

Received June 26, 2018, accepted August 9, 2018, date of publication August 17, 2018, date of current version November 30, 2018.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2865967

# Quality of Experience Framework for Cloud Computing (QoC)

ASIF ALI LAGHARI<sup>1</sup>, HUI HE<sup>1</sup>, ASIYA KHAN<sup>2</sup>, (Member, IEEE),  
NEETESH KUMAR<sup>3</sup>, AND RUPAK KHAREL<sup>4</sup>, (Member, IEEE)

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science & Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Engineering, University of Plymouth, Plymouth PL4 8AA, U.K.

<sup>3</sup>Indian Institute of Information Technology and Management, Gwalior 474015, India

<sup>4</sup>School of Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M15 6BH, U.K.

Corresponding author: Hui He (hehui@hit.edu.cn)

This work was supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant 2017YFB0801801 and in part by the National Science Foundation of China under Grant 61472108 and Grant 61672186.

**ABSTRACT** Cloud computing provides platform for pay-per-use services, such as software, hardware, and platforms. Previous cloud frameworks use fix policies that do not have the functionality to upgrade services on demand when the user does not receive services according to Service Level Agreement (SLA). In addition, there was a lack of functionality to monitor external network and client device resources. This paper presents Quality of experience framework for Cloud computing (QoC) for monitoring the Quality of Experience (QoE) of the end user using video streaming services in the cloud computing environment. The management platform is used for administration purpose in QoC framework that provides facility to easily manage the cloud environment and provide services according to SLA via runtime policy change. The objective QoE/Quality of Service (QoS) section will automatically monitor the QoS data. It will also compare and analyze the subjective QoE submitted by the users and objective QoS data collected by agent-based framework for accurate QoE prediction and proper management. The proposed QoC framework has new features of real-time network monitoring and client device monitoring and allows changing policy in runtime environment, which to the best of our knowledge is currently not provided by existing frameworks.

**INDEX TERMS** Cloud computing, service level agreement (SLA), quality of experience (QoE), quality of service (QoS), QoC.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Multimedia usage on the Internet has increased dramatically over the last few years to access resources such as video tutorials, video-on-demand (VOD), video conferences, audio/video streaming, etc. Users can access free video services such as IPTV, online videos, video conferences etc. from the cloud servers including commercial services on a pay per use basis. In a client server architecture, the users can access these videos from video servers that have options of streaming with multiple bit rates e.g. YouTube. The user will simply make the selection or the service provider automatically defaults to a particular bit rate according to the network bandwidth and device compatibility [1], [2]. These are free of cost services, no service level agreement (SLA) between user and service provider exists for Quality of Service (QoS) provision and thus compensation on low services is irrelevant. Hence, less storage is normally provided to users

for uploading their personal contents. Free service providers such as Facebook has its own settings for videos and thus when users upload video, it is automatically converted to service provider's predefined format, normally with reduced quality [3]. The free cloud service providers do not provide the QoS for video streaming but user can freely access their multimedia contents and also share publicly. Commercial cloud service provider allows video storage space on pay per use basis with better QoS for video streaming. The user can access video services (for stream, download and upload) using variety of user interfaces including mobile apps [4], [5]. Earning more revenues from the market is basic competition between the cloud service providers, so all providers try to offer better QoS to their customers to deliver better user satisfaction thus retaining the customer.

Poor QoS of video streaming and violation of SLA in commercial cloud infrastructure force users to move to other




FIGURE 1. Cloud QoE/QoS monitoring scenario [11].

service provider that guarantee better QoS. However, migration of user from one provider to another is a loss of economy for the business as well as annoyance for user who have to move all the stored data from the previous cloud to a new cloud [6]. To avoid user migration problems, cloud organizations provide user feedback or user support page on their website to receive data about the user experience regarding their services or complaints about monitoring QoS and avoid violation of SLA. But organizations struggle to capture positive user experience for management of cloud services [7]. To capture positive and accurate QoE is cumbersome for cloud organizations because of the greedy behavior of the user and less knowledge of user’s QoE is a problem for cloud management [8]. There are so many autonomous tools developed by cloud organizations for QoS data monitoring in cloud environment limited to their firewall and are given in Figure 1 [9]–[11]. A few cloud service providers also add subjective Quality of Experience (QoE)/customer feedback/complaint pages on their websites and apps for customer feedback to

improve the overall QoS and increase user experience level. Therefore, middleware network and QoS monitoring at user side are still not included in monitoring frameworks for cloud management.

