[91E][43][2G_3G_inclusive_language] Moderator Summary - Version 0.0.4
RAN

3GPP TSG-RAN Meeting # 91-e RP-210831

Electronic Meeting, March 16-26, 2021

Agenda item: 12

Source: Ericsson (Moderator)

Document for: Information

1 Introduction

At RAN#90 document RP-202179 was endorsed which addresses Inclusive Language in 3GPP specifications. Among other things it includes a set of actions for 3GPP to take to make the language of its specifications more inclusive. While these actions map well to specifications which are regularly updated (such as specifications relating to LTE and NR) it is not obvious how to make the language in less regularly updated specifications (i.e. specifications relating to GSM and UTRA) more inclusive. For this meeting CRs were submitted to update the language in TS 25.306 (RP-210333), TS 25.331 (RP-210334), TS 44.318 (RP-210335), and TS 45.008 (RP-210336).

The goal of this e-mail discussion is to come up with a way forward on how to treat specifications in GSM and UTRA in the context of inclusive language.

It should be noted that in the context of this discussion GSM and UTRA specifications refer to GSM and UTRA specifications handled by RAN plenary. Other GSM and UTRA specifications are not considered and are assumed to be handled by their respective WG. A list of all specifications handled by RAN plenary can be found here:
https://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/TSG-WG–RP.htm?Itemid=280

2 Initial round

Deadline for input 2021-03-23 11:59 UTC.

Several working groups have endorsed CRs updating Rel-16 specifications to make the language more inclusive. The intention is to agree the CRs once the Rel-17 version is created by other CRs and the end of Rel-17. For GSM and UTRA specifications it is unlikely that other CRs will trigger creation of Rel-17 versions of the specifications. One issue to resolve is when to approve the CRs and thus trigger creation of Rel-17 specifications. One opportunity could be to do it as soon as CRs are submitted to RAN, another opportunity could be to do it at RAN#95, the Rel-17 stage-3 freeze, but other opportunities are also possible.

Feedback Form 1: Q1: When should RAN approve Inclusive Language CRs for GSM and UTRA specifications?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Nokia Corporation	No strong view but it would be preferable to agree all CRs at the same time. This also allows checking that all CRs are aligned and use the exact same final terminology. Hence, we have a slight preference to do this at RAN#95.
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	It would be preferable to have the CRs agreed at the same time. I would suggest that we aim for RAN#93 in order to get the task completed before we get to the pressure of deciding Rel-18 package at RAN#94 and Rel-17 stage 3 completion at RAN#95. But not a very strong preference. For these specs we don't need to be concerned about early creation of Rel-17 specs resulting in the need for companies to produce Cat F CRs.
3	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] We prefer to agree on all the CRs at the same time. Doing it at RAN#95 seems fine.
4	VODAFONE Group Plc	With the exception of the treatment in SA2 of an answer from IEEE on the replacement terminology for "master-slave", the technical work seems to have now been done across virtually the whole of 3GPP. Thank you, rapporteurs. However, the R16 maintenance load in at least TSG-RAN seems high and so the early creation of R17 specifications may be undesirable. Hence we would prefer to see that the changes were included across all 3GPP TSGs in **Release 16 in June 2021** TSG meetings.
5	Ericsson LM	We are fine approving the CRs at stage-3 freeze, i.e. RAN#95.
6	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	In addition to the already declared steps, a publicly referable policy document to make clear the 3GPP position on inclusivity and neutrality would be useful to avoid any confusion regarding potentially offensive language in referenced specifications including legacy and yet to be updated versions. (This may be already available/ in preparation in which case I missed it, my apologies) In general we see no big issues in approving these other than logistics so co-timing with other REL17 specification generation seems reasonable.
7	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom: This has been endorsed at RAN#90e already: "The formal approval of the terminology CR for each spec will be undertaken together with the first Rel-17 technical CR for that spec."
8	Ericsson LM	[RAN3 Chairman here] Indeed, the endorsed way of working calls for Rel-17 CRs, and only in a second step it should be discussed whether to do the same exercise to previous releases. Rel-16 seems out of scope at this time.
9	ZTE Corporation	We also think it would be preferable to agree all CRs at the same time an then we have a preference to do this at RAN#95.

It is important to get the language aligned between the specifications. One way to address this could

be to employ a 2-step procedure in which a CR when submitted to a RAN plenary can only be endorsed. Only at a second meeting can the CR be approved. This allows companies more time to review the CR which should reduce the risk of errors. However, this may require more work from MCC, depending on whose responsibility it would be to submit the CR the second time.

