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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN2 has discussed the "busy indication" for multi-SIM, wherein UE connected to network A receives paging from network B and wants to respond to network B to indicate it is "busy" with network A. In RAN2#113bise, RAN2 discussed how to handle the busy indication for RRC\_INACTIVE, i.e. for RAN paging from network B and made the following agreement:

Agreements

1 Only support NAS-based busy indication (for IDLE and INACTIVE)

One motivation for this agreement by RAN2 was that the assumption that harmonizing the busy indication between RRC\_INACTIVE mode with RRC\_IDLE would save specification effort in all WGs. However, after the decision was made, it was raised that this might not be the case and there may be at least the following potential impacts to SA2, CT1 and RAN3:

- **Service Request triggering for RRC\_INACTIVE:** Triggeringbusy indication from NAS while UE is in RRC\_INACTIVE state (which NAS does not differentiate from CONNECTED) requires specification changes (SA2, CT1). This is assuming that the NAS based busy indication will use Service Request procedure per SA2 agreements.

- **NAS needs to filter RAN paging** indications to determine whether to trigger busy indication, which may need AS to inform NAS whenever a RAN paging is received (CT1, RAN2)

- **Sending busy indication to 5GC** causes extra delay if 5GC then needs to inform RAN about it (SA2, RAN3)

However, it is also not clear to RAN2 whether these are the only impacts, or whether there would be other impacts. Therefore, RAN2 would like to request the following feedback in order to understand whether the RAN2 decision on busy indication would have issues for other groups:

* **Question 1: Are the impacts identified by RAN2 valid (SA2, CT1, RAN3)?**
* **Question 2: Are there any other impacts beyond those identified by RAN2 (SA2, CT1, RAN3)?**
* **Question 3: If the ANS to Q1 and/or to Q 2 is yes, can they be specified within Rel-17 timeframe (by SA2, CT1, RAN3)?**

RAN2 also agreed to revert its agreement on NAS-based busy indication for RRC INACTIVE if SA2/CT1/RAN3 feedback indicates that it is not possible for these groups to arrive at a specified solution within R17 timeframe.

**2. Actions:**

**To SA2, CT1 and RAN3 groups.**

**ACTION:** RAN2 respectfully asks CT1, RAN3 and SA2 to feedback on aforementioned questions.

**3. Date of Next TSG-RAN WG2 Meetings:**

3GPP RAN2#114-e from 2021-05-19 to 2021-05-27 Electronic Meeting

3GPP RAN2#115-e from 2021-08-16 to 2021-08-27 Electronic Meeting