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# A.X Obtaining PDU Set information from marked and unmarked PDUs

A guideline is provided to support the case where both marked and unmarked packets exist in a stream to which RTP HE for PDU Set marking is applied. In some cases, packets from some media streams contain an RTP Header Extension while some packets do not or can not contain an RTP Header extension for PDU Set marking. An example could be a stream of multiplexed audio and video RTP packets with only video packets marked with PDU Set marking. In this case the video stream RTP packets include RTP HE for PDU Set marking for each RTP packet but the audio stream RTP packets do not contain (e.g., to reduce overhead) the RTP Header Extension for PDU Set marking. Another example could be RTCP packets multiplexed in a stream, since it is not possible to add an RTP HE to RTCP packets..

NOTE: Guidelines for PDU Set handling of unmarked video packets at the UPF are available in Annex A.2.2.2 and Annex A.2.2.3. This clause considers the case of multiplexed marked and unmarked packets with PDU Set information.

In this case, the 5G System UPF network entity needs to map both marked and unmarked packets to PDU Sets including the PDU Set information, as PDU Set QoS handling, when enabled, is applied to all packets in a flow. An example guideline for determining PDU Set information at the UPF from either RTP HE or unmarked PDU is given in Table A.X-1.

The middle column indicates how the UPF can derive PDU Set information for packets that include RTP HE for PDU Set marking. The right column indicates how the UPF can derive PDU Set information for unmarked packets (unmarked PDUs). The left column lists the PDU Set information parameters, as defined in TS 23.501 [12],set by the UPF in DL in the GTP-U header PDU Set information container, see TS 38.415 [XX]..

Table A.X-1: Determining PDU Set information at UPF for marked PDUs with RTP HE for PDU Set marking and unmarked PDUs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PDU Set information (PDU Session User Plane Protocol) [XX]  | Marked PDUs with RTP HE for PDU Set marking (see clause 4.2) | Unmarked PDUs  |
| PDU Set Importance | Set by interpreting PSI field in the RTP HE | Set based on 5G System configured value given the payload and/or packet type (RTP Payload or RTCP packet type) |
| PDU Set Size | Set based on optionally transmitted PSSize field, otherwise this can be calculated. | Set to the PDU Size |
| End of Data Burst | Can be set by EoDB flag | N/A for unmarked PDU |
| PDU Sequence Number (within a PDU Set) | Set from PSN in the RTP HE | Set to 0 |
| PDU Set Sequence Number  | Set from PSSN in the RTP HE with a separate number space, e.g. PSSN field from RTP HE with most significant bit is set to 0 (another partition is also possible) | Set by UPF implementation with a separate number space e.g. set by UPF with most significant bit set to 1 (another partition is also possible)  |
| End of PDU Set | Set from End of the PDU Set (E) field in the RTP HE | Set to 1 |

PDU Set Importance can be set based on a configured value (e.g., by operator pre-configured policy or AF configured value for the session) in the 5G System for unmarked PDUs and from the RTP HE for PDU Set marking for marked PDUs.

PDU Set Size can be derived from the RTP HE if available, otherwise it can be calculated if needed, For unmarked packets it equals the PDU Size (assuming single packet per PDU Set in these cases).

PDU Sequence Number (within a PDU Set) could be retrieved from the PSN in RTP HE, or when no RTP HE is present (unmarked PDU), it can be set to 0 as only a single PDU is present in the PDU Set.

Deriving the PDU Set Sequence Number includes some additional steps to enable using a different number space for marked and unmarked PDUs. As an example, the UPF can only use the 9 least significant bits of the RTP HE to number the marked PDUs. In addition, for unmarked PDUs it can set the most significant bit of PSSN in PDU Set information to 1. Other number space separations of the PSSN field are also possible up to UPF implementation.

NOTE 1: The RTP HE PSSN of marked PDUs cannot map directly to PSSN for PDU Set information when unmarked PDUs are also present as the UPF needs to assign non-colliding PSSN numbers to both.

NOTE 2: The example shows how a possible mapping of PSSN from RTP HE and non RTP HE packets can be done at the UPF. Other implementations can be equally valid and applicable by the UPF.

End of Data Burst is not applicable for unmarked PDUs.

End of PDU Set for unmarked PDUs is always equal to 1 since there is only one PDU in the PDU Set.

NOTE 3: This guideline example will be coordinated with SA2 to confirm that this is aspect is left to implementation and that this example is feasible.