Feedback Form 2: Q2: Should a 2-step procedure be used in which a CR is first endorsed and later approved? Why/why not?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Nokia Corporation	The specifications under RAN/SA/CT WGs are already doing a two-step process (e.g. RAN2 inclusive language CRs were endorsed in RAN2#113e but will not be approved yet). This allows for consistency checking between all TSGs and WGs, which improves specification quality since consistency checks can be done more easily. As for increasing the work for MCC, we think the individual companies in charge of the specifications should be asked to re-submit the endorsed CRs. This will anyway be used for LTE/NR CRs whos specifications continue to evolve more rapidly, so aligning with that process would be useful. Hence, we have a slight preference for 2-step process. We would also note that 1-step process can still work, so we have no objection to doing that either if majority prefers that. We just think it will be easier to have a single, unified process for specifications of all RATs.
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	2 step process seems sensible in order to ensure alignment within RAN as well as alignment with specs under SA and CT. I think the most important aspect for ensuring alignment of the terminology is that we do the work over 2 meeting cycles. Whether we formally endorse the CRs at the first meeting may not be that critical.
3	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] We like the 2-step approach idea
4	VODAFONE Group Plc	R16 CRs in June 2021 avoid the work load issues
5	Ericsson LM	We think a 2-step approach would be beneficial. Also similar to Nokia, we think the individual companies can be responsible for the submission.
6	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	the two step approach in particular to ensure alignment seems reasonable. However, I'm not too sure about how it is applied in practice if for example RAN x has an endorsed CR and SA/CT x+1 identify a need for a corresponding CR, so now does RAN x+1 approves and implements but does CT/SA x+1 now also have a 2 step wait i.e. only approves at CT/SA x+2? is this okay?
7	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom: This has been endorsed at RAN#90e already: "The formal approval of the terminology CR for each spec will be undertaken together with the first Rel-17 technical CR for that spec."
8	ZTE Corporation	OK with the 2-step approach

Feedback Form 3: Q3: If a 2-step procedure aiming at reducing errors and aligning language across specifications is not used, how should these issues be addressed?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Nokia Corporation	If 1-step procedure is used, it's better to postpone the CRs and come back to them at the time when the WG inclusive language CRs are agreed. That allows cross-checking at the time of CR agreement.
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	See comment to Q2
3	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] we prefer to have some sort of 2-step approach in any case. It is safer, the overhead is limited.
4	VODAFONE Group Plc	Draft CRs seem now to be available across 3GPP. the period between now and June 2021 can be used for cross checking and updating.
5	Ericsson LM	We prefer a 2-step process, but if not used the procedure proposed by Nokia could also work.
6	Deutsche Telekom AG	see above statement
7	ZTE Corporation	Same comment as Nokia and Ericsson

Feedback Form 4: Q4: Any other feedback, e.g. lessons learned from your WG, or other topics you'd like to discuss in future rounds?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.	Is there a need to create R17 versions of GSM and UTRA specifications at all considering the fact that there will be very likely no R17 CRs other than for inclusive language. To me it looks like unnecessary efforts which we should avoid if possible.
2	Nokia Corporation	Has it been checked that these are all the GSM/UTRA specifications (under RAN responsibility) that require inclusive language CRs? Also, the CRs submitted to RAN#91e do use the same inclusive language terminology as the RAN2 CRs, which is good. If improved visibility is desired for the chosen terminology, RANP could also officially endorse that to better help consistency across the 3GPP TSGs. Hence, whether that is required could be discussed as well.

