

# Towards Framework for Choosing 360-degree Video SDK

Antti Luoto

*Pervasive Computing, Tampere University of Technology, Korkeakoulunkatu 10, FI-33101 Tampere, Finland*

**Keywords** 360-degree Video SDK Software Development Kit

**Abstract** 360-degree videos are gaining popularity among consumers. Still software developers are early adopters of technology so it is important to map their needs for 360-degree video development. The use of software development kits that help creating software on the 360-degree video software domain. We want to find out which factors developers need to take into account when choosing these software development kits. In this position paper we describe a preliminary 360-degree video SDK choosing criteria based on literature and our own experiences which we plan to evaluate with a survey.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

360-degree videos also known as spherical videos are getting more popular. Alfacc et al. 2011. Applications for 360-degree videos can be found for example from entertainment industry surveillance and robotics. One of the reasons for popularity is that head mounted displays (HMD) supporting 360-degree video and virtual reality (VR) have become easily available for consumers. HMD is a wearable display device which consists of an optical system in a helmet with displays located in front of user's eyes creating an illusion of depth. Shi et al. 2002. They are applicable for presenting interactive spatial information such as 360-degree videos or VR worlds. HMDs include dedicated display devices like Oculus Rift and HTC Vive in addition to mobile phone devices attached to headsets like Google Cardboard, Daydream and Gear VR. 360-degree videos are also getting more popular in web applications. For example YouTube and Facebook support 360-degree videos.

360-degree video domain often requires reading the sensors of HMDs and calculating sphere mathematics. Luckily there are Software Development Kits (SDK) that help developers with such tasks. The online SDK using the definition. Palme et al. 2010. The SDK is as a set of development tools that allows a developer to create applications for a certain software package and hardware platform. SDKs differ in terms of their programming code languages, their libraries and API support. Thus 360-degree video SDK is an SDK that allows developing 360-degree video applications. A 360-degree video SDK

can for example offer an API that helps creating a video player which can detect the head movements in spherical videos both in monoscopic or stereoscopic mode. Examples of 360-degree video SDKs include Google VR SDK, Unity3D Player SDK and K-Pano. Comparing those SDKs and finding the best one for development work can require a considerable amount of time.

360-degree video SDKs offer many useful features but naturally they have different specifications and features and they cannot offer everything for everyone. For example our experience is that some 360-degree video SDKs for mobile devices do not allow easy development of user interface elements such as user interaction points. However some of those 360-degree video SDKs can be integrated with a popular game engine called Unity3D. With the help of Unity3D or similar game engines, UI elements can be added more easily on top of 360-degree videos. Still using complex tools such as Unity3D can require more resources. For example Linowes and Schoen 2016 state that an empty Unity3D scene for Android requires a much bigger application package than a simple native code application which has an increasing effect on memory and battery consumption.

The motivation for the work is that we have use cases for 360-degree videos so we need to choose a convenient SDK to work with. Further we noticed that there seems to be relatively few scientific publications about choosing 360-degree video SDKs. The study aims to gain knowledge about the growing field and the topic is significant for developers who need

a scientific structured criteria for choosing 360-degree video SDKs for example for inspecting development tools

our research questions are

- Which criteria is important when software developers choose SDKs for 360-degree video application development
- What features software developers hope for 360-degree video SDKs to have

To answer these questions we present a preliminary criteria for choosing an SDK from the developers viewpoint. Our study can be seen as a contribution to developer experience studies

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the scientific background for our work. Section 3 describes the identified criteria for choosing a 360-degree video SDK. Section 4 analyses the criteria and planned survey from a critical point of view. Section 5 concludes the paper and describes our on-going and planned research

## 2 BACKGROUND

Our work can be seen as a part of developer experience studies. According to Fagerholm and Munch 2012, developer experience consists of experiences relating to all kinds of artifacts and activities that a developer may encounter as part of their involvement in software development. The three developer experience categories: development infrastructure, feelings about work, and the value of one's own contribution. Our study relates mostly to the first one since SDKs are a part of development infrastructure.

