# Status Report for WI to TSG

Work Item Name: SI: Direct bearers between SRNC and Node-B

SOURCE: Rapporteur (Ericsson) TSG: RAN WG: 3

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):

During RAN3 #26 there was no time to discuss this SI.

In between RAN3#26 and RAN3#27 there was email discussion on this topic, in which there was quite general support allowing direct bearers in case of an IP TNL.

During RAN3 #27 a short discussion took place on the email discussion report not leading to any further consensus. None of the submitted contribution was handled and therefore no progress was made on any of the open issues.

## 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 groups:

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#16.

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

TR 25.883 v0.2.0 (R3-020405)