Item	Company	Comments
3	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Before embarking on too much more work on the GSM and UTRA specifications I think it is important to have a principle decision whether we are going introduce the inclusive language in these specs. If we are forced to create Rel-17 specs, due to some other technical CR, then I think we should certainly make the inclusive language changes at the same time. If there is no other CR then we could take a decision to not update the GSM and UTRA specification beyond Rel-16. Whatever approach we decide to take it should be a 3GPP wide decision so it needs to be made in coordination with SA and CT. My understanding is that there are additional specifications than just those submitted to this meeting. For UMTS I am aware that 25.304 would need to be updated. Certainly some more careful checking will be needed, but that is the point behind doing this work over the next few meeting cycles,
4	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] we believe that there are other TSs that need to be checked for the language. We need to agree on the process (e.g. the rapporteur produces a CR in RAN#94 with the aim of endorsing it and fix all the issues in that meeting, then formally agree on it in RAN#95). If there is no impact in one spec it should be stated. If a company different from the rapporteur find issues they should have the opportunity to raise it (in RAN#??). Also this effort should focus only on Rel-17 specs.
5	VODAFONE Group Plc	Relatively neutral on 2G and 3G - but if the CR work has been done, then why not agree them? Updates to company documentation, training material, and network monitoring tools can then happen whenever their authors deem it appropriate.
6	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	We support clear communication and statements from 3GPP and its members for inclusive and non-discriminatory language, and a reference statement or notice should be clearly referable and observable. Whilst some GSM and UMTS (and LTE) specifications may not be updated to R17, we need to bare in mind that some of these specifications may be referenced by other documents including REL17 TRs and TSs. As such unintentionally offensive language may be referenced if they remain in their current state. However, it may be impractical to amend every specification to ensure the suite of 3GPP specifications is inclusive so we could consider a mechanism to ensure our beliefs and intent in this matter are clear. One way to do this could be to include within any new and updated REL17 TR and TS, a statement to the effect that the document is intended to be inclusive and non-discriminatory, but where reference to legacy specifications or other references inside or outside of 3GPP exist no offence is implied or intended and a reference to a clear and accessible 3GPP public policy notice on inclusive and neutral language is made.
7	Ericsson LM	The CRs submitted to RAN were submitted by Ericsson and we only checked the TSs with Ericsson rapporteurs. There could be other TSs with non-inclusive language also, as hinted by Intel.

Item	Company	Comments
8	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom: Yes, this topic is important - but is it REALLY necssary to apply changes on the GSM and UMTS specifications at this point in time, where no further development is expected and the technologies are pulled out of teh market ? Further: I thought it was agreed as part of the email discussion in RAN#90e that IE shall not be renamed ? The fear also raised by me where the sideeffects this would have on other systems using the (ASN.1) Information Element names ! To my knowledge no check on such potentially side effects has been performed — changing the 3GPP specifications is one thing, but Re-Coding OAM Systems and planning tools using such parameters as input is another story. This needs to be seriously taken into accout as in the end pot. operators are facing problem or have to pay the cost (for misfunction or SW redevelopment/re-coding)
9	ZTE Corporation	We agree that first of all we need a principle decision whether we need to introduce the inclusive language in GSM and UTRA specs.

2.1 Summary from Initial round

From Question 1 it seems many companies want to agree to the CRs all together in one meeting. There seems to be a preference for RAN#95, although one company suggested RAN#93 to avoid the load in RAN#94 (concluding Rel-18 package) and RAN#95 (completing stage-3). The rapporteur does not expect much meeting time will be used for this and proposes to approve all the Rel-17 CRs at RAN#95.

There was also questions raised about earlier releases and the previous agreement to approve the CRs together with the first technical CRs to Rel-17. The moderator will address this in the intermediate round.

From Question 2 it seems most companies accepted a process which involves two meeting cycles. This way the work can be coordinated with CT and SA. Given the input from some companies the moderators thinks there is no need to endorse the CRs at the first meeting and let individual companies ensure their CR is submitted in the second meeting. This would probably reduce the load on MCC also. There were also thoughts on how to align with SA and CT which the moderator will follow up in the intermediate round.

In Question 4 several topics were mentioned:

- The need to address these old specifications at all;

- Whether there are additional specifications than those addressed in the input documents to this meeting;

- Alternative ways to address non-inclusive language than CRs to old specifications;

- Renaming of (ASN.1) Information Elements.

The moderator will address them in the intermediate round.

Conclusion from initial round: Approve all Rel-17 CRs together at RAN#95. A CR for

inclusive language shall be submitted to RAN#94 for information and review, and then to RAN#95 for approval.

3 Intermediate round

Deadline for input 2021-03-24 10:59 UTC.

As several companies wondered if we should do this work at all, it would be good to settle that first. It should be understood that if the conclusion is that RAN intends not to update GSM/UMTS specifications to remove non-inclusive language, then that would be the only output of this discussion and the process would be halted. The moderator thinks this would not be in line with the conclusions from last plenary, but new agreements can of course always be made. The moderator would like to explain that some of the GSM specifications in the 44-series have not been modified for 15 years, apart from uplifting them to the latest release. Hence all of them exist as technical specifications in Rel-16 making them just as valid as the latest NR specifications. This question also resolves what the endorsed text "Rel-17 specifications which are created after March 2021 should be updated to the new terminology at their creation." implies for specifications which have no technical CRs approved.

