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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN3 thanks RAN2 for the LS “[R2-210435](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cterhentt%5CDocuments%5CTdocs%5CRAN2%5CRAN2_113bis-e%5CR2-2104351.zip)4 LS on NAS-based busy indication”.

RAN3 has discussed this issue, and would like to provide the following feedback:

Question 1: Are the impacts identified by RAN2 valid?

Answer 1: Yes. The impacts identified by RAN2 are valid.

RAN3 understands the latency may be different dependent on the potential solutions. RAN3 has no consensus whether the extra delay is a big issue.

Question 2: Are there any other impacts beyond those identified by RAN2?

Answer 2:

RAN3 knows the final solution is decided by SA2/RAN2, RAN3 will further analyse the RAN3’s impact based on the detail solution from SA2/RAN2.

Question 3: If the ANS to Q1 and/or to Q2 is yes, can they be specified within Rel-17 timeframe?

Answer 3:

RAN3 would like to postpone to answer this question until SA2/RAN2 provides the detail solution.

**2. Actions:**

**To RAN2 group.**

**ACTION:** RAN3 respectfully asks RAN2 to take the above information into account.

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

3GPP RAN3#113-e August 2020