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## 5.2 Key Issue #2: QoS handling requirements for lone PDU

### 5.2.1 Description

In the FS\_5G\_RTP\_Ph2, one objective is to study “ issues around "lone" PDU, as identified by SA2”.

In the LS from SA2, S2-2313691/S4-240168, SA4 was asked the following questions:

*SA2 in Rel-18 has agreed that the PSA UPF marks, in the downlink, each N6-unmarked PDU (lone PDU) with PDU Set information into a PDU Set over N3/N9. As a consequence, RAN will apply the PDU Set QoS parameters, e.g. apply the PDU Set Delay Budget (which is assumed to be larger than the PDB, if applicable) for the lone PDU.*

*Questions: Will applying PDU Set QoS parameters to these lone PDUs pose any issue from application perspective? If yes, what is the issue?*

*SA2 will not change the agreement to map N6-unmarked PDUs to PDU Sets over N3/N9 in Rel-18. However, since this topic may be in the scope of the FS\_XRM\_Ph2 study, SA2 would like to get feedback from SA4 on the questions above.*

For a single PDU which doesn't belong to any PDU Set, the 5GS handles such lone PDU as a single PDU Set following the PDU Set QoS parameters. Furthermore, a lone PDU does not carry the RTP header extension for PDU Set marking defined in TS 26.522 and thus cannot convey any PDU Set Information to the 5GS. It is proposed to study:

- whether there is any issue when applying PDU Set QoS parameters to the lone PDUs from the application layer perspective?

 a. with PDU Set marking (i.e. RTP HE) to provide PDU Set information (e.g. considering overhead of marking and processing for the lone pdu case)

b. without PDU Set marking to provide PDU Set information (e.g. considering explicit guidelines for handling unmarked packets based on the media syntax)

- Study and detail the scenarios when such lone PDU may arise, e.g RTP/RTCP multiplexing, unmarked packets, incomplete sender implementation, existing guidelines for PDU Set marking.

- Develop solutions to handle the issue of missing PDU Set Information in case of lone PDUs

- Study the benefits of marking versus not marking of lone PDUs into PDU Sets

NOTE: Both the marking in DL direction and at the UE for uplink direction should be considered.

NOTE: An answer to questions from SA2 in liaisons on this matter should be provided when concluding this key issue. If a solution requires changes or clarifications to SA2 specifications, SA2 should be informed in time.
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