Feedback Form 5: Q5: Should RAN correct non-inclusive language in GSM and UMTS specifications (even if they have no Rel-17 technical CRs approved) to make them more inclusive?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom: No there is no need to touch specifications for this which have not been touched for technical reasons for 15 years (or 10 ..). It was also already "endorsed" in RAN#90e: "The formal approval of the terminology CR for each spec will be undertaken together with the first Rel-17 technical CR for that spec." (based on RP-202179).
2	Nokia Corporation	Agree with DT but it would be good to resolve the whole topic at once where possible. However, we would note that this is (in relevant parts) also discussed in the later question on the Xiaomi proposal
3	Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.	I see no stringent need for it due to reasons given by DT. But the decision on this may be postponed to next RAN#92-e when we have a full picture of all the inclusive language CRs which are needed for GSM/UTRA specs.
4	Ericsson LM	The GSM/UMTS specifications are part of the 3GPP ecosystem and the latest release. We do not see why some specifications can be allowed to have non-inclusive language while others don't. Regarding the endorsed text quoted by DT we would like to draw the attention to RP-202176 which says: "Rel-17 specifications which are created after March 2021 should be updated to the new terminology at their creation." As we have seen for these specifications, technical CRs are not required to create a new release of a specification. One way to interpret this statement is that the Inclusive language CR is implemented when it is decided to create new releases of a specification.

Item	Company	Comments
5	Ericsson LM	One additional comment: We think it is very important to align across the TSGs on this issue.
6	Deutsche Telekom AG	@Ericsson: RP-202176 is the 3GPP calendar ... ;-) Fine ... I give up ...
7	Ericsson LM	Reply to DT: My mistake, should be RP-202179. Apologies for this.
8	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	1 - Most important is that we align with CT/SA on this - it cannot be a RAN only decision 2 - I think it is important that 3GPP can say that from Rel-17 all specifications are using inclusive language. Therefore if the GSM/UMTS specs are upgraded to Rel-17 (even if no technical changes are introduced) then I think we should do go through the process of correcting this language 2 - I think that if there are no technical changes to these specifications then we could leave them unchanged in Rel-16, and not upgrade them to any later release.
9	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	We proposed use of a single reference policy as a possible way to ensure future and backwards compatibility for specs that are technically changed and the ones that are not. We are unsure on the scope of checking and creating changes involved across 3GPP for these GSM/UMTS specification and saw this as a way to manage work load, ensure no cases were missed and consistency across 3GPP as an organisation. But if the impact of creating changes is relatively manageable and consistency can be ensured we are fine to make the potential changes.
10	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	just to confirm we strongly support common approach across TSGs (I see some misalignments have already been identified) clear and open communication is, as always, required
11	ZTE Corporation	Agree with Intel's comments
12	InterDigital Germany GmbH	We agree with Intel, Ericsson - all should be updated when Release 17 versions are created, even if this is the only change. But of course, aligned with CT/SA.
13	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	No need to touch specifications for this reason. and absolutely do not touch ASN.1!

For this meeting CRs to 25.306, 25.331, 44.318, and 45.008 were submitted. The moderator thinks these are not the only ones with non-inclusive language and would like to discuss how non-inclusive language is detected and if companies have come across other specifications with non-inclusive language.

Feedback Form 6: Q6: How do you detect non-inclusive language in a specification? Is there an easier way than reading it from start to finish?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	I provided already a suggestion during the email discussion at RAN#90e: https://3gpp.guru/ (Neither I nor Deutsche Telekom are in any way related to this) Type **WhiteList** as search string and you will find: :: whitelist CSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their associated PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 25.304 R15 , 25.304 R16 CSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG Identities of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 25.367 R15 , 25.367 R16 CSG Whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their associated PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 36.304 R15 , 36.304 R16 CSG Whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs, see 3GPP TS 23.122 [4]. 45.008 R15 , 45.008 R16 Whitelist = List of identities or identity ranges that are provided particular services. Whitelist is also named VIP list. 22.173 R15 , 22.173 R16 , 22.173 R17