Since 360-degree video software development has similarities to VR software development, Tierbaum and Lustig 2018 offers the most related background for our work. According to them, the primary requirements for VR development environment include performance, reliability, and ease of use. In a more detailed level, the list required capabilities and factors such as cross-platform development support for VR hardware, high-level and low-level interfaces, programming languages, user interaction, minimal limitations, and choosing between commercial and open solutions, all of which we also included in our criteria. They discuss about the whole development environment whereas we concentrate more on choosing only the SDK. The following background describes research about how developers choose their SDKs on other domains than 360-degree video domain and what they need to consider when doing that

Palme et al. 2010 propose a six-dimension benchmark: security, individual and organization user choice, market growth, ease of implementation, and net revenue. For choosing a smart phone operating system. For mobile application development. The dimensions are based on their own opinion about the most critical ones. They take SDK related viewpoints into account for example, saying that the Android SDK for Android is related to ease of development and market availability. They also note that the license of an SDK can have an effect on the usage decision. We did not include security in our criteria because we think that security is not among of the most essential characteristics for a 360-degree video SDK. If there are security related requirements the other software components should offer the solution for most of them.

Kakka et al. 2002 interviewed developers about their needs for SDK documentation. They studied one particular documentation and gave a detailed analysis of useful documentation features such as necessary content, taking into account the target audience and prerequisite knowledge, etc. Though documentation is an important part of using an SDK, we are not interested only about documentations. Documentation is however related to ease of implementation found in our criteria.

Dalmaso et al. 2013 acknowledge the problem of the variety of different platforms and SDKs. They formed a classification and a comparison for different cross-platform development tools for mobile platforms. The classification is based on general desirable requirements identified themselves. The criteria they use has some similar aspects to our work. For example, they included the SDKs available to be used for multiple platform development, also mentioned in our interview as a part of their criteria. Additionally, they discuss performance in terms of CPU, memory, and power usage, which we approach from the low resource consumption point of view.

Argriou et al. 2016 discuss about the challenges of designing VR in mixed 360-degree and game environment using Google VR SDK and Unity 3D. Though they do not concentrate on creating choosing criteria of different SDKs, they are interested about user interaction which is also taken into account in our criteria.

## 3 CRITERIA FOR CHOOSING 360-DEGREE VIDEO SDK

We present a criteria about the factors software developers need to consider when choosing a 360-degree

ideo SDK. The criteria is based on scientific literature, an interview with a 360-degree ideo application developer from industry with several years of 360-degree ideo application development experience, our own experiences six months with Google VR SDK for Android, Okia SDK and Nit 3D. The interview with an expert was helpful especially from the development perspective. Additional background for the criteria comes from our discussions with industry partners that have made us interested in some particular use cases such as user logging and user interaction.

### 3.1 Platforms, Domains and SDKs

As Table 1 presents, there are multiple platform alternatives for 360-degree ideo applications. Every SDK can not support every platform, but for example, web browser applications can be run in different kind of environments and Cardboard/Dream applications can be run on different mobile devices, Android and iOS. There are also many fields for 360-degree ideo applications such as education, entertainment, industry, and research, which can have an effect on the desired characteristics of an SDK. Further, Table 2 lists different 360-degree ideo SDKs. We might be missing some SDKs, but the list works as an example of different alternatives and it reflects the difficulty of choosing the best one for development work from many options.

Table 1. Example platforms for 360-degree ideo applications

Platform
web browser
Cardboard/Dream
Windows
Linux
macOS
TV/Video
Gear VR
culus Rift

### 3.2 Features and Characteristics of SDKs

The combination of different features and characteristics of SDK can be the most important reason for choosing one. Table 3 lists the features and characteristics that are based on our own development experience, knowledge gained from an interview with an expert from industry, and aspects found from the research literature. There are naturally other features and characteristics as well, but either we have experience

or we have found scientific background for the chosen ones. The features and characteristics in the list are elaborated in the following paragraphs.

