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**Title: KI#4 and KI#5, key questions for company view collection**

This document is to collect company views on key questions of KI#4 and #5 to facilitate the following conclusion discussion. Please kindly provide your company views on the following questions before EoB of Sep 16th. The rapporteur will collect the views and propose summary/way forwards/SoH for further discussion afterwards.

### Q1: How does UPF identify DL PDU Set info?

* Option 1: use existing IETF RTP/SRTP RFC and draft
* Option 2: Define/extend N6 protocols to carry related info
  + Option 2.1: extend GTP-U protocol
  + Option 2.2: extend HTTP header (S2-2205830)
  + Option 2.3: extend RTP header
* Option 3: UPF implementation based on e.g. traffic characteristics.
* Option 4: UPF interacts with NWDAF(S2-2205838)

**[Samsung view]**

**Position:** Support Option 1, and Option 2.3

**Justification**:

Option 1 seems not to have standardization effort and if required e.g in SA4, RTP header can be extended to deliver some PDU set info, which can be updated and implemented in IETF by CT WGs.

XR server can deliver header information to UPF via existing or some new extended header. And option 3 implies non-standardization method which can not be excluded specfically.

### Q2. How to deliver PDU Set importance information to RAN:

* Option 1: use different QoS Flows with different priority level. PDU Set importance is mapped to existing QoS flow priority.
* Option 2: use one QoS flow for different PDU Set with different priority level
  + Option 2.1: use different sub-QoS Flow within one QoS Flow, and using sub-QoS flow Identifier in GTP-U header
  + Option 2.2: use PDU Set importance information in GTP-U header

**[Samsung view]**

**Position:** Support Option 2.2

**Justification**:

* We don’t see the need of sub-QoS Flow concept, but such PDU Set info can be additionally used for better scheduling.

### Q3: Support to PDU Set dependency-based scheduling

* Option 1: Identify accurate dependency relationship between PDU Sets for scheduling.
* Option 2: In some scenario (e.g. closed GOP), the decoding of the non-I frames between two successive I frames always directly or indirectly relies on the 1st I frame of the two successive I frames. If the 1st I frame is in error, the non-I frames can be dropped until the next I frame. (proposed in S2-2205839)
* Option 3: If a PDU Set is depended by others, it can be considered as more important during scheduling. But the scheduling will not further consider the accurate dependency relationship.

**[Samsung view]**

**Position:** Support Option 1 and possibly Option 2

**Justification**:

RAN need to know dependency and importance of each PDUs which belong to PDU set(i.e. PDU set’s dependency and importance) then other PDU sets. Option 2 can be a partial solution. So need more general way(i.e Option1)

### Q4. Support to hierarchical PDU Set:

* Option 1: introduces PDU Set group. (S2-2205938)
* Option 2: not support.

**[Samsung view]**

**Position:** Support Option 2

**Justification**:

We don’t see the need of PDU Set group without considering interworking/handling multiple service flows.

### Q5. On “*Whether to drop a PDU Set in case PSDB is exceeded*”, do we need further define “*PDU Set Discard Time*” (A PDU Set shall be dropped in case this time is exceeded (sol 25 etc):

* Option 1: Support
* Option 2: not support.

**[Samsung view]**

**Position:** Support Option 2

**Justification**:

The question can be answered after we conclude the PSDB