QoC framework provides the solution of the above discussed problems. The proposed QoC framework based on the agent technology, automatically collects objective QoE/QoS from cloud to client device and user also have an option to subjective QoE to cloud management. The QoE data submitted by end users and objective QoE/QoS data collected by the system will be analyzed for service delivery according to SLA. The main contribution of this paper is to propose a QoE framework for Cloud computing (QoC) that is able to:

- Collect data (status) of the internal cloud environment, client’s device and middle network environment from cloud to end user’s device automatically.
- Submit complains and feedback about services and mobile app to access cloud services from remote locations.

- Upgrade policy for the time being if the user does not get QoS according to SLA and extend package limitation for users to complete current task.
- Distinguish the negative and positive QoE by comparison of current service delivery parameters when the user submits feedback which to our knowledge is currently not provided by existing cloud QoE frameworks.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we provide related work based on the overview of the cloud infrastructure and existing QoE based frameworks. Section III depicts the architecture of the proposed framework, which contains QoE model of QoC framework and functionality. Section IV presents sequence diagram of the QoC framework and Section V provides details of the web and mobile app of QoC framework. Section VI illustrates results and discussions. Finally, in Section VII, we conclude the work and provide future research directions.

## II. RELATED WORKS

This section presents the related work and is further divided into two parts. It provides an over-view of the cloud infrastructure and summarizes the existing QoE-based cloud frameworks.

### A. OVERVIEW OF THE CLOUD INFRASTRUCTURE

Cloud computing is an evolution of grid computing [12]. Grid computing is a collection of shared hardware resources such as computers, network routers managed via software from multiple locations for one common goal [13]. In grid computing, all resources are used for one specific large task or workloads like weather forecast and earth simulation for earthquake alerts. Whereas, cloud computing provides high computational power with more features such as permanent storage and hardware resources or infrastructure as a service (IaaS), application software as a service (SaaS) and platforms or operating systems for application development as a service (PaaS) [14], [15]. According to the NIST Cloud Computing Definition, "Cloud computing is a model for enabling convenient, on-demand network access to a shared pool of configurable computing resources (such as, networks, servers, storage, applications, and services) that can be rapidly provisioned and released with minimal management effort or service provider interaction" [16], [17]. Cloud computing is based on the three service models - SaaS, PaaS and IaaS. SaaS is a business and consumer type of service, which is used by end users e.g. for email, the application software of database and accounting but users do not necessarily need the technical information to manage the cloud [18], [19]. PaaS provides development tools for developers, which are technically managed and configured by the end user developers according to their requirement. IaaS is fully dependent on access to cloud infrastructure and devices like servers, network and storage devices so in IaaS developer has full access to manage and change cloud infrastructure [20].

Cloud management monitor technical parameters to provide QoS to the user but customer satisfaction and accurate

QoE still remains a big issue for cloud management. It is hard to capture user needs and manage the services according to their needs. There is no framework provided by industry or academia for cloud management, which provides complete solution to capture and distinguish between positive and negative QoE.

### B. EXISTING QoE BASED FRAMEWORKS

QoE/QoS frameworks are designed and developed for cloud computing to analyze the user needs and their satisfaction level about cloud services. One such framework is proposed in [21], where the framework is based on the agent technology. The proposed framework works on two conditions, cloud-assisted adaptive video streaming and social-aware video prefetching. A private agent constructed in cloud center for each mobile user will analyze the network traffic and on the basis of network capacity, will adjust video quality (bitrate) by the scalable video coding technique.

CLAMS (Cross-Layer Multi-Cloud Application Monitoring as a Service Framework) is QoS monitoring based on the agent technology, which monitors applications and big data analytics in multi cloud environment and addresses the issue of cross layer monitoring of applications [22]. Follow Me Cloud: FMC Interworking Federated Clouds and Distributed Mobile Networks cloud framework presented by Taleb and Ksentini [23], this framework is based on the subjective evaluation of user for network delay when their services are migrated from one cloud data center to another. The idea of this framework is that services migrate to near location datacenter will enhance the QoE of the user and this will generate a high cost for cloud service providers.

Another QoE framework Cloud2Bubble is proposed by Costa *et al.* [24]. This framework monitors the environment based on the user profile, addresses disconnect and service delivery status enabling the delivery of personalized services for users based on their preferences and needs. This framework proposed to provide QoS for every single user profile according to needs when multiple users use same devices in different times. QoE test is not conducted to validate the proposed framework.

Mobile Cloud Gaming (CMG) framework was proposed for multi user gaming environment for the mobile user via cloud server instead of client server architecture [25]. The purpose of the framework is providing an idea to shift mobile user load to cloud server due to the inherent hardware constraint of mobile devices (memory and graphics processing). The framework is based on the objective and subjective QoE measures. The objective factors analyzed which influence on QoE measure are four factors: cloud server, source video, wireless network and client. The author set network based model for subjective QoE validation of framework and also propose Game Mean Opinion Score (GMOS) for measurement of end user's QoE.

