Applied Machine Learning: Examples in the ICT domain Lecture 2

Prof. Andrea Zanella

zanella@dei.unipd.it

- office: +39 049 8277770
 fax : +39 049 8277699
- email: <u>zanella@dei.unipd.it</u>
- web : <u>http://www.dei.unipd.it/~zanella</u>











Cognition-based networks: applying cognitive science to wireless networking





Cognition-based networks

Evolution of cognitive communications and networks

New holistic concept of cognition-based networks

Use of machine learning tools toward this vision

Examples of application

QoE-driven video streaming control



Motivation

- Communication systems are becoming very complex, and call for intelligent solutions
- New technologies make such evolutions real

□ For example:

- White spaces in licensed spectrum (e.g., TV bands), spectrum re-used by a secondary user
- Self-organizing networks in ad hoc (e.g., disaster) scenarios
- Advanced paradigms in HetNets
- All of these are specific cases of a more general approach based on learning and context-awareness



Cognition applied to wireless

- Applying cognition is a way to deal with the complexity and challenges of future systems
- Cognition is already in use today in several cases
 - Cognitive radios, biologically inspired networks, node adaptation by learning, etc
- However, in order to draw the most benefit from this approach, one needs to
 - Consider all players in a more coherent manner
 - Apply cognition at all network layers and end-to-end
 - Apply the most advanced paradigms taken from cognitive science



Cognition applied to wireless

- Mitola (2000) and Haykin (2005) actually gave a very general definition of the cognitive paradigm
- They spoke about the essence of cognition, including
 - Intelligent observation, learning, decision-making, emergent and collaborative behaviors
- It is clear that what has happened in this field since then has only scratched the surface
 - Cognitive networking in a broad sense remains an exciting and largely unexplored research field



Evolution of the cognitive paradigm

- Cognitive radios: frequency-agile devices for opportunistic access
- Cognitive radio networks: networks of CRs
- Cognitive networks: the cognitive approach applied to networking layers and end-to-end
 - Learning, decision-making, information sharing
- Cognition-based networks: drawing from the most recent results in cognitive science
 - Advanced unsupervised learning, emergent behaviors, evolutionary computation, model building, collective intelligence, combined with reconfigurable, software-defined communication techniques
 - Including out-stack information (related to the environment & the user)



SIGNET - University of Padova



 Sense: nowadays devices are crammed with transducers / sensing apparatuses
 needs efficient data handling

- Learn: optimization algorithms can be run at each node individually
 - needs (i) efficient algos (ii) harmonization
- Act: network modifies the environment
 requires convergence of multiple devices

Supervised vs unsupervised learning

- Supervised learning requires a training set and/or explicit feedback about outcomes
 - Suitable when this is available, and when the goal is welldefined and known a priori
 - However, it has been shown to fail in some cases

Unsupervised has no prior knowledge

- No pre-existing model, more general
- Reveals features that are not predefined, leading to the development of a data-driven worldview
- Can be used in distributed optimization



Unsupervised learning

- The way we learn without prior information
- Cognitive stimuli are processed
 - We build a view of the world based on data
 - Generative model: probabilistic view of the world
 - Background for all our cognitive activities
- Has the potential to give an agent the ability to face and react to situations never seen before
- Can use the huge amount of data available
- The worldview provided will be an extremely valuable starting point for goal-specific learning



Learning in networks

So far, we have discussed learning in nodes

- When dealing with populations of agents, we can refer to more complex phenomena, e.g.:
 - Evolutionary approaches mimic natural evolution
 - Emergent behaviors in agent based systems
 - Intelligent behaviors may emerge from simple entities (swarm intelligence)

Network optimization as emergent property
 Nature has solved the scalability problem



Cognition-based Network

Each node of the network:

exploits local information to achieve its goal
 shares (part of) it with its neighbors

Self-adaptation to the environment to achieve network wide goals

Cognition applied to the entire network (not just at the PHY and MAC layers)

Both vertically and horizontally



Restricted Boltzmann Machine

(RBM)

- Stochastic neural network with input layer symmetrically connected with a hidden layer of feature-detectors
 (probabilistic graphical model: undirected graph)
- Unsupervised learning of an internal model of the data (features or latent causes).
- Objective function: minimize contrastive divergence (Kullback-Liebler) between input data and (top-down) reconstruction of the data





