish to maintain the same audio quality under higher burst ratios. For example, to maintain a consistent level of user perception at MOS 3.5 with G.711 under network loss rate of 4%, the redundancy ratio should be set to 0.2 when the burst ratio is 1; however, it should be set to 0.45 and 0.75 when the burst ratios are 1.5 and 2, respectively.

### D. Optimal Redundancy Ratio for FEC Coding Schemes

Since the payloads of Skype packets are encrypted, we cannot determine which FEC coding scheme Skype employs. Nevertheless, based on the observation that the payload size doubles when FEC data is




Fig. 5. The contour plots of audio quality scores under two Reed Solomon coding schemes

added, it is highly likely that Skype piggybacks the coding of previous voice packets onto the current packet. This FEC coding scheme, which is also known as Reed-Solomon  $(n, k)$  code, or  $RS-(n, k)$  code, is widely used in VoIP systems [10]. An  $RS-(n, k)$  code can recover all losses in the same FEC block if and only if at least  $k$  out of  $n$  packets are received. Fig. 3(b) shows an example of  $RS-(2, 1)$ , where each packet piggybacks a copy of the previous packet. Since each packet carries redundant FEC data, the redundancy ratio in this example is 1. Under  $RS-(2, 1)$  coding, if a voice packet is dropped during transmission, it can be restored if the subsequent packet is not dropped and carries redundant voice data.

Other Reed-Solomon codes, such as  $RS-(3, 2)$  or  $RS-(4, 3)$ , can also have the double-size payloads as we observed in Skype’s voice traces. An example of  $RS-(3, 2)$  with a redundancy ratio of 1 is shown in Fig. 3(c). In this case, each packet carries the multiplex of its two previous packets. Under  $RS-(3, 2)$  coding, a packet can be recovered if the other two packets in the same FEC block have not been dropped and at least one of them carries FEC data. For example, when the packet B is lost, it is recoverable from  $C \oplus (B \oplus C)$  if both packet C and packet D are received successfully.

Fig. 5 shows the QoE analysis of the  $RS-(2, 1)$  and  $RS-(3, 2)$  codes under different levels of loss burstiness. The codec in these experiments is G.729, which is used by SkypeOut. Compared to the  $RS-(2, 1)$  code,  $RS-(3, 2)$  is more resilient to network loss. For example, under the  $RS-(3, 2)$  code, if packet B is lost, it can be recovered either from  $C \oplus (B \oplus C)$  if packet C and D are received correctly, or from  $A \oplus (A \oplus B)$  if packet A and C are received. On the other hand, under the  $RS-(2, 1)$  code, packet B can only be recovered from the piggybacked copy in packet C. Fig. 5(a) compares the  $RS-(2, 1)$  and  $RS-(3, 2)$  codes under uniform random loss, i.e., the burst ratio equals 1. As shown in the figure, to maintain the voice quality at MOS 3.5 when the network loss rate is 4%, the redundancy ratio needed for  $RS-(3, 2)$




Fig. 6. (a) Comparison of Skype's FEC mechanism vs. the optimal redundancy ratios; (b) quantification of how Skype's FEC mechanism deviates from optimal

must be set at 0.6, compared to 0.8 for RS-(2, 1).

Moreover, RS-(3, 2) is also more resilient to bursty loss. For example, if both packet A and B are lost, A is not recoverable under RS-(2, 1) code. However, under RS-(3, 2), if packets C and D are both received successfully, packet B can be recovered. Once B is recovered, packet A could also be restored from  $B \oplus (A \oplus B)$ . When the burst ratio is 1.5, to maintain a consistent level of user perception at MOS 3.3 under a network loss rate of 4%, the redundancy ratio should be set at 0.6 for RS-(3, 2), as shown in Fig. 5(b); however, it would need to be at 0.85 for RS-(2, 1).

Under RS-(3, 2) coding, it might be necessary to wait for three subsequent packets to arrive before the receiver can recover a lost packet. With iSAC and SVOPC, whose framing times could be as high as 60 ms, waiting for three more packets is equivalent to add an additional 180 ms of FEC delay in the worst case. This would not be acceptable for real-time interactive voice communication. The FEC delay for other Reed Solomon codes, such as RS-(4, 3), may be worse, but they are more resilient to network loss. The choice of FEC coding scheme is a trade-off between the responsiveness and loss resilience.

### E. Skype vs. Optimal

Having determined Skype's FEC mechanism in Section III and derived the optimal algorithm above, we can now assess whether Skype's redundancy ratio settings are optimal. In Fig. 6, we overlap the observed Skype's redundancy ratios and the optimal redundancy ratios for G.729; each graph corresponds to a certain burst ratio. By comparing the contour curves and Skype's redundancy ratio curve, we find that *Skype fails to maintain consistent voice quality*.