*User interaction* For immersive experience, a convenient way to implement user interaction for example, adding an embedded UI on top of 360-degree ideo can be an important factor. Probably, the development of UI requires some kind of graphical API. However, not every SDK offers a possibility to add user interaction points easily.

*Minimal limitations* The usage of an SDK should not be restricted only to the ready-made features. A skillful programmer should be able to extend the functionality if needed.

*Performance* While even modern mobile devices are powerful enough for showing 360-degree ideos, the performance requirements can increase for high-resolution ideos with a high refresh rate including other computation. An SDK should provide sufficient performance for comfortable immersive experience. Some SDKs include performance monitors, but it is probably not the most essential feature for a 360-degree ideo SDK if the development environment otherwise includes a performance monitor.

*VR hardware support* MDs can be integrated to different kinds of devices that help for example, with navigation and user interaction. For example, Google/Dream supports a dedicated controller that can be used for pointing and clicking.

*Low-level API* In addition to high-level interface, an SDK can offer a low-level interface. With low-level source code, the developers can make applications that perform faster or use less resources. For example, Google VR SDK for Android comes with a native developer kit (DK) that is less restricted than the Java SDK, but requires knowledge about C and C++. On the other hand, development work as an abstraction level can be even increased for example, with Nit 3D integration.

*Programming language* The programming language of an SDK can have an effect on the usage decision. Some programmers are more familiar with some languages or the platform can require a certain language. For example, a high-level language can support cross-platform development better or a script can be needed for development.

*Multiple platforms* Often creating an application for a single platform is not enough, but the implementation is needed for other platforms as well. An example of multiple platform support is Google VR environment that is provided for Android and iOS, in addition to integration with Nit 3D and several game engines and support for web applications.

*Low resource usage* Playing 360-degree ideos

Table 2 Sample 360-degree video SDKs

SDK	Developer	Platform
Google VR SDK	Google	Android iS nit 3D nreal e
planer SDK	okia	Android iS culus Mo ile SteamV
penVR SDK SteamVR SDK	Val e	Multiple endors
SV SDK	pen source	pen Source V headset
VR ne SDK	eiss	VR ne
krpano	krpano	e
Pano2V	Garden Gnome Software	e Card oard
Mar ipano	pen source	e
culus SDKs	culus V	ift Gear V nit 3D nreal e PC

Table 3 Different characteristics or features of 360-degree video SDKs with background

Feature or characteristic
user interaction Arg riou et al 2016
Minimal limitations ier aum and ust 1 8
Performance ier aum and ust 1 8
VR hardware support ier aum and ust 1 8
low-level API ier aum and ust 1 8
Programming language ier aum and ust 1 8
Multiple platforms Dalmasso et al 2013
low resource usage Dalmasso et al 2013
Content management Inter iew
VR support Inter iew
Access to sensor data aValle et al 2014
Viewport tracking aValle et al 2014
Multiple 360 video formats wn e perience
360 video format detection wn e perience
DRM protection support wn e perience
Free pen source license Palme et al 2010
ease of implementation Palme et al 2010
Market situation Palme et al 2010

can require relatively much computing power for mobile devices. With low resource usage we mean the SDKs are able to keep CPU memory and power usage on minimal level for example for saving battery resources.

**Content management** Some 360-degree video use cases are related to content management. For example a 360-degree video can be a part of an educational webpage managed with a content management system. Thus SDKs could support embedding 360-degree videos in various content environments. On the other hand content management inside 360-degree videos can be important as well. For example sometimes it would be useful to add text on top a video or highlight a part of the it according to associated metadata.

**Web support** While many 360-degree video applications are made for mobile devices a support for web applications can be more important in the fu-

ture when 360-degree videos become more popular in web.