Hierarchical processing

A key feature of cortical computation





Deep learning



Higher-level (abstract) representation

Increasingly complex, non-linear distributed representations

Input (sensory) data

Large scale simulation Deep network 9 layers (1 billion connections) 10 million (200x200) unlabeled images

(Le et al., 2012)

Bottom-up:

- Higher layer neurons "activate" when input presents some specific features
- Higher layer provides an abstract representation of input features
- **Top-down**:
 - Activating hidden layer neurons according to their weight and propagating back toward inputs we can generate signals with
 similar features of training signal



Advantages of deep learning

- Classification objective: divide inputs according to certain criteria
- Standard approach: supervised training of classifier
 - e.g., linear classifier, or neural network
 - representative set of input signals with associated classes
 - Apply classifier to new signals and look at outputs
- Classification is (often) better if classifier is trained by using higher-layer deep network neurons as inputs in place of original signal



Examples of application

Content-based video management

Learn video features and apply this knowledge to some useful networking task

Context-dependent handover in HetNets

Learn environmental features and make contextbased handover decisions accordingly

Prediction of Mobile Devices Discharging Time

Learn the usage pattern and predict the battery charge duration of a smartphone







Deep Learning for Video Streaming Characterization



Type of devices

Smartphone & TV counts for about half of connected devices but generate most of the traffic!





Connected TV sets



By 2023, 66 percent of connected flat-panel TV sets will be 4K

Source: Cisco Annual Internet Report (2018–2023) White Paper



Bandwidth vs latency





Challenges

Mobile video streaming is very demanding:

High bitrates

Compressed HD videos still requires 2-10 Mbit/s

Low delay

Less than 10 ms for interactive videos, less than 250 ms for real-time streaming

Stable links

- Link fluctuations are counteracted by a (small) playout buffer → if the buffer empties then the play freezes!
- Content-dependent requirements
 - Quality-rate characteristic depends on the video content



DASH - Dynamic Adaptive Streaming



- HTTP Standard Server
- Client-side Adaptation Engine
 - The client chooses the proper segments
 - Maximize Quality of Experience (QoE) e.g. avoid rebuffering...













- We consider a test set of 38 video clips, all encoded in an H.264-AVC format
- All the videos are encoded with a 16-frame structure (1 I-frame, 15 P-frames) and compressed with 18 different quantization strategies
 - □ Transmit rate [bit/s] of video v at compression level c: r_v(c)
 - **Bate Scaling Factor (RSF):** $\rho_v(c) = \log(r_v(c)/r_v(1))$



 Depending on the content, the perceived quality of a given compression level changes
 There are several metrics to measure quality of a video signal
 Here video quality is expressed in terms of

Here, video quality is expressed in terms of Structural Similarity (SSIM)



SSIM measures the closeness of square sets of pixels, and is computed as

$$SSIM(X,Y) = \frac{(2\mu_X\mu_Y + c_1)(2\sigma_{XY} + c_2)}{(\mu_X^2 + \mu_Y^2 + c_1)(\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2 + c_2)}$$
(1)

with μ and σ^2 denoting the mean and variance of the luminance value in the corresponding window, and c_1 and c_2 being variables to stabilize the division with weak denominator

- Measures image degradation in terms of perceived structural information change
- Represents quality as seen by the human eye

SSIM versus RSF





SIGNET - University of Padova





All the videos exhibit similar trends monotonic descent a steep "fall" after a threshold

However, there are quantitative differences
 different perceived end quality
 different resource requirements

These characteristics are roughly consistent within the same (homogeneous) video



We introduce a polynomial approximation to express SSIM behavior

This provides a compact representation for use in VAC and RM

$$F_v^{(n)}(\rho) \simeq 1 + a_{v,1}\rho + a_{v,2}\rho^2 + a_{v,3}\rho^3 + \ldots + a_{v,n}\rho^n$$

A 4-degree polynomial provides a quite accurate approximation of the SSIM vs RSF curve



- Knowledge of these characteristics of the video may be useful for
 - (i) QoE-aware admission/congestion control
 - (ii) determining popular content
 - (iii) inferring user behavioral characteristics



