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**1. Overall Description:**

SA2 is concluding a Key Issue for "Traffic detection and QoS flow mapping for multiplexed data flows" in clause 8.4 of TR 23.700-70. As part of the key issue, SA2 is planning to define an additional packet filter, that should be provided to the UE in NAS protocol along the QoS rule. The additional packet filter describes a packet filter for a media flow when multiple media flows are sharing the same transport protocol packet filter. For example, audio and video media streams carried over RTP/UDP could share the same IP 5-tuple but can be distinguished by the UE using the additional packet filters that indicate the SSRC values for audio and video streams in the RTP layer. In this example, the UE could receive multiple QoS rules with the same packet filter value (but with different QoS rule precedence values), and each packet filter is associated with an "additional packet filter" that the UE can use to map the UL traffic to the corresponding QoS flow (i.e. QFI).

SA2 is discussing how the UE not supporting the "additional packet filter" (e.g. pre-Rel-19 UE) behaves in such scenario when receiving multiple QoS rules with the same packet filter but with different QoS rule precedence values.

**Question**: Is it possible to define the "additional packet filter" as described above in a manner that it is not considered as an error in the UE not supporting the feature (e.g. pre-Rel-19 UE), i.e. the UE should ignore the additional packet filter and operate based on the QoS rules as defined in Rel-18?

If the above is not possible, SA2 assumes the UE that support the new additional packet filter shall indicate this capability to the network and the network provides the additional packet filter only in this case, is this correct understanding?

**2. Actions:**

**CT1:**

**ACTION:** Kindly provide feedback on the questions above.

**3. Date of Next TSG SA WG2 Meetings:**

TSG-SA2 Meeting #165 14-18 October 2024 Hyderabad, IN

TSG-SA2 Meeting #166 18-22 November 2024 Orlando, FL, US