Item	Company	Comments
2	Nokia Corporation	While tedious, searching the few known offensive terms (white/blacklist, master/slave) may be the only certain way to detect them. But we agree that using tools such as DT highlights can be helpful!
3	Ericsson LM	We remember the tip from DT and have used it to find non-inclusive language in specifications with Ericsson rapporteurs. However, there is always a need for manual scrutiny too.
4	Deutsche Telekom AG	... but this is not a Standards Experts job ... pretty sure interested companies have student workers for this ! ;-)

Item	Company	Comments
		Feedback Form 7: Q7: Which other specifications with non-inclusive language than the ones addressed in this meeting have you come across?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	whitelist CSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their associated PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 25.304 R15 , 25.304 R16 CSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG Identities of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 25.367 R15 , 25.367 R16 CSG Whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their associated PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs. 36.304 R15 , 36.304 R16 CSG Whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs, see 3GPP TS 23.122 [4]. 45.008 R15 , 45.008 R16 Whitelist = List of identities or identity ranges that are provided particular services. Whitelist is also named VIP list. 22.173 R15 , 22.173 R16 , 22.173 R17 :: blacklistBlacklist = List of identities or identity ranges that, for one reason or another, are being denied a particular service.22.173 R15 , 22.173 R16 , 22.173 R17 :: blackBlacklist = List of identities or identity ranges that, for one reason or another, are being denied a particular service.22.173 R15 , 22.173 R16 , 22.173 R17 :: whiteCSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG identities and their associated PLMN IDs of the CSGs to which the subscriber belongs.25.304 R15 , 25.304 R16 CSG whitelist = A list provided by NAS containing all the CSG Identities of the CSGs to which the subscriber

Item	Company	Comments

Xiaomi made a proposal in the initial round as an alternative to having CRs:

"Whilst some GSM and UMTS (and LTE) specifications may not be updated to R17, we need to bare in mind that some of these specifications may be referenced by other documents including REL17 TRs and TSs. As such unintentionally offensive language may be referenced if they remain in their current state. However, it may be impractical to amend every specification to ensure the suite of 3GPP specifications is inclusive so we could consider a mechanism to ensure our beliefs and intent in this matter are clear.

One way to do this could be to include within any new and updated REL17 TR and TS, a statement to the effect that the document is intended to be inclusive and non-discriminatory, but where reference to legacy specifications or other references inside or outside of 3GPP exist no offence is implied or intended and a reference to a clear and accessible 3GPP public policy notice on inclusive and neutral language is made."

This proposal would mean that we do not need to update specifications which do not get a technical CR for Rel-17 approved (such as the GSM/UMTS specifications), on the other hand different specifications may use different terms for the same thing which could be confusing. The moderator is keen to know what companies think of this proposal.

Feedback Form 8: Q8: What is your view on Xiaomi's proposal as an alternative to have CRs to GSM/UMTS specifications? What are the benefits and drawbacks?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	I think this is a good proposal ! This should be applied to any GSM or UMTS specification (25.xxx and 44./45.xxx series) under 3GPP RAN responsibility.
2	Nokia Corporation	This is an interesting proposal that might work well so we would be supportive of at least considering this. Just to see if we understand this correctly: So would e.g. any LTE/NR Rel-17 specification that gets a CR be amended with such a statement? If so, only specifications that do get technical CRs will be amended like this (i.e. only active specifications get changed). The benefit is that we have a "simple" way to mark the use, whereas the downside is that there will be inconsistency between specifications.
3	Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.	This is a good solution to avoid unnecessary work for GSM/UTRA specs. Agree with Nokia about the downside of this solution but we should strive for a pragmatic solution.

Item	Company	Comments
4	Ericsson LM	While we can understand the benefits of the proposal, we think it would be better to improve all specifications instead. This note could be interpreted that 3GPP would be too lazy to update all their specifications. Other drawbacks of this proposal is that this text has to be very carefully crafted which would also take time. Finally we are not aware of a 3GPP public policy of inclusive and neutral language. If such policy does not exist, developing it would also incur a cost.
5	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	1 - If we were to go with such an approach I think it would be important that we align with CT/SA - it should not be a RAN only decision. 2 - In general I think we should be careful with adopting an approach like this for 3GPP's own specifications. It could create the impression that 3GPP could only be bothered to do half of the job. Repeating my earlier comment, I think that if we see it is important to upgrade these specs to Rel-17 then we should do this work.
6	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	As mentioned above we saw this as a way to address workload, ensure consistency (things are missed, unintentionally) and build in an element of forwards compatibility (the world changes). But acknowledge it should not be used as an excuse to avoid doing things right where within reasonable effort it is possible to achieve. We do not see it as a way to avoid updating current and active specifications. Use of a reference statement in active and updated specification in my thinking could be limited to the application and use of cited references within the document. Changes as proposed should be applied, there is no excuse for doing the right thing.
7	ZTE Corporation	Agree with Intel's comments. If there is an overall SA/RAN/CT decision to upgrade GSM and UTRA specs to Rel-17 to handle the inclusive language aspect, then we should do the real work.
8	InterDigital Germany GmbH	agree with Intel
9	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	same view as DT