Proposed approach



SIGNET - University of Padova



Proposed approach

□ Input to the RBM: **frame size only**

- This is done for a whole GoP (isolated)
- The RBM "learns" by creating certain patterns in the hidden layer
- This enables a sparser representation of the input in the hidden layer

After that, we apply a linear classifier for recognition / classification / SSIM estimation

Note: we must train a different linear classifier for each case, while the RBM is trained just once for all



Dataset is split: Training Set - Test Set Input of the RBM (visible layer): 32 units for each of the 16 frames, size of the uncompressed version and of the version compressed at intermediate rate 9 Hidden layer set (empirically) to 70 units The result is compared to just using the raw data as the input of the classifier



SSIM-based Video Classification



SIGNET - University of Padova


Preliminary results





Learning via RBM: accuracy

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) between exact SSIM and polynomial approximation with estimated coefficients



Exact vs. estimated SSIM curves for two random videos



CognitiveVideo Admission Control & Resource Management

- Videos multiplexed into a shared link of capacity R
- Resource Manager (RM): detects changes and triggers optimization to adapt video rates to maximize QoE utility function

Video Admission Controller (VAC): determines whether a new video request can be accepted without decreasing QoE of any video below a threshold F*





- At each new video flow request, VAC invokes RM to get the "best" resource allocation according to a specified policy
- RM returns the resource that can be assigned to each video
- VAC computes the SSIM of each video with the best compression level, compatible with the allotted resources
 - If estimated SSIM of all active videos is above the quality threshold the video request is accepted



Cognitive RM

The optimization problem addressed by RM is as follows





Cognitive RM algorithms

Possible utility functions

Rate fairness (RF)
$$U(\Gamma, R, \{F_v\}) = \left[\sum_{v} \left|\log \frac{\gamma_v R}{r_v(1)}\right|\right]^{-1}$$

SSIM fairness (SF) $U(\Gamma, R, \{F_v\}) = \min_v F_v(\log(\gamma_v R / r_v(1)))$

Resource share to be allotted:

where

RF:
$$\gamma_v = \frac{r_v(1)}{\sum_j r_j(1)}$$

SF:
$$\gamma_v = r_v(1) 10^{F_v^{-1}(\phi)}$$

$$\phi = \arg\max_{\phi} \left\{ \sum_{v} r_v(1) 10^{F_v^{-1}(\phi)} \le R \right\}$$

SIGNET - University of Padova



Simulation setup

Poisson video requests (0.66 req./s)
average offered load of 11 videos
Aggregate max rate of G = 161 Mbit/s
F* = 0.95 SSIM value to reach MOS 4

SSIM	MOS	Quality	Impairment
≥ 0.99	5	Excellent	Imperceptible
[0.95, 0.99)	4	Good	Perceptible but not annoying
[0.88, 0.95)	3	Fair	Slightly annoying
[0.5, 0.88)	2	Poor	Annoying
< 0.5	1	Bad	Very annoying



- ← SF RBM-2 - ← SF RBM-3 - ★ - SF RBM-4

10⁰

--RF

SIGNET - University of Padova

Link rate over aggregate full-quality video rate

10⁻¹

R/G

10-2



Effect of SSIM approximation





Quality outage probability

- Because of SSIM approximation errors, videos may occasionally be accepted even if quality threshold is not met
- Tradeoff on SSIM polynomial approximation: the fewer the coefficients, the coarser the approximation, but the better the RBM coefficient estimate
- Question: is it better to have a well-estimated low degree or a coarsely estimated highdegree polynomial?



Quality outage probability



n=2 is too small, n=3 or 4 give very similar results: n=3 is the best choice in this case



QoE-aware proxy vs legacy video clients



SSIM





Deep Reinforcement Learning for DASH Video Streaming



Video streaming problem

- □ A user is watching a movie through her smartphone
- Connection quality may change over time due to mobility and network congestions
- Video quality can also change over time to adapt to connection variations
 - Video quality reduces when video buffer is almost empty to speed up downloading of the next segment
 - If buffer empties, video playout freezes while next few segments are downloaded from the server
- Quality of Experience is heavily affected by freezing events, low quality, or continuous quality variatons



Problem setting

- The problem is hence to determine the quality of the next video segment to download from the server in order to maximize the QoE
- Suppose video is split in segments of 1 second each
- Each segment can be downloaded with different quality levels
 - The higher the quality, the larger the segment size
- Every second, the video client chooses the quality of the next segment to download



Defining the problem as MDP

- Can you set the problem as a MDP?
- □ State?
- Action space?
- □ Reward?



