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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT113-e][201][Inclusive] Inclusive language CRs (Nokia)

Scope:

* + - Determine affected RAN2 specifications and decide on terminology used
		- Check CRs according to agreed terminology for each required specification

 Intended outcome:

* + - Discussion summary in [R2-2101961](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101961.zip) (by email rapporteur).
		- Endorsed CRs (by each affected 36.xxx/38.xxx specification rapporteur)

 Deadline for providing comments, for rapporteur inputs, conclusions and CR finalization:

* + - Deadline for companies' feedback: Thursday morning 1st week
		- Deadline for rapporteur's summary: Thursday evening 1st week (8h after the initial deadline)
		- Deadline for endorsed CRs: Thursday morning 2nd week

# 2 Background

TSG SA# 90-e has endorsed a proposal to use more inclusive and neutral language in all 3GPP specifications [[SP-201042](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/TSG_SA/TSGs_90E_Electronic/Docs/SP-201042.zip)]. TSG SA#90-e has also approved a CR that introduces an Annex into the 3GPP TR 21.801 that lists all non-inclusive terminology to be replaced [[SP-201142](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/TSG_SA/TSGs_90E_Electronic/Docs/SP-201142.zip)].

# 3 Process

[R2-2100691](file:///C%3A%5Cevutukuri%5Cwork%5C5G%5CRAN2%5Cdocs%5CR2-2100691.zip) suggests the following in order to incorporate inclusive language into RAN2 specifications:

1. As long as Rel-17 specifications are not created for other purposes, the CRs on inclusive language should be updated and submitted as draft CRs for information at every meeting.

2. The CRs on inclusive language are Category D CRs, issued under TEI17 and using “Inclusive Language Review” as title.

NOTE: The two last points were mentioned in SP-201042/RP-202179 but not in the first one.

**Question 1**: Do companies agree that as long as Rel-17 specifications are not created for other purposes, the CRs on inclusive language should be updated and submitted as draft CRs for information at every meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| ZTE | Yes in general | To reduce the work load for the rapporteur of these CRs, perhaps, it is also okay to technically approve the CRs and only resubmit the CRs with the correct content once the new version of the spec is created (i.e. no need to resubmit it to every meeting unless there is change in contents)?Perhaps one thing to also keep in mind is that there would be running Rel-17 CRs which might impact/include this terminology (as they will be based on the existing baseline), but best to leave this to the rapporteurs of these CRs for now and clean-up those running CRs at the end (if needed).  |
| Ericsson | Yes, but... | In principle the CRs should be resubmitted and endorsed at each meeting, but ZTE makes a good point that we can be pragmatic and maybe only submit them if there are any changes (e.g. alignment to terminology in other CRs) or when it is time to formally agree to the CRs.We can accept to submit them as draft CRs at every meeting if that is the view from other companies. |
| Nokia | Yes | Good points from ZTE. |
| Lenovo | No | We share the comments from ZTE. It’s sufficient to technically endorse the CRs in this meeting and save unnecessary work in view of the R17 timeline. R17 specs may be available in Q4 2020 at the earliest (for stage 2).* Stage 2 freeze: June 2021
* Stage 3 freeze: March 2022
* ASN.1 freeze: June 2022
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | RAN plenary has agreed the following process:* “WGs are encouraged to ask the rapporteurs of the relevant specifications to produce draft CRs for the terminology changes by March/2021. The formal approval of the terminology CR for each spec will be undertaken together with the first Rel-17 technical CR for that spec.”

Hence, we think the CRs for the impacted specifications can be submitted for information to RAN#91 and then be updated once for the formal approval before submission to RAN plenary when the first set of RAN2 Rel-17 specifications is to be approved. We do not see the reason to resubmit and recheck them for every meeting between now and then as the required updates will be anyway none or minimal once we agree on the terminology to use. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

**Question 2**: Do companies agree that the CRs on inclusive language are Category D CRs, issued under TEI17 and using “Inclusive Language Review” as title.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Questions: 1. Do we need to list "other specs affected" in on the cover sheet? Seems like a huge hassle with limited gain.2. Should we align more things on the cover sheet? E.g. reason for change, summary of changes? |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Other than what Ericsson raised, it would be good to add specifications number to the title as well, i.e. “Inclusive Language Review for TS 38.xxx”. Although the TS number can be derived from other Tdoc parameters, this is helpful in quickly identifying the proper Tdoc. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