The proposed QoC framework is based on agent technology, the agent monitors environment from cloud to end users and technical data for performance analysis. Previous QoE

**TABLE 1. Comparison of QoE framework of cloud computing.**

QoE/QoS Cloud Frameworks	Wang [21]	CLAMS [22]	FMC [23]	Cloud2Bubble [24]	CMG [25]	QoC
Parameters	NQoS	AQoS	NQoS	NQoS & AQoS	NQoS & PSNR/VQ	NQoS & AQoS
Monitoring Support	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Analysis Support	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative	Quantitative & Qualitative
Reporting	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Policy Change	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Client Monitoring	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Remarks	Objective (QoS) Evaluation	Objective QoS Evaluation	Subjective Evaluation	Subjective Evaluation	Objective & Subjective Evaluation	Objective QoE/QoS & Subjective Evaluation

based cloud framework has limited scope of monitoring and analysis at cloud side but QoC framework monitor cloud as well as network environment and client side. No existing framework upgrades the policy in the runtime environment to provide QoS according to the SLA and is unable to differentiate between the positive and negative QoE of end users. Comparison of previous QoE frameworks with QoC framework is given in Table 1.

### III. ARCHITECTURE OF THE PROPOSED QoC FRAMEWORK

This section presents the architecture of the proposed QoC framework and is further divided into two parts to describe the QoE model used in the QoC framework and the proposed QoC framework.

#### A. QUALITY OF EXPERIENCE (QoE)

Nowadays QoE is a major notion for organizations for developing products and providing services to end users. The QoE is a measurement of user factors like feelings enjoyment, perception, satisfaction and cognition for given service or product [26]. QoS was used in past for improvement in services and technical parameters were changed by vendors, but SLA violation and user satisfaction remains big problem [27]. SLA is a document which is signed by the user and vendor for QoS, but user needs evolve by time and vendor has fix policies for long period, so this is the main reason for merging QoE for service delivery and product development [28]. Using QoE notion vendor/service providers capture information of user needs in a timely manner for their performance of services and avoiding violation of SLA. There are two types of QoE, (i) subjective and (ii) Objective. Subjective QoE can be captured by using interviews, questionnaire, scales and web-based surveys [28]. Objective QoE is further divided into two parts, one is human physiological data which can be captured by MRI and EEG tests and other is technical parameter QoS data [29], [30]. Subjective QoE is costly and it is very difficult to distinguish positive and negative feedback

of users, but objective QoE provides almost accurate results without negative feedback. Vendors mostly use subjective QoE for services or products because it is easy to capture as compared to objective QoE, but few vendors also use objective QoE for more accurate data [31], [32]. The QoE model contains components associated with management and users. Generally, management side has the database, which contains information of user and SLA. When the user starts using services, they have an option to submit experience or complains via web page commonly given from all service providers. The user experience is based on the user's level of satisfaction, learning ability, enjoyment and engagement [33]–[35], this feedback given for the service quality which end user received at the destination. When users submit the feedback, it is directly stored in the database and management analyze the feedback/complains. If any changes is required at their side, they manage within the limitation of SLA [28]. QoE model with detailed components are given in Figure 2.

In Figure 2, QoE model is based on the management side, client side and the network are in the middle of service delivery from cloud to client. Management section is based on the QoE database (DB). DB is further subdivided into user profile information, QoE data, SLA for particular user, record of evaluation and changes (log reports) and analysis section of subjective and objective QoE/QoS. User side components are QoE/complaint which is based on the user's level of satisfaction, enjoyment, learning and engagement.

Previously QoE has been used for network management in client server architectures to provide QoS to end users according to their needs [32], now academia and industry merge QoE features in cloud environment for better management and provide QoS to end users according to their needs. The proposed QoC framework automatically captures objective QoE in runtime environment from cloud management to end user and also provides a facility for the user to submit subjective QoE/complains feedback via a web form. Objective QoE monitoring tool based on the agent technology which




FIGURE 2. Proposed QoE model.




FIGURE 3. Architecture of the proposed QoC framework.

collects QoS data from cloud environment to destination user and finds problems.