DASH-DQN

State

$$r(q_t, q_{t-1}, f_t) = q_t - \beta ||q_t - q_{t-1}|| - \lambda f_t$$

Actions (q): choose among 8 segment qualities levels



Deep Q-Network (DQN)





Neural Network Training

Loss function for segment t

long-term reward estimate through Bellman equation

$$L_t = \left(r_t + \lambda \max_{q} \hat{Q}(s_{t+1}, q | \overline{\boldsymbol{w}}_t) - Q(s_t, q_t | \boldsymbol{w}_t) \right)^2$$

- r_t : reward accrued for segment t
- Two neural networks are used [Mnih15]
 - First neural network
 - updated for each new segment (every t)
 - weight vector $oldsymbol{w}_t$
 - Second "target network"
 - Updated every K segments (learning steps)
 - Setting $\overline{\boldsymbol{w}}_t = \boldsymbol{w}_t$ if $(t \mod K) = 0$

[Mnih15] V. Mnih et al., Human Level Control through Deep Reinforcement Learning, Vol. 518, No. 7540, Nature, 2015.



Update iteration



SIGNET - University of Padova

Simulation



- Video model: 5 complexities, exponential scene duration
- Capacity model for the wireless channel
 - Markov 500 pre-training videos
 - Real 40 training videos + 100 test videos
 - NS3 40 training videos + 100 test videos
- Comparison
 - Rate-based
 - FESTIVE
 - Q-Learning



Exploration/training/test





Convergence time





Buffer



D-Dash fully exploits the buffer to survive connection fluctuations while keeping constant video quality

Legacy DASH clients try to keep buffer level constant, adapting video quality (worse QoE)



Comparison along three axes







Optimizing resource allocation for video transmission is challenging

- many numerical parameters involved
- subjective QoE issues
- high signaling exchange

Learning-based approaches are useful to
obtain a compact representation
extrapolate the most significant data

Provide a framework with no need for prior models



Publications

- M. De Filippo De Grazia, D. Zucchetto, A. Testolin, A. Zanella, and Ma. Zorzi, and M. Zorzi, "QoE Multi-Stage Machine Learning for Dynamic Video Streaming," IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking (TCCN) vol. 4, n. 1, pp. 146 - 161, March 2018.
- M. Gadaleta, F. Chiariotti, M. Rossi, and A. Zanella, "D-DASH: a Deep Q-learning Framework for DASH Video Streaming," IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking in IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 703-718, Dec. 2017. DOI: 10.1109/TCCN.2017.2755007
- Daniele Munaretto, Andrea Zanella, Daniel Zucchetto, Michele Zorzi, "Data-driven QoE optimization techniques for multi-user wireless networks" in the Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications, February 16-19, 2015, Anaheim, California, USA
- Alberto Testolin, Marco Zanforlin, Michele De Filippo De Grazia, Daniele Munaretto, Andrea Zanella, Marco Zorzi, Michele Zorzi, "A Machine Learning Approach to QoE-based Video Admission Control and Resource Allocation in Wireless Systems" in the Proceedings of IEEE IFIP Annual Mediterranean Ad Hoc Networking Workshop, Med-Hoc-Net 2014, June 2-4, 2014, Piran, Slovenia.
- Leonardo Badia, Daniele Munaretto, Alberto Testolin, Andrea Zanella, Marco Zorzi, Michele Zorzi, "Cognition-based networks: applying cognitive science to multimedia wireless networking" in the Proceedings of Video Everywhere (VidEv) Workshop of IEEE WoWMoM'14, 16 June, 2014, Sydney, Australia.
- Marco Zanforlin, Daniele Munaretto, Andrea Zanella, Michele Zorzi, "SSIM-based video admission control and resource allocation algorithms" in the Proceedings of WiOpt workshop WiVid'14, May 12-16, 2014, Hammamet, Tunisia.





