

## Status Report for SI to TSG

**Work Item Name:** SI: Introduction of direct transport bearers between SRNC and Node-B

**SOURCE:** Gert-Jan van Lieshout (Ericsson)    **TSG:** RAN    **WG:** WG3

**E-mail address rapporteur:** Gert-Jan.van.Lieshout@eln.ericsson.se

**Ref. to WI sheet:** RAN\_Study\_Items.doc

### **Progress Report since the last TSG (for all involved WGs):**

Similarly to the situation reported at RAN#13, again during this period RAN3 has only been able to spend very limited time on this SI.

During RAN3#24, two documents were included with some modifications into the TR. These documents are considered to give quite a complete overview on benefits and drawbacks of a network solution based on direct bearers. In addition, the main concern that direct bearers would disable SRNS relocation has been answered: a solution using R99 procedures has been provided showing how SRNS Relocation can be achieved when direct transport bearers between SNRC and Node B. The TR was split in two parts: one for an ATM-based TNL and the other one for an IP-based TNL.

During RAN3#25, no new documents were handled due to the lack of time except the new version of the TR.

### **List of Completed elements (for complex work items):**

#### **List of open issues:**

1. Is the feature without an AAL2 switch in the Transport Network feasible and practical from the configuration point of view? Is there a gain in bandwidth?
2. Establishment delay: Does the use of an AAL2 switch provides an additional gain in delay if this implies the same two-step ALCAP establishment as it is done in the current approach (DRNC involved)?
3. Reliability: What happened if an AAL2 switch fails? Is it still possible to perform ATM Path Switching? Is it then needed a redundant AAL2 switch?
4. How does the RNC know if it supports a functionality that completely depends on the transport network configuration? For example, what happened if a Node supports the feature but there is not an AAL2 switch in the path?

**Estimates of the level of completion (when possible): 80%**

#### **WI completion date review resulting from the discussion at the working group:**

The Study Item is closed for the case of an IP-based TNL, however, as there are still open issues related to the case of an ATM-based TNL, the completion date of the SI is moved to RAN#15.

#### **References to WG's internal documentation and/or TRs:**

R3-013353, TR v0.1.1 approved as TR v0.2.0.