Deutsche Telekom wonders about renaming Information Elements in ASN.1. They argue that it could have unwanted side effects on e.g. OAM systems and want RAN to really think about the consequences of renaming Information Elements in ASN.1. The moderator recalls that this was discussed during RAN#90, but it does not seem it made it in to the endorsed document RP-202179, at least not explicitly. The moderator would like to know what companies think of this.

Feedback Form 9: Q9: What should be done with Information Elements (and other programmatic components) in ASN.1 which have non-inclusive language?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Ericsson LM	[RAN3 Chairman here] since the beginning of this discussion among WG officers a few months ago, the assumption has always been that we should not touch IE names, ASN.1 and/or xml parts of specifications. We should not revisit this assumption now.
2	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom fully agrees with the RAN3 chairman view here ! (and did in the past).
3	Nokia Corporation	[RAN2 VC here] Just to note that the RAN2 RRC CRs on inclusive language **did** modify also field and IE names but this was not seen a problem when the CRs were endorsed (there were also a substantial number of references to those, that's why it was done).
4	Ericsson LM	We also recognize that the RAN2 RRC CRs included changes to ASN.1 code. One of the benefits in doing so is that we would use the same terminology in e.g. procedure text as field names. We think this makes the specification easier to understand.
5	Deutsche Telekom AG	We repeat our earlier comment: We do **not agree on modification of IE/ASN.1** inline with the agreement quoted by the RAN3 Chairman. See guidance from RP-202179 "a. The changes shall only be done if they are of purely editorial nature and does not lead to any backward incompatibility." Just checked: CT4 keeps the IE names and adds for example # PRHIBITED as a comment after BLACKLISTED
6	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Given that there were no concerns raised over this in the RAN2 discussion, we have no concern with modifying the ASN.1 names. In general, we feel that the modifying these names does make it easier to read the spec. It should also be noted that in a spec like RRC nearly all usages of the non-inclusive terminology is in ASN.1 field names and someone looking at the Rel-17 version of this spec could easily come to the conclusion that 3GPP has does nothing to address this issue.
7	TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.	Do not touch ASN.1!!!!!!
8	Nokia Corporation	One comment on ASN.1: Changing the name of IE or field in ASN.1 does NOT impact the ASN.1 encoding or decoding in any way if done correctly. It's understandable that such changes are desirable to avoid due to other reasons, though, but name changes do not create any NBC changes *per se*.

Item	Company	Comments
9	Deutsche Telekom AG	To Nokia; But it might have an impact on the other systems which decode the ASN.1 message and use the ASN.1 names for further processing ... OAM, PlanningTools, Network Optimisers as planning databases are just examples ...

Vodafone argued for updating Rel-16 specifications in June 2021. The moderator thinks this goes against the endorsed contribution RP-202179 which states: "Once the changes to Rel-17 and later release specifications are done it is still possible to discuss whether related changes should be applied also to earlier releases.". Nevertheless, new agreements can always be made and the moderator is keen to know how companies think specifications of earlier releases should be handled.

Feedback Form 10: Q10: What should be done with specifications with non-inclusive language in Rel-16 and earlier?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	See our comments in the above submissions ...
2	Motorola Mobility UK Ltd.	We should be pragmatic and not overload ourselves with extra work. So, updating the specs from R17 onwards is sufficient.
3	Ericsson LM	We think it is not urgent to resolve this now. The current focus should be on creating Rel-17 versions with inclusive language, as was discussed in RAN#90.
4	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	We would be open to considering Rel-16 as well once we have all the CRs for Rel-17, by I acknowledge the reluctance of others to go this way. As with some other aspects, this needs to be a cross 3GPP decision and hence coordinated with SA/CT.
5	ZTE Corporation	We prefer to stick to earlier decisions at RAN#90 and introduce inclusive language from Rel-17.
6	InterDigital Germany GmbH	Stay with earlier decision and do R17 only - at least right now.
7	VODAFONE Group Plc	Updating R16 specs in June 2021 remains the least effort for 3GPP and has the most beneficial impact.