**B. THE PROPOSED QoC FRAMEWORK**

The proposed QoC framework is a semi-automatic management based on agent technology. In QoC framework, cloud side components are cloud manager, QoE manager, user profile & SLA, user storage, agent framework for monitoring objective, QoE/QoS and MySQL database for storing the subjective and objective QoE of end user shown in Figure 3. Further, the QoC framework architecture contains cloud web interface and mobile app for user to access cloud features. We develop web-based tool “QoE test cloud” for testing subjective QoE validation of QoC framework for multimedia services. QoE test cloud web-based tool provides the facility of storage video on the cloud, share and download features

to users. The QoE test cloud is based on different sections, every section facilitates users to manage their videos on the cloud. This tool provides facility to user to create an account for storage and makes his profile for QoE submission in the context of complaints, needs and decline of services (QoS) mentioned in signed SLA. If a user enters negative feedback or wrong information to get more QoS mentioned in SLA from the cloud, submitted subjective QoE of the user will be analyzed and compared with monitored objective QoE/QoS then QoC framework will not take any action on user’s feedback. QoC framework compares both subjective and objective QoE for accurate analysis that QoS is provided according to SLA or not. If QoS is not according to SLA then alert to user about the problem at user side is sent, if problem is on the cloud side, i.e. network speed, network error, traffic burden on cloud internal network, or storage problem,





FIGURE 4. Sequence diagram of proposed QoC framework.


VM migration issue then it will be solved and provide QoS according to SLA.

If the user did not get QoS according to SLA and the subjective QoE is positive then the objective system will search for the problem. If the problem is found within cloud environment then it sends alert to cloud administrator, but if problem is found outside from the cloud environment then QoC framework will search exact issue for the disturbance in providing QoS to end user. For example, QoC framework found a problem at user’s device and user facing the problem getting QoS because of low hardware configuration of the device or due to peak network traffic then QoC framework will send alert to the user about the problem. Sometimes end user will not get QoS from service providers due to the lack of free computational resources in their own devices. In this situation, QoC framework will send alert to the user to make

their device free for use of cloud services. This is a major issue for cloud administration because nontechnical users are not always aware of resources on their side and may not understand the reason of QoS degradation and may claim for SLA violation to cloud management. The purpose of merging both subjective and objective QoE/QoS in QoC framework is that if a nontechnical user will not know about the submission of complaint using feedback form then objective QoE/QoS monitoring tool will automatically detect the services and compare to the signed SLA. If the user had not receive services according to SLA, the system will diagnose the problem and react on it. User perception could not give a precise evaluation of the problem and unable to detect accurate problem and level of performance. Users also provide negative feedback for getting more QoS because of greed, so objective QoE/QoS technical data will provide accurate information




(a)




(b)

FIGURE 5. (a) Account registration. (b) Edit video information.



(a)



(b)


FIGURE 6. (a) Page of user. (b) Playing of video and sharing options of social media.

about the performance. Subjective feedback helps administrator to understand user’s perception, complaints, future needs and objective QoE/QoS data will help to get final accurate user feedback for decision.


#### IV. SEQUENCE DIAGRAM OF PROPOSED QoC FRAMEWORK

The sequence diagram in Figure 4 explains how our proposed QoC framework operates, how agent code collects data at the end user’s device and internal cloud and the evaluation of subjective and objective QoE/QoS. The sequence diagram is based on the client and admin section. Admin section is further subdivided in 4 parts which contains QoE manager, user videos, management platform and QoE database. The operations of sequence diagram are presented in two actions.

- The user invokes services to access the cloud, the request goes to QoE manager for account verification and policy activation and the user starts video streaming from his account. Cloud transfers video streaming data to end users and after perception user will submit QoE, which will be stored in QoE database (DB). QoE manager will automatically collect objective QoS data from cloud to end user’s device, which contains network information (e.g. delay, packet loss, reordering and number of routers between cloud and user), user device information (e.g., buffer information, device hardware information, battery status information and location) which is shown as 6 activity in diagram. This information will be compared by management platform with subjective QoE submitted by the user for analysis of services according



(a)



(b)

FIGURE 7. (a) Feedback form. (b) User QoE submission list.

to SLA and stored in QoE DB for future use. Objective QoE again is collected by agents and resent to management section for analysis, if services are low from the mentioned value in SLA then management platform

- updates policy and the user will receive services with the upgraded policy.
- Cloud admin will send request to QoE manager to check user reports and profile and QoE manager will forward






FIGURE 8. Buffer reading result via Wi-Fi network.




FIGURE 9. 100% buffer filled (local system).

the request to management platform to generate a report from QoE DB. Admin can select a particular user from management section and view the report. The problem

report will also be forwarded to the end user for the device performance degradation for receiving services according to SLA.



FIGURE 10. (a) Monitoring local cloud environment. (b) Monitoring network environment.

**V. MOBILE USER QoE MEASUREMENTS BASED ON QoC**  
**A. CLOUD VIDEO SERVICE WEBSITE**

Client side contains web interface for registration, for example a user Mike registers himself on the cloud using the web interface registration module as shown in Figure 5a. He must select a package for P1, or P2 etc., which contains storage data limit of 1GB and 2GB respectively on pay per use basis. Details of user like email, name and phone number will be stored in cloud database with his package. The user will log in using his ID and upload videos on the cloud storage using standard web interface.