# 4 Terminology

The suggested terms from SA can be found in [SP-201042](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/TSG_SA/TSGs_90E_Electronic/Docs/SP-201042.zip) and [SP-201142](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_sa/TSG_SA/TSGs_90E_Electronic/Docs/SP-201142.zip):

Table Z.1: Non-inclusive terms and alternatives

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Non-inclusive term | Examples of alternative terms |
| **master** (when used in "master / slave" context) | primary, controller, main |
| **slave** | secondary, standby |
| **white list** (NOTE) | allow list, accept list |
| **black list** (NOTE) | block list, drop list, forbidden list |
| **grey list** (a term which has been used in conjunction with white list and black list) should be replaced with e.g. track list, inspect list (NOTE). |
| **NOTE:** **i**ncluding single word and hyphenated versions. |

Unfortunately, neither RAN, nor SA has agreed fixed terms for the new terminology and for consistency across RAN specifications, it is important to agree one first. Two discussion papers were submitted to this meeting ([R2-2100691](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100691.zip) & [R2-2101472](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101472.zip)), each bringing some arguments forward:

- When possible, using terms that do not require changing acronyms is beneficial.

- Regarding the *master*/*slave* terminology, only when the term *master* is used in conjunction with *slave* it should be replaced. Indeed, as explained in SP-201042/RP-202179, *the terms "master"/"secondary", as used in the context of Dual Connectivity in multiple RAN specifications and across the industry are not intended to be replaced*. Similarly, the master information block can be kept as such.

- The terms *allow*, *accept*, *block*, *drop* seem to be more appropriate for use in some kind of admission control context and do not fit well with the RAN2 usage in measurement reporting and cell reselection.

- In Rel-8 RAN2 had originally used the term *Allowed CSG list* but this was changed to *CSG whitelist* in Rel-9 when CT1 introduced the 2 separate lists at the NAS level.

**Question 3**: any comments or additions to the high level arguments related to the inclusive terminology?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 3 |
| Company | Comments |
| ZTE | Agree that it would be good to keep the acronyms unchanged if possible.  |
| Ericsson | No comments. It seems additional questions go into more detail. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

Several alternatives to *white* were suggested and *allow* seems to be favoured by a small majority in the submitted contributions to this meeting from Ericsson, Intel and Nokia.

**Question 4**: are companies happy with adopting the term *allow-list* or *allowed-list* instead of *whitelist*?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes | *allowed-list* seems better (grammatically) |
| Ericsson | Yes | We would prefer "allow-list" over "allowed-list" as the latter could be confused with a list which itself is permissible (an allowed list). But we are happy for more input also. |
| Nokia | Yes | Slight preference for *allow-list* |
| Lenovo | Yes | Slight preference for “allow-list”.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Allow-list is our preference for the same reason as mentioned by Ericsson. For CSG whitelist, we can use Permitted CSG list as suggested by Intel in their paper, so that we avoid confusion with Allowed CSG list defined by CT1. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**: TBD.

**Proposal 4**: TBD.

Several alternatives to *black* were suggested and *excluded* seems to be favoured by a small majority in the submitted contributions to this meeting from Ericsson, Intel and Nokia.

**Question 5**: are companies happy with adopting the term *exclude-list* or *excluded-list* instead of *blacklist*?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 5 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes | *excluded-list* seems better (grammatically) |
| Ericsson | Yes | Our comment above fits here too. |
| Nokia | Yes | Slight preference for *exclude-list* |
| Lenovo | Yes | Slight preference for “exclude-list”. The term “block” is used in the context of SIB and SSB, so it may give a wrong impression if it would be also used for lists. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Exclude-list is our preference. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**: TBD.

**Proposal 5**: TBD.

While *whitelisted* and *blacklisted* are obvious references to the concepts of *whitelists* and *blacklists* respectively, using generic terms such as *allowed* and *excluded* leaves the door open to multiple interpretations. Indeed, a cell can be *allowed* from many angles. We would therefore always need to either refer to the list a cell belongs to i.e. *a cell belonging to the allow-lis*t instead of *whitelisted cell*, or neologise and use e.g. *allow-listed*.