It is important to coordinate and align with SA and CT, and this was also raised in the initial round. The moderator thinks we can send an LS to them to keep them updated.

Feedback Form 11: Q11: Should an LS be sent to SA and CT to keep them updated of our progress?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	We do not see a need for this. The RAN chair can simply put this in the de-briefing slides for SA

Item	Company	Comments
2	Nokia Corporation	RAN2 sent one LS to CT1 and SA to inform them of the terminology agreed in RAN2 to ensure alignment. Unless changes are done to that, new LSs are likely not needed.
3	Ericsson LM	We disagree with the proposal from the moderator. The proposal from DT should be sufficient, and Nokia has a point too. That said we think it is important to align with SA and CT, for example how to deal with older specifications.
4	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	Clear communication is always desirable and SA and CT should be aware of our decisions. For now a RAN chair report may suffice, but if we make changes to our process a LS to formalise the decision and make clear as a reference for others would be better.
5	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	It is essential that aspects of this discussion are coordinated with SA/CT. I'm ok for this to be done directly by the chair rather then LS.
6	InterDigital Germany GmbH	RAN chair report is sufficient
7	VODAFONE Group Plc	SA discussion shows some alignment on CSG list terminology is needed with RAN

Any other feedback?

Feedback Form 12: Q12: Any other feedback?

Item	Company	Comments

3.1 Summary from intermediate round

From Questions 5 and 8 the moderator notes there are almost even split between companies wanting and not wanting to update the GSM/UMTS specifications. Taking the different arguments into account the moderator thinks from an outside perspective it might be perceived that 3GPP is not really committed to correcting non-inclusive language. Also, the reason why some specifications are inclusive and others not may appear arbitrary. But the moderator notes that this will require more work. The moderator acknowledges that this decision must be coordinated with SA and CT.

From Questions 6 and 7 the moderator would like to thank DT for the suggestion to use the non-affiliated search engine http://3gpp.guru.

In Question 9 the topic of modifying ASN.1 names (fields, IEs, etc) was discussed. The moderator notes there were strong opinions from two operators against changing ASN.1 names, two vendors argued it should be done and one vendor being more neutral providing insights that modifying ASN.1 names are not non-backwards compatible. The moderator notes that changing the ASN.1 names may have more impact on support systems e.g. OAM, Planning tools, and network optimizers. As one operator explicitly stated they do not agree modifications to ASN.1 names, the moderator notes there is no consensus to make these changes.

From Question 10 the moderator concludes the support to address earlier Releases than Rel-17 is limited and suggests to continue with Rel-17 as decided at RAN#90. Correcting earlier releases can be discussed once Rel-17 is completed.

From Question 11 the moderator notes there is no support to send an LS. Instead we task the RAN chairman to inform SA and CT.

Conclusion from intermediate round:

*** RAN will correct all specifications with non-inclusive language (i.e. including GSM/UMTS specifications), pending confirmation with SA and CT.**

*** The non-affiliated search engine http://3gpp.guru can be used to search in all 3GPP specifications for non-inclusive language.**

*** RAN can address earlier releases once Rel-17 is completed.**

*** RAN chairman is tasked to inform SA and CT about the conclusions made in RAN.**

4 Fine-tuning round

The moderator thinks the issue of updating ASN.1 names cannot be concluded in this meeting.

The moderator proposes:

- Postpone the issue on updating ASN.1 names to next plenary, as there is no immediate urgency.

- Urge companies to investigate any drawbacks of updating ASN.1 names to be more inclusive. Focus should lie on support systems and similar, as the impact on specifications and interfaces is fairly well known.

Feedback Form 13: Q13: Thoughts on the moderator proposal in the fine-tuning round?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	Deutsche Telekom: We do not see to keep this discussion open. ASN.1/IE names shall not be updated. This is inline with the guidance from SA/CT/RAN in RP-202179 and related discussions, the understaning of the RAN3 Chairman, the desires of operators in this thread and the practise in other groups (ref. CT4)

Item	Company	Comments
2	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	We are ok with the conclusions from he moderator and the proposal for the fine tuning round. Regarding the ASN.1/IE name topic, the previous endorsed document RP202179 stated "The changes shall only be done if they are of purely editorial nature and does not lead to any backward incompatibility". It has been explained in this discussion that changing the ASN.1 names does not affect backwards compatibility on the radio interface. What has also been explained in this meeting is that changing those names might have compatibility impacts on other tools that might rely on the ASN.1. Given this, I think the moderators proposal to allow more time for people to consider the impacts to these other tools is a reasonable one.
3	InterDigital Germany GmbH	We support the moderator's proposal, including the continuation of the ASN discussion.