The QoC framework supports all type of videos that contains different formats and codecs with high data volume. Other clouds support only few popular video codecs and during the upload file is compressed, decreasing the quality of the video from original quality [36]. After uploading videos on the cloud, the user has option to select a particular video to edit information, delete, move to other folder and share

publicly on a different social media networks like Facebook, Twitter or Baidu. This QoC framework also provides facility for users to play online video. The user can manage and perform an operation on their uploaded videos as shown in Figure 5b.

The mobile app is also developed for users because most users want access to videos via mobile phones during their travel. The mobile app contains all user based functionalities for accessing, upload and download of videos. QoC framework cloud based mobile app has all the same functions which are available for the desktop system so the user can access same features via desktop or mobile phones. The snapshots of the mobile app are shown in Figures 6a and 6b respectively.

**VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**  
**A. SUBJECTIVE EXPERIMENTS**

During the online playing of videos, the user feels the quality of the video is low from original or is facing delay/buffering





FIGURE 11. (a) User list. (b) Manual/Automatic control option.

issues then s/he can submit complaint/experience to cloud management by using the feedback form, which is also given in the QoC framework. The user will enter information about the problem currently being faced and also priority of problem that they have, either major issue to solve on the emergency basis or low level issue solved on the normal routine of management. Other information includes QoS of network, user’s network connection speed, video quality information like facing buffering, low quality video and rank the quality of the video. User complaints will be submitted to the database with their profile for processing to provide QoS according to SLA. QoC framework feedback form is used to collect subjective QoE from user to analyze his problem; service delivered to user comparison with SLA and needs. Subjective QoE form of QoC framework is designed using standard web interface are shown in Figure 7a.

Management Platform is another part of QoC framework, which is used for cloud administration to manage user’s accounts, set SLAs, and solve problems. Management platform depends on three parts: feedback, QoE data and Objective QoE/QoS data. Feedback list provides details of user submitted complaints from the start of using services to

till date. The list will provide information including user ID, name, phone, email date, reply, status and option for view details of buffer and network information using standard web interface. These are the details of components which user can input during submission of QoE. The details of the components that user can input during submission of QoE is shown in Figure 7b.

Subjective QoE section of QoC framework also has a functionality to read user buffer status and information of video, total playing, current and roaming time with data size of the video, when user submits complaint/subjective QoE. The buffer checking agent runs across the firewall of a user device in the same way as agent work in Globus toolkit of grid computing for resource discovery [37]. Figure 8 shows that 1Mb buffer is not filled due to network delay when video content is playing and buffer code is tested by using Wi-Fi network. But test of buffer code on the local system in android virtual environment provides results that buffer is filled every millisecond while playing the video, see Figure 9. The agent base code is also used to extract user’s device information and its power status and battery life and shown in the web interface alongside the buffer information.




FIGURE 12. (a) Test sample 1. (b) Test sample 2. (c) Test sample 3.

**B. OBJECTIVE MEASUREMENT**

Objective QoE/QoS is a part of management platform of QoC framework administration side. Objective QoE monitoring is based on the agent technology and QoS data can be retrieved by applied functionalities, which are provided by simple network management protocol (SNMP) [16]. SNMP uses agents to retrieve QoS data of network such as route information from cloud to end user, number of packets in and out number of network interfaces. SIGAR (<https://support.hyperic.com/display/SIGAR/Home>) is used for low level system information such as total memory,

used memory, actual free memory, CPU utilization and specific information e.g memory and CPU consumed by a process [38]. In QoC framework, system management software will monitor cloud environment for free resources like computation, storage and load on the internal cloud network. Monitoring of QoS data from cloud to user contains distance from cloud to user, number of routers between them, specific delay on network traffic passing from router, network bandwidth, type of network, user device capability, OS, browser, CPU usage, memory usage, route queue delay, etc. CPU and memory usage have huge impact on the performance

of accessing cloud while router queue delay is important information for administration to understand the deficiencies in QoS according to SLA.

Objective QoE/QoS part is based on monitoring function, which is subdivided into three parts such as monitoring of local cloud environment, network environment, user device and usage information. Other components of objective QoE/QoS contain task section, which provides information about the task (current task, start time, estimated time of completion and remaining time). User section provides details of the list of registered users and particular information of users like email, phone and registration date etc. SLA section contains signed SLA between user and services provider and status of SLA with policy change or previous policy for providing QoS. Objective QoE/QoS also have a manual/automatic control system, in manual function administrator of cloud service provider will manage the operations for cloud management and in automatic cloud management software self-manage all operation of management like user complaint and reaction on the submitted complaints. Results of objective QoE/QoS functions of local cloud environment and network being monitored are given in Figures 10a and 10b. Figures 11a and 11b further show the QoE/QoS monitoring from the user's point of view.