**Access to sensor data** An SDK can support different ways to access sensor data for head tracking. For example the the head orientation can be retrieved in many formats such as Euler angles, quaternions or matrix data. In addition accessing accelerometer can be needed.

**Viewport tracking** With viewport tracking we mean the video player is able to automatically adapt to user's head orientation. For VR usage this is basically a required ability but for web applications it can be preferable to navigate with mouse dragging.

**Multiple 360 video formats** 360-degree videos come in multiple formats so an SDK should support as many as possible. There can be monoscopic each frame is monocular equirectangular panorama or stereoscopic two vertically stacked equirectangular panoramas or the video can stream MP4-G-4 we m etc.

**360 video format detection** In addition to be able to play different 360-degree videos it would be helpful for an SDK to detect the video format. For example when using the class `VRVideoView` of Google VR SDK for Android it is required to set the video format monoscopic or stereoscopic in the program code because the player can not detect the video format itself.

**DRM protection support** As traditional videos 360-degree videos can be protected with digital rights management DRM techniques. Not all SDKs offer playback for DRM protected videos.

**Free / Open source license** The license of an SDK can affect the usage decision. For example an individual developer getting familiar with VR might want to start with a completely free SDK while a company might want to pay for non-restricted usage.

**Ease of implementation** When choosing tools for software development work the ease of implementation can be an important aspect. Ease of implementation includes things such as good documentation familiar technologies the quality of an API etc. e

include the easiness of integration with other components such as OSs and game engines under this category.

*Market situation* Market situation can have an effect on the SDK usage decision. For example new devices can have new features that have the charm of novelty. In addition, the organization's strategy can determine the used platform.

## 4 DISCUSSION

When starting to work with 360-degree video development, we realized that choosing an SDK for 360-degree video application development is not an easy task. Additionally, we could not find a proper scientific criteria for choosing an SDK. Since 360-degree videos are a growing phenomena, a criteria for choosing the tools for the development work is essential for multiple parties.

To evaluate our criteria, we plan to conduct a survey. We chose the method because it is inexpensive, we hope to reach a large respondent group and the responses are anonymous. Disadvantages in using surveys include the inability of the survey form and the lack of human interaction. Piloting the survey beforehand is important.

We plan to make an online survey with Google Forms. Primarily, we will call for participants from an association called Virtual Reality Finland that supports the development of the VR and AR ecosystem in Finland. The survey is planned to be lightweight and not requiring much time to answer (10-15 minutes). According to plan, the survey has 10 questions divided to four sections: three multiple choice questions, four open-ended questions and one grid question with a 5-step answer scale. We aim to keep the questions short and simple.

A good survey should be clear, easy to follow and provide enough information for respondents. There is a danger that some respondents do not understand what we mean with the questions. Answering to the open-ended questions can be more difficult for some respondents, so is it possible that they will leave the open-ended empty even though open-ended answers could give the most interesting insight for us.

Our own development experience was limited to working with Google VR SDK for Android, Ouya SDK and Unity 3D with simple applications. For that reason, we wanted to interview experts from the industry. However, we only managed to conduct one interview because it turned out to be difficult to get interviews from industry experts. That is one of the reasons we try to reach for a larger respondent

group with an online survey.

The group of survey respondents can be expected to be quite diverse since only developers with experience about 360-degree video SDKs are able to answer. Not all software developers can give proper insight on the topic. Therefore, getting a large enough response set for making meaningful research is not an easy task.

The answers will be analyzed statistically. Open answers naturally require more preparation for analysis. At first, we intend to categorize them for further quantitative analysis. We also hope to get enough material for qualitative analysis.

Our criteria reflects our own interests to some extent. We are most interested in some particular use cases like user logging and user interaction. However, we did not want to restrict the criteria only to those topics, but we wanted to gain more wide view on the field and we found support from the literature for many aspects. On the other hand, we assume that some interesting and important aspects were not included. Therefore, we hope that the planned open questions in the survey will give insight on those factors.