For example, as shown in Fig. 6(a), Skype's audio quality is better than that of a MOS score of 3.5 when the loss rate is higher than 4% or lower than 1%, but its quality level is much lower than 3.5 when the loss rate is between 2% and 4%. The inconsistency in voice quality could be frustrating for users. On the other hand, assuming that the desired MOS score is 3.3, this phenomenon indicates that Skype may inject more than necessary of redundant traffic into the network by over-adjusting the redundancy ratio. That is, Skype injects extra traffic into the network. It would increase the probability of congestion and in turn result in lower quality of experience for users. In contrast, by adjusting the redundancy ratio to the optimal redundancy ratio derived by our methodology, we can ensure a balance between bandwidth utilization and voice quality.

In Fig. 6(b), we quantify how much Skype's FEC mechanism deviates from the policy that achieves a consistent audio quality under various network conditions. The graphs are computed based on the assumption that the desired MOS score is 3.4, as Skype's audio quality is mostly around that level in our emulation scenarios. For each network setting, we plot the bandwidth Skype uses and the MOS score Skype provides on the respective normalized scales. The desired MOS score and the bandwidth required to achieve the desired audio quality are both set at 100. In this figure, we observe that the bandwidth utilization and audio quality of Skype fluctuate over different network settings. As in the scenario with a 2% loss rate in Fig. 6(b), Skype uses too little bandwidth and results in a quality level lower than what is desired. Conversely, as in the scenarios with a higher than 4% loss rate in Fig. 6(b), Skype injects too much redundant data and thus achieves a quality level higher than necessary.

## V. COULD SKYPE BE MORE SATISFYING?

Yes, Skype could be more satisfying. Our results show that Skype's audio quality is not consistent as *it adjusts the redundancy ratio independently of the codec, the redundancy coding scheme, and the network loss burstiness*. The inconsistency in voice quality may result in user frustration or over-utilization of bandwidth. Therefore, to balance the needs of users and ensure network efficiency, a more sophisticated FEC mechanism is required.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments. This work was supported in part by the Ministry of Economic Affairs under the grant 98-EC-17-A-19-S2-0134 and

National Science Council of Taiwan under the grant NSC98-2221-E-002-072-MY3, NSC96-2628-E-001-027-MY3, and Mr. and Mrs. Chun Chiu Stanford Graduate Fellowship.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Baset and H. Schulzrinne, "An Analysis of the Skype Peer-to-Peer Internet Telephony Protocol," in *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'06*, Barcelona, Spain, Apr. 2006.
- [2] D. Bonfiglio, M. Mellia, M. Meo, N. Ritacca, and D. Rossi, "Tracking Down Skype Traffic," in *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'08*, Phoenix, AZ, Apr. 2008.
- [3] D. Bonfiglio, M. Mellia, M. Meo, and D. Rossi, "Detailed Analysis of Skype Traffic," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 117–126, January 2009.
- [4] E. Gilbert, "Capacity of a Burst-Noise Channel," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 39, pp. 1253–1265, SEP 1960.
- [5] S. Guha, N. Daswani, and R. Jain, "An Experimental Study of the Skype Peer-to-Peer VoIP System," in *Proceedings of The 5th International Workshop on Peer-to-Peer Systems (IPTPS'06)*, Santa Barbara, CA, Feb. 2006, pp. 1–6.
- [6] T.-Y. Huang, K.-T. Chen, and P. Huang, "Tuning Skype's Redundancy Control Algorithm for User Satisfaction," in *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'09*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Apr. 2009.
- [7] ITU-T Recommendation G.107, "The E-model, a computational model for use in transmission planning," Mar. 2005.
- [8] ITU-T Recommendation P.800, "Methods for subjective determination of transmission quality," 1996.
- [9] ITU-T Recommendation P.862, "Perceptual evaluation of speech quality (PESQ), an objective method for end-to-end speech quality assessment of narrow-band telephone networks and speech codecs," Feb. 2001.
- [10] W. Jiang and H. Schulzrinne, "Comparison and optimization of packet loss repair methods on VoIP perceived quality under bursty loss," in *Proceedings of NOSSDAV'02*, Miami Beach, FL, May 2002.
- [11] J. Lindblom, "A Sinusoidal Voice Over Packet Coder Tailored for the Frame-Erasure Channel," *IEEE Trans. Speech Audio Processing*, 2004.
- [12] L. Rizzo, "Dummysnet and Forward Error Correction," in *In Proc. of the 1998 USENIX Annual Technical Conf.* USENIX Association, 1998.
- [13] Skype P2P Telephony Explained. [Online]. Available: <http://www.skype.com/help/guides/p2pexplained/>