The allocation of resources is provided to the user on the basis of task and previous usage pattern. For example, a user Alice always uses high computational power to process simulations for short time, so the system will manage to provide resources in the free rack where the load is minimum and the rack's internal network traffic is low for high volume data upload, which will be used in the completion of this current task. User Bob always requires low computational resources for a long time to complete his task, therefore system management will shift his resources from those racks which have less computational resources available for sharing. This approach in internal cloud management will provide better overall service to the end users. For example, if user starts the task of scientific simulation on the cloud and one hour estimated time for task completion is displayed to the user. After 50 minutes, 87% of the task is completed, but suddenly remaining time of the task is increased due to the increased traffic load on the network. The task of the user is still running on the cloud and the prepaid resources will finish after 5 minutes. The estimated time for task completion is still 40 minutes with 100% utilization of computation resources from cloud side. In this situation, cloud will provide additional time automatically for the task and it will be finished with flexible SLA. In this example, if strict SLA were to be applied, it will cause loss of 87% completed task together with uploaded data and these types of strict policies will force the user to migrate from the current provider.

### C. MOBILE USER PERFORMANCE EXPERIMENTS

Mobile user performance was measured on different network conditions where speed limits are applied and

here are the three test samples (1, 2, 3) are given in Figures 12a, 12b and 12c.

The first test sample is in the limit speed under the condition of the test curve and buffer is full of proportion to 0%, plays with severe video Caton. The second test sample is in normal condition under the network environment but the user frequently switches playing time point of the curve test, switch to a play between the need of re-buffer, the buffer is full of 43%, video playback is not smooth. The third test sample is normally played test results and buffer is full of proportion was 78%, smooth video playback. So through the analysis of the buffer curves can be a certain degree of response to user's playback quality of experience, and the buffer is full of proportion can direct response the user's Caton.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have designed and developed a QoC framework for cloud services based on the agent technology for measuring user QoE and found the QoS according to SLA, thus, avoiding violation of SLA. The QoC framework provides web interface facility for the user to manage their information, upload and share videos with HD quality among their friends via QoC cloud and social media. The QoC framework provides feedback form for submission of user complaint and their experience when using services. Subjective QoE part will also extract the device information of user and battery status if using cloud services via mobile phone or laptop. The framework also reads the buffer information of user device and measure the network speed and type of the network. The management platform is administrative part of QoC framework, which provides user interface facility to the administrator for management of cloud. The feedback, QoS data and reports of subjective QoE are submitted by the end user. The objective QoE/QoS part forms the management platform, which is only visible for the administrator of the cloud, collects QoS data such as monitoring the internal environment for computational and network resources. The QoC framework captures both subjective and objective QoE in runtime environment, analyze the captured QoE and change policy, if service degradation problem in internal cloud environment is found. In comparison with existing cloud frameworks, the proposed QoC framework provides functionality to monitor entire environment from cloud to end user's device, collect QoS data using agents and store in database for analysis of service according to SLA. The QoC automatically upgrades the policy of user in runtime and extend package limitation for task completion avoiding negative experience with users thus preventing migration to different platform of competitors.

In the future, we will design and develop image and file hosting facility in QoC framework and test the user experience for quality and size of images. The database file hosting and SaaS applications will also be embedded for online database operations. This is ongoing research work with academia and industry and the results of performance of objective metrics, such as video quality metric (VQM) and

