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# 1 Decision/action requested

***Endorse the proposal and apply it at SA5#142e onwards***

# 2 References

-

# 3 Rationale

With the growing number of Rel-18 work/study items causing a high risk for unacceptable workload as in Rel-17 (causing stress and exhaustion for delegates and thereby also risk for lower quality output), we need a way to prioritise the work in a structured, democratic and transparent way that works for e-meetings. The proposal herein is based on the outcome of SA5 Leaders’ meeting discussions with the current and former SA chairs. Those discussions also involved consideration of using “Time Units” as in SA2, but we came to the conclusion that this would become a very complex and time-consuming process, whose usefulness for SA5 is likely quite low as it is impossible to control and monitor how much time is spent on each work/study item at every e-meeting.

# 4 Detailed proposal

Firstly, we recommend that the number of active work/study items is kept below 20 for OAM and below 10 for CH.

However, it is impossible to know what number of work/study items is the real “limit” for unacceptable workload, as this depends on the complexity/scope of the work items and how many active companies are driving each work item, both these factors highly affecting the number of contributions (and the complexity of them) to each meeting. Therefore we propose the following principles to be applied already from SA5#142e (mandatorily for OAM and optionally for CH), and evaluate how it works after a few meetings.

We ask all rapporteurs to “split” each (SA-approved) **WID/SID’s objectives** into **Work Packages (WoP)** (like SA2 has done with WTs for the TU discussions) - at least 2-3 for each WID/SID, but preferably more. Typically there can be one **WoP** for each “bullet” in the Objective and some sub-tasks under some of them if it makes sense, like **WoP** #1.1, **WoP** #1.2.

These **WoP** definitions could be documented in SA5-local revised WID/SIDs, no need to send them to SA for approval.

A proposal for the split of all SA-approved WID/SIDs from SA#94 and SA#95 into a complete set of WoPs in a revised (SA5-local) WID/SID should be proposed by each rapporteur to SA5#142e and agreed at SA5#142e.

Then we ask the rapporteurs to propose a subset of all WoPs to be recommended to the leaders to be put on the agenda for next meeting, which means that contributions to the meeting are only allowed to address the selected WTs. This proposed selection of subset of WoPs should be agreed at the end of every SA5 meeting, starting from SA5#142e, so that this agenda limitation is clear for everyone as base for producing contributions to next meeting.

How to select which subset of all WoPs to use for each meeting could be proposed by the rapporteur and decided case by case, but it should be a clear reduction compared to “all objectives” to have a real effect on the workload.

If the above WoP-reduction doesn’t work well, we can instead start splitting the agenda to take about half of the WI/SI at every second meeting like we did once in 2020.