While the criteria and the survey is not the main goal of our research project, it is an important first step to gain knowledge about the field. We realize that there is a gap in current research not providing enough knowledge about developer experience in 360-degree video development. Studying software developers is important because for example Ucel and Dgell (2015) state that software developers intend uses for devices popular in future and the impact of early adopters of technology, so their preferences can have effects on early market advantages.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

In this position paper we presented a preliminary criteria for choosing a 360-degree video SDK. The criteria is based on research literature, our own experiences and an interview with an expert on the domain. To evaluate our criteria, we plan to conduct an online survey for software developers working in the field of 360-degree videos. Our eventual goal is to find out on which criteria software developers choose 360-degree video SDKs and what features are expected from them.

The motivation for the work comes from the need to sort out the field for further development of 360-degree video applications. We need to choose a proper SDK for our use cases which include user interaction and user logging. In addition, we hope that

we can identify functional gaps in the current SDKs

The upcoming surge will be significant because 360-degree videos are gaining popularity among consumers; the developers are early adopters of technology and there are relatively few scientific publications about choosing 360-degree video SDKs

This work is an initial study for a research project called 360 Video Intelligence. The purpose of the project is to create a 360-degree video platform which provides an easy way to run different kinds of analysis for example object detection algorithms on 360-degree videos. The videos with added metadata will be then played on 360-degree video player application. However the player will not only play the video with visualized metadata but it will also gather user log for further analysis. Practical use cases for user logging include view port prediction that can be used for example on providing better video resolution only to the field of view similar to work presented in [1]. We will also need some kind of UI elements for visualizing the added metadata on 360-degree videos. With the knowledge gained from developing our criteria and the following surge we can have a better understanding about developing such applications.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made in a research project called 360 Video Intelligence. We would like to thank T. K. S. for funding the project.

## REFERENCES

- Alfance P, Mac -F and Ver ip 2011 Evaluation of bandwidth performance for interactive spherical video. In *Multimedia and Expo (ICME), 2011 IEEE International Conference on* pages 1-6 I
- Arg riou conomou D ouki V and Doumanis I 2016 Engaging immersive video consumers: Challenges regarding 360-degree gamified video applications. In *Ubiquitous Computing and Communications and 2016 International Symposium on CyberSpace and Security (IUCC-CSS), International Conference on* pages 145-152 I
- ier aum A and ust C 1-8 Software tools for virtual reality application development. *Course Notes for SIGGRAPH* 8
- Dalmasso I, Datta S, Konnet C and Ikaein 2013 Survey: comparison and evaluation of cross platform mobile application development tools. In *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conference (IWCMC), 2013 9th International* pages 323-328 I
- Fagerholm F and Munch 2012 Developer experience: Concept and definition. In *Software and System Process (ICSSP), 2012 International Conference on* pages 73-77 I
- aValle S, Mersho A, Katse M and Antono M 2014 Head tracking for the Oculus Rift. In *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2014 IEEE International Conference on* pages 187-194 I
- inowes and Schoen M 2016 *Cardboard VR Projects for Android*. Packt Publishing Ltd
- ka a, Messinger oehme F, orman C, Mace M and Gordon M 2002 What programmers really want: results of a needs assessment for SDK documentation. In *Proceedings of the 20th annual international conference on Computer documentation* pages 133-141 ACM
- chi D, Kunita Fu ii K, Ko ima A, Iwaki S and irose 2014 Rendering spherical video streaming system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Multimedia* pages 763-764 ACM
- Palme Tan C - Sutanto and Phang C 2010 Choosing the smart phone operating system for developing mobile applications. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Electronic Commerce: Roadmap for the Future of Electronic Business* pages 146-152 ACM
- Shi ata T 2002 Head mounted display. *Displays* 23(1):57-64
- ucel I and dgell A 2015 Conceptualizing factors of adoption for head mounted displays: Toward an integrated multi-perspective framework. *Journal For Virtual Worlds Research* 8(2)