peak signal to noise ratio (PSNR), in assessing the provided video quality will be presented in the future.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and T.-H. Kim, "Detecting bad information in mobile wireless networks based on the wireless application protocol," *Computing*, vol. 96, no. 9, pp. 855–874, 2014.
- [2] W. Zhang, G. Lu, H. He, Q. Zhang, and C. Yu, "Exploring large-scale small file storage for search engines," *J. Supercomput.*, vol. 72, no. 8, pp. 2911–2923, 2016.
- [3] S. Schmiedeke, P. Kelm, and T. Sikora, "DCT-based features for categorisation of social media in compressed domain," in *Proc. IEEE 15th Int. Workshop Multimedia Signal Process. (MMSP)*, Pula, Croatia, Sep. 2013, pp. 295–300.
- [4] J. He, D. Wu, Y. Zeng, X. Hei, and Y. Wen, "Toward optimal deployment of cloud-assisted video distribution services," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Video Technol.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1717–1728, Oct. 2013.
- [5] A. Ahmed et al., "Cloud computing in VANETs: Architecture, taxonomy, and challenges," *IETE Tech. Rev.*, vol. 34, pp. 1–25, Jul. 2017.
- [6] V. C. Emeakaroha, T. C. Ferreto, M. A. S. Netto, I. Brandic, and C. A. F. de Rose, "CASViD: Application level monitoring for SLA violation detection in clouds," in *Proc. IEEE 36th Annu. Comput. Softw. Appl. Conf.*, Izmir, Turkey, Jul. 2012, pp. 499–508.
- [7] N. Samet, A. Ben Letaïfa, M. Hamdi, and S. Tabbane, "Toward quality of experience models of cloud-based mobile services," in *Proc. Int. Wireless Commun. Mobile Comput. Conf. (IWCMC)*, Dubrovnik, Croatia, Aug. 2015, pp. 1510–1514.
- [8] A. A. Laghari, H. Hui, M. Shafiq, and A. Khan, "Assessment of quality of experience (QoE) of image compression in social cloud computing," *Multiaagent Grid Syst.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 125–143, 2018, doi: 10.3233/MGS-180284.
- [9] A. Ahmed, A. A. Hanan, K. Omprakash, M. Usman, and O. Syed, "Mobile cloud computing energy-aware task offloading (MCC: ETO)," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Commun. Comput. Syst. (ICCCS)*, Feb. 2017, p. 359.
- [10] K. Alhamazani et al., "Cross-layer multi-cloud real-time application QoS monitoring and benchmarking as-a-service framework," *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 3, 2015.
- [11] Accessed: Mar. 4, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://cloudessa.com/products/cloudessa-radius-service/>
- [12] S. M. Abdulhamid, M. S. A. Latiff, and M. B. Bashir. (2014). "On-demand grid provisioning using cloud infrastructures and related virtualization tools: A survey and taxonomy." [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0696>
- [13] S. M. Abdulhamid, M. S. A. Latiff, and M. B. Bashir, "Scheduling techniques in on-demand grid as a service cloud: A review," *J. Theor. Appl. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 10–19, 2014.
- [14] J. K. Verma et al., "Enabling green computing in cloud environments: Network virtualization approach toward 5G support," *Trans. Emerg. Telecommun. Technol.*, to be published.
- [15] M. Abdullahi and M. A. Ngadi, "Symbiotic Organism Search optimization based task scheduling in cloud computing environment," *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 56, pp. 640–650, Mar. 2016.
- [16] M. A. Hadi, "Overview of cloud computing towards to future networks," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Innov.*, vol. 2015, no. 2, pp. 68–78, 2015.
- [17] A. A. Laghari, H. He, M. Shafiq, and A. Khan, "Impact of storage of mobile on quality of experience (QoE) at user level accessing cloud," in *Proc. IEEE 9th Int. Conf. Commun. Softw. Netw. (ICCSN)*, May 2017, pp. 1402–1409.
- [18] S. M. Abdulhamid, M. S. A. Latiff, M. B. Bashir, and I. Idris. (2015). "Tasks scheduling technique using league championship algorithm for makespan minimization in IAAS cloud," [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03173>
- [19] Accessed: Mar. 6, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://aws.amazon.com/what-is-cloud-computing/>
- [20] S. H. H. Madni, M. S. A. Latiff, and Y. Coulibaly, "Recent advancements in resource allocation techniques for cloud computing environment: A systematic review," *Cluster Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 2489–2533, 2017.
- [21] X. Wang, T. Kwon, Y. Choi, H. Wang, and J. Liu, "Cloud-assisted adaptive video streaming and social-aware video prefetching for mobile users," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 72–79, Jun. 2013.
- [22] K. Alhamazani et al., "Real-time QoS monitoring for cloud-based big data analytics applications in mobile environments," in *Proc. IEEE 15th Int. Conf. Mobile Data Manage.*, Brisbane, QLD, Australia, Jul. 2014, pp. 337–340.
- [23] T. Taleb and A. Ksentini, "Follow me cloud: Interworking federated clouds and distributed mobile networks," *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 12–19, Sep./Oct. 2013.
- [24] P. M. Costa, J. Pitt, J. E. F. Cunha, and T. Galvão, "Cloud2Bubble: Enhancing quality of experience in mobile cloud computing settings," in *Proc. 3rd ACM Workshop Mobile Cloud Comput. Services*, New York, NY, USA, 2012, pp. 45–52.
- [25] S. Wang and S. Dey, "Cloud mobile gaming: Modeling and measuring user experience in mobile wireless networks," *ACM SIGMOBILE Mobile Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 10–21, 2012.
- [26] A. A. Laghari, I. H. Sadhaya, and M. I. Channa, "Enhanced autonomic networking management architecture (enama)," *Eng., Sci. Technol.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 9–13, Jan./Jun. 2015.
- [27] A. Laghari, H. He, M. Ibrahim, and S. Shaikh, "Automatic network policy change on the basis of quality of experience (QoE)," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, vol. 107, pp. 657–659, Jan. 2017.
- [28] A. A. Laghari, K. R. Laghari, M. I. Channa, and T. H. Falk, "QON: Quality of experience (QoE) framework for network services," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Softw. Technol. Eng. (ICSTE)*, 2012, pp. 1–5.
- [29] A. A. Laghari, H. He, S. Karim, H. A. Shah, and N. K. Karn, "Quality of experience assessment of video quality in social clouds," *Wireless Commun. Mobile Comput.*, Dec. 2017, Art. no. 8313942.
- [30] A. Laghari, H. He, S. Zardari, and M. Shafiq, "Systematic analysis of quality of experience (QoE) frameworks for multimedia services," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Netw. Secur.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 121–124, 2017.
- [31] Accessed: Mar. 6, 2018. [Online]. Available: [www.witbe.net](http://www.witbe.net)
- [32] Accessed: Mar. 7, 2018. [Online]. Available: [www.qoesystems.com](http://www.qoesystems.com)
- [33] A. A. Laghari, H. He, M. Shafiq, and A. Khan, "Assessing effect of Cloud distance on end user's quality of experience (QoE)," in *Proc. 2nd IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Commun. (ICCC)*, Oct. 2016, pp. 500–505.
- [34] L. Farhan, R. Kharel, O. Kaiwartya, M. Hammoudeh, and B. Adebisi, "Towards green computing for Internet of things: Energy oriented path and message scheduling approach," *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, vol. 38, pp. 195–204, Apr. 2018.
- [35] K. Adhikari, S. Tatinati, W. T. Ang, K. C. Veluvolu, and K. Nazarpour, "A quaternion weighted Fourier linear combiner for modeling physiological tremor," *IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng.*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 2336–2346, Nov. 2016.
- [36] C. Mascolo, "The power of mobile computing in a social era," *IEEE Internet Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 76–79, Nov./Dec. 2010.
- [37] M. J. Schop et al., "Monitoring the grid with the Globus Toolkit MDS4," *J. Phys., Conf. Ser.*, vol. 46, no. 1, p. 521, 2006.
- [38] Accessed: Mar. 8, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://support.hyperic.com/display/SIGAR/Home>