**Question 6**: do companies agree that we cannot simply use *allowed cell* and *excluded cell* to replace *whitelisted* and *blacklisted* and that we should either always refer to the list the cell belongs to, or introduce new terms such as *allow-listed* and *exclude-listed*?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 6 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| ZTE | No strong view | We think allowed cell and excluded cell are also fine (if needed we can define these terms – e.g. allowed cell: A cell included in the *allowed-list* of cells etc).  |
| Ericsson | Yes | The rapporteur brings up a valuable point. The proposed terms have a wider scope than whitelist/blacklist. It is something to consider. Do we have any examples we could work on during the meeting? |
| Nokia | Yes | Introducing new definitions of these commonly used words - as ZTE suggests - would impact the existing occurrences of those terms and is not desirable. It seems straightforward to simply replace *whitelisted* by *allow-listed* and *blacklisted* by *exclude-listed* instead. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We should avoid ambiguities in the description of the specifications. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For specifications clarity, it is better to use “allow/exclude-listed” or “cells in a xxx list”. The terms “allowed cells” or “excluded cells”, when used in the context, should not be problematic, but it will be hard to ensure that the terms are not used in the more general meaning in some places of the specifications.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**: TBD.

**Proposal 6**: TBD.

# 3 Conclusion

TBD

# Annex – Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Benoist Sébire | benoist.sebire@nokia.com |
| ZTE | Eswar Vutukuri | eswar.vutukuri@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Mats Folke | mats.folke@ericsson.com |
| Lenovo | Hyung-Nam Choi | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
| Huawei | Dawid Koziol | dawid.koziol@huawei.com  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Annex – RAN2 Specifications

The list of all 3GPP specifications falling under RAN2 responsibility is summarized in the table below [[source](https://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/TSG-WG--R2.htm)]:

| **Number** | **Title** | **Rapporteur** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TR 30.302 | 1.28 Mcps TDD enhanced uplink: RAN WG2 Stage 2 decisions | Mrs. Quan, Haiyang |
| TS 34.109 | Terminal logical test interface; Special conformance testing functions | Ms. Eklof, Cecilia |
| TS 36.300 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA) and Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN); Overall description; Stage 2 | Mr. Henttonen, Tero |
| TS 36.302 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Services provided by the physical layer | Ms. Wu, Chunli |
| TS 36.304 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); User Equipment (UE) procedures in idle mode | Mr. Koskela, Jarkko |
| TS 36.305 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN); Stage 2 functional specification of User Equipment (UE) positioning in E-UTRAN | Mr. Kitazoe, Masato |
| TS 36.306 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); User Equipment (UE) radio access capabilities | Mr. Kuchibhotla, Ravi |
| TS 36.314 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Layer 2 - Measurements | Mr. Chen, Jun |
| TS 36.321 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Medium Access Control (MAC) protocol specification | Mr. Folke, Mats |
| TS 36.322 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Radio Link Control (RLC) protocol specification | Mr. Harada, Kouhei |
| TS 36.323 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Packet Data Convergence Protocol (PDCP) specification | Mr. Yi, SeungJune |
| TS 36.331 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Radio Resource Control (RRC); Protocol specification | Dr. Jin, Seungri |
| TS 36.355 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); LTE Positioning Protocol (LPP) | Mr. Kitazoe, Masato |
| TS 36.360 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); LTE-WLAN Aggregation Adaptation Protocol (LWAAP) specification | Mr. Yi, SeungJune |
| TS 36.361 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); LTE-WLAN Radio Level Integration Using Ipsec Tunnel (LWIP) encapsulation; Protocol specification | Mr. Henttonen, Tero |
| TR 36.743 | Enhanced Multimedia Broadcast/Multicast (eMBMS) enhancements for LTE | Mr. Huschke, Joerg |
| TR 36.746 | Study on further enhancements to LTE Device to Device (D2D), UE to network relays for Internet of Things (IoT) and wearables | Mr. Lee, Jaewook |
| TR 36.750 | Study on Voice and Video Enhancement for LTE | Mr. Chen, Zhuo |
| TR 36.754 | Study on Uplink (UL) data compression in LTE | Dr. Worrall, Chandrika |
| TR 36.777 | Enhanced LTE support for aerial vehicles | Miss Hapsari, Wuri |
| TR 36.805 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Study on minimization of drive-tests in next generation networks | Mr. Kitazoe, Masato |
| TR 36.806 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Relay architectures for E-UTRA (LTE-Advanced) | Mr. Stattin, Magnus |
| TR 36.816 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Study on signalling and procedure for interference avoidance for in-device coexistence | Dr. Hu, Zhenping |
| TR 36.822 | LTE Radio Access Network (RAN) enhancements for diverse data applications | Mr. Young, Gordon |
| TR 36.839 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Mobility enhancements in heterogeneous networks | Dr. Palat, Sudeep |
| TR 36.842 | Study on Small Cell enhancements for E-UTRA and E-UTRAN; Higher layer aspects | Mr. Takahashi, Hideaki |
| TR 36.848 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN); Study on smart congestion mitigation | Mr. Lee, Youngdae |
| TR 36.868 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Study on group communication for E-UTRA | Dr. Worrall, Chandrika |
| TR 36.880 | Study on further enhancements of Minimization of Drive Tests (MDT) for E-UTRAN | Mr. Hu, Nan |
| TR 36.881 | Study on latency reduction techniques for LTE | Mr. Enbuske, Henrik |
| TR 36.890 | Study on Support of single-cell point-to-multipoint transmission in LTE | Mr. Gao, Jeff |
| TR 36.938 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN); Improved network controlled mobility between E-UTRAN and 3GPP2/mobile WiMAX radio technologies | Mr. Bi, Hao |
| TS 37.320 | Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (UTRA) and Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Radio measurement collection for Minimization of Drive Tests (MDT); Overall description; Stage 2 | Mrs. Tomala, Malgorzata |
| TS 37.324 | Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA) and NR; Service Data Adaptation Protocol (SDAP) specification | Mr. Bi, Hao |
| TS 37.340 | NR; Multi-connectivity; Overall description; Stage-2 | Mr. Parolari, Sergio |
| TS 37.355 | LTE Positioning Protocol (LPP) | Mr. Kitazoe, Masato |
| TR 37.834 | Study on Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) - 3GPP radio interworking | Mr. Sirotkin, Sasha |
| TR 37.868 | RAN Improvements for Machine-type Communications | Mr. Gao, Jeff |
| TR 37.869 | Study on enhancements to Machine-Type Communications (MTC) and other mobile data applications; Radio Access Network (RAN) aspects | Mr. Parolari, Sergio |
| TR 37.873 | Study on optimizations of UE radio capability signalling; NR / Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access Network (E-UTRAN) aspects | Dr. Hsu, Alex |
| TS 38.300 | NR; NR and NG-RAN Overall description; Stage-2 | Mr. SEBIRE, Benoist |
| TS 38.304 | NR; User Equipment (UE) procedures in idle mode and in RRC Inactive state | Dr. Ozturk, Ozcan |
| TS 38.305 | NG Radio Access Network (NG-RAN); Stage 2 functional specification of User Equipment (UE) positioning in NG-RAN | Dr. Fischer, Sven |
| TS 38.306 | NR; User Equipment (UE) radio access capabilities | Mr. Lim, Seau Sian |
| TS 38.314 | NR; Layer 2 measurements | Mr. Chen, Ningyu |
| TS 38.321 | NR; Medium Access Control (MAC) protocol specification | Mr. Jang, Jaehyuk |
| TS 38.322 | NR; Radio Link Control (RLC) protocol specification | Ms. Zhang, Yuanyuan |
| TS 38.323 | NR; Packet Data Convergence Protocol (PDCP) specification | Mr. Yi, SeungJune |
| TS 38.331 | NR; Radio Resource Control (RRC); Protocol specification | Mr. Palm, Hakan |
| TS 38.340 | NR; Backhaul Adaptation Protocol (BAP) specification | Dr. Cao, Zhenzhen |
| TR 38.804 | Study on new radio access technology Radio interface protocol aspects | Mr. Takahashi, Hideaki |
| TR 38.822 | NR; User Equipment (UE) feature list | Mr. Takahashi, Hideaki |
| TR 38.825 | Study on NR industrial Internet of Things (IoT) | Mr. Koziol, Dawid |
| TR 38.832 | Study on enhancement of Radio Access Network (RAN) slicing for NR | Mr. Chen, Ningyu |
| TR 38.836 | Study on NR sidelink relay | Dr. Lu, Qianxi |
| TR 38.874 | NR; Study on integrated access and backhaul | Dr. Hampel, Georg |