DISTRIBUTED DEEP REINFORCEMENT LEARNING FOR DRONE SWARM CONTROL

Credits to Federico Venturini, Federico Mason, Federico Chiariotti, Alberto Testolin



DRONE SWARM



- Drone swarm can be used for:
 - Rescue operations
 - Environmental monitoring
 - Delivery services
 - Defence
 - Aerial filming
 - Maintenance



REINFORCEMENT LEARNING



The environment is a map with some targets (the white pixels).







Each drone

pixel) is an

(yellow

agent



The environment is a map with some targets (the white pixels).



Action



Each drone

pixel) is an

(yellow

agent

Agent state reward action S_t R_t A_t R_{t+1} Environment S_{t+1} 5 10 15 0 0 5 -10 15 -

Each agent can choose one of the following 5 actions: • Stand

- StandLeft
- Right
- Up
- Down

The environment is a map with some targets (the white pixels).



State and rewards









Real map: 4 targets (white pixels)







The values of the pixels are between 0 (black pixels) and 1 (white pixels)






Some drones in the map







That don't know the real map but share a known map







They have a Field of View (FOV) of 3x3 pixels







And when they move they discover the real values of the pixels inside the FOV















State definition



State

The input of the model (the state) is the combination of these 2 matrices: the one containing the position of the drones and the *known* map.





0 -0 -5 -10 -15 · 15 -

State

Our goal is to discover the map, that is unknown at the beginnning of each episode.



Actual state representation

State



In detail, the state is composed by 3 matrices, 2 for the positions of the drones and one for the *known* map. This is due to the fact that the algorithm is distributed and applied to each drone. Therefore, each of them must be able to distinguish between its own position, and the position of other drones.



Actual state representation



So, the first matrix contains my own position.



Actual state representation



The second one contains the positions of the other drones. In the case of more than 2 drones, this second matrix will contain more than 1 yellow pixels.



NEURAL NETWORK'S I/O

The state (the 3 matrices of the previous slide) is the input of a neural network, the agent, that has to learn which is the best action to the take, given own position of the drone, the of position the other drones, and the map discovered at the actual time step. In output there are as many outputs as the number of possible actions. These outputs represent the Q-values. the long-term reward associated to each possible action, given that state in input.





At each time step, 1 drone takes an action (the drones move aynchronously) and receives a reward based on that action

Rewards:







At each time step, 1 drone takes an action (the drones move aynchronously) and receives a reward based on that action









At each time step, 1 drone takes an action (the drones move aynchronously) and receives a reward based on that action

Rewards:





When we have a collision between the drones: they are in the same position



At each time step, 1 drone takes an action (the drones move aynchronously) and receives a reward based on that action







When the drone reaches one of the targets (white pixels)

When we have a collision between the drones: they are in the same position



At each time step, 1 drone takes an action (the drones move aynchronously) and receives a reward based on that action

Rewards:





In all the other cases

When the drone reaches one of the targets (white pixels)

When we have a collision between the drones: they are in the same position










































































































Training

Mean reward per episodes per step



We trained the algorithm 5 times. These are the performances during learning of the 5 trainings.



Greedy rewards



Every 100 episodes of training, we tested the learned strategy on 100 further episodes, and we plotted the distribution of the rewards accumulated during the testing phase

You can see that the drones learn quite soon to remain inside the map. The real challenge is to make both of them able to reach the targets.



Training (cont)

Correct episodes



Our algorithm is able to place both the drones on top of 2 targets in at least the 60% of the simulated episodes

Results





We also compared our algorithm (DQN) with some look-ahead heuristic, named L2,L3, and L4, where the number indicates the look-ahed capability, i.e., the number of step forward that the policy can anticipate to evaluate the next action.

DQN requires less steps to reach the targets, showing better coordination among the drones.



Work in progress

- Transfer Learning to generalize to an arbitrary number of drones
- Dynamic map
- Application of Reinforcement Learning to the routing scenarios
- Hierarchial Reinforcement Learning to coordinate drones with different tasks (exploration, exploitation...)