**ASIF ALI LAGHARI** received the B.S. and master's degrees in information technology from the Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology, Nawabshah, Pakistan, in 2007 and 2014, respectively. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with the Harbin Institute of Technology. From 2007 to 2008, he was a Lecturer with the Computer and Information Science Department, Digital Institute of Information Technology, Pakistan. In 2015, he joined the School of the Computer Science & Technology, Harbin Institute of Technology. He has published over 10 technical articles in scientific journals and conference proceedings. His current research interests include computer networks, cloud computing, and multimedia quality of experience management.



**HUI HE** was born in 1974. Dr. Hui He is Professor and doctoral tutor. IEEE & IEEE Computer Member, China Computer Society, ACM Association. Harbin Institute of Technology School of computer science and technology. Mainly engaged in computer network, network measurement and simulation, network active defense technology, mobile network security, cloud computing, migration learning, and so on. Presided over or participated in the national network information security project key projects.



**ASIYA KHAN** received the B.Eng. degree (Hons.) in electrical and electronic engineering from the University of Glasgow, Glasgow, U.K., in 1992, the M.Sc. degree in communication, control, and digital signal processing from Strathclyde University, Glasgow, in 1993, and the Ph.D. degree in multimedia communication from the University of Plymouth, Plymouth, U.K. She is currently a Lecturer of control systems engineering with the School of Engineering, University of Plymouth.

From 1993 to 2002, she was with British Telecommunication Plc, in a management capacity, developing various products and seeing them from inception through to launch. She has been a Research Assistant of Perceived QoS Control for New and Emerging Multimedia Services (VoIP and IPTV)–FP7 ADAMANTIUM Project at the University of Plymouth. She has published several papers in international journals and conferences. Her research interests include video quality of service over wireless networks, adaptation, perceptual modeling, and content-based analysis.



**NEETESH KUMAR** received the M.Tech. degree in computer science and technology and the Ph.D. degree from the School of Computer and System Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India, in 2012 and 2015, respectively. He was an Assistant Professor with Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India. He has been appointed as an Assistant Professor at the Department of Computer Engineering, Delhi Technological University (Delhi College of Engineering), New Delhi, India. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Indian Institute of Information Technology and Management, Gwalior, India. His research interests include HPC (parallel and distributed computing, grid computing, green computing, and GPU), evolutionary computation, cloud computing, and parallel algorithms.



**Rupak Kharel** (M'09) received the Ph.D. degree in communication systems from the Department of Computer, Engineering and Information Sciences, Northumbria University, U.K., in 2011. He is currently a Senior Lecturer with the School of Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University, U.K. His research interests focus on various use-cases and technical advancements for Internet of Things, cyber security, wireless sensor networks, 5G, and Industry 4.0.

• • •