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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN3 thanks SA2 for the LS on NAS Non delivery for RRC Inactive state.

For the second answer, RAN3 discussed and agreed to report the NAS NON DELIVERY INDICATION message for the non-PDU session related NAS-PDU in the "PDU Session Resource Setup" in case of failed delivery.

However, we have not reached the consensus on how to handle the non-delivered non-PDU session related NAS-PDU in the "Initial Context Setup Request", two solutions on the table:

* Solution 1: Use NAS NON DELIVERY INDICATION message to indicate the failure of the NAS delivery.
* Solution 2: Use the "Initial Context Setup failure” to implicitly indicate the failure of the NAS delivery.

RAN3 would like to ask SA2 to check which solution is preferred on how to handle the non-delivered non-PDU session related NAS-PDU in the "Initial Context Setup Request"?

**2. Actions:**

**To SA2 group:**

**ACTION: Question:** RAN3 would like to ask SA2 to check which solution is preferred on how to handle the non-delivered non-PDU session related NAS-PDU in the "Initial Context Setup Request"?

**3. Date of Next RAN3 Meetings:**

RAN3#111 25 Jan – 04 Feb 2020 Electronic