Feedback Form 14: Q14: Any other feedback?

Item	Company	Comments
1	Deutsche Telekom AG	On Conclusions: "**RAN will correct all specifications with non-inclusive language (i.e. including GSM/UMTS specifications), pending confirmation with SA and CT.**" I don't think that this has been concluded as part of this week's discussion.
2	HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.	[Huawei, HiSilicon] Thanks you Mats, it sound all good. Maybe only one small rewording needed: **RAN can address earlier releases once Rel-17 is completed.** should be worded: **RAN can consider addressing earlier releases once Rel-17 is completed.** to better reflect the feedbacks expressed in the discussion.
3	Ericsson LM	[Moderator] To DT: I have informed the chairman about these agreements, but I guess it is likely we will not get a final reply from SA/CT during this week. To Huawei: That is a good proposal. I received other suggestions for minor updates to make it clear in which context the proposals are made, e.g. "**Approve all Rel-17 CRs together at RAN#95**" –> "**Approve all Rel-17 Inclusive language CRs for specifications with no technical CRs together at RAN#95**", as per earlier agreements it is clear that for specifications with technical CRs, then the Inclusive language CR will be agreed when the Rel-17 version is created. Although this might be obvious to everyone involved in the discussion, it might help others.
4	Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd	Regarding GSM/UMTS specs, I am ok with what the moderator has proposed as a conclusion. But in my mind the most important aspect here is the triggering of a 3GPP wide discussion (i.e. RAN/SA/CT) on what to do with these. On Rel-16 aspect, I would be ok with the rewording suggested by Huawei.

Item	Company	Comments
5	Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software	It still seems we do not have a full handle on the scope of what changes to GSM/UMTS may entail and whether updating these will in fact be practical in terms of inter dependency between specifications and how many releases we go back to? Close coordination across RAN WGs and with SA and CT TSGs remains essential in order to avoid miss-aligned changes and decisions. I hope it is clear however we are and remain committed to inclusivity and the use of inclusive language.

4.1 Summary from fine-tuning round

The moderator notes that the issue on updating ASN.1 names cannot be resolved in this discussion. It seems working groups in 3GPP have taken different decisions, which is unfortunate, as coordination across 3GPP is very important on this matter. The moderator makes no proposal on this matter, but would like to urge companies to think about the consequences of updating versus not updating ASN.1 names, in particular in relation to impacted support systems. As with any other topic, the discussion could continue at next plenary based on company contributions.

5 Conclusions

After fine-tuning, and some e-mail discussion on the RAN reflector, the following is the way forward for work on inclusive language for GSM/UMTS specifications which likely will not have any technical CRs approved to create Rel-17 versions. The moderator also concludes that the input documents to this discussion must be postponed.

*** Approve all Rel-17 Inclusive language CRs at the Rel-17 functional freeze (RAN#95).**

*** A Rel-17 CR for inclusive language for these specifications shall be submitted to RAN#94 for information and review, and then to RAN#95 for approval.**

*** RAN will correct all GSM/UMTS specifications with non-inclusive language if SA and CT also do so for their corresponding specifications. Hence this is pending confirmation with SA and CT.**

*** The non-affiliated search engine http://3gpp.guru can be used to search in all 3GPP specifications for non-inclusive language.**

*** RAN can consider addressing earlier releases once Rel-17 is completed.**

*** RAN chairman is tasked to inform SA and CT about the conclusions made in RAN.**

*** The following documents are postponed: RP-210333, RP-210334, RP-210335, and RP-210336.**

*** Changes to inclusive language in 3GPP specification shall be done in cross-TSG consistent way in terms of which set of specs to be updated (GSM/UMTS/LTE/5G) in which way (individual changes/general statement), at what occasion (creation of**

Rel-17) and how changes to Information Element (IE) and ASN.1 names are handled (changed, kept but note added etc).

*** RAN WGs shall not decide it self on the way how changes are done.**