

**Internet2 New Network Advisory Structure Group
Conference Call, July 6 – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

In the call:

Paul Schopis (OARNET)
James Deaton (OneNet)
Ray Ford (Univ Montana)
Mark Johnson (NCREN)
Michael Krugman (Boston Univ)
Greg Palmer (MAGPI)
Garret Yoshimi (Univ Hawaii)
Peter O'Neil (NCAR)
Ana Preston (Internet2)
Rick Summerhill (Internet2)

New Action Items:

ACTION 1: based on input and discussion, Paul offered to alter the strawman. He will circulate to all and will also start articulating some draft language on what has been discussed. He will send prior to the next call.

ACTION 2: Ana to include an update from Internet2 exec staff on status and timeline of changes and process taking place with Internet2 wider advisory structure. Will ask Laurie Burns to join next call and provide this update or get someone to do this.

No pending action items from last call.

Notes/Minutes from call:

Paul opened meeting by reviewing email sent that alluded to what possible milestones need to be met to deliver recommendations by August 1st. Group consensus that timeline suggested was reasonable.

Some discussion on following attractive IETF "model." While there are some very formal aspects to process in place, agreement that the structure and framework, open communication seemed appropriate to emulate. Shows openness, acknowledging the "great unknown" and being flexible/adaptable throughout the process(es).

Discussion around revised strawman. Group in agreement in who the Network Advisory Group (NAG) was position in relation to the other areas in the diagram

Discussion around the review process/how to bring up issues/ideas and recommendations into NAG. How to make the process inclusive. Some suggestions were discussed about putting something like a RFC quasi-type of process. Like the idea that one could submit in writing a brief description of a problem/issue. Issues, challenges, something related to the new network could be submitted – could be then be put into a form/forum/mechanism by which then the community has an opportunity to comment on it. There's then a sense of feeling engaged, involvement. This should be something that we/NAG should try to emulate. Process is open and inclusive IETF has process by which draft is reviewed – some of which may not have any merit nor are they of interest. Before putting out there, documents have to pass some kind of preliminary review ('triaging') and then put out there for the community.

Question was asked if the group thought that these type of submissions/ideas should they be reviewed by the NAG first or an area director (Internet2) and brought to the NAG? Someone could have an idea at any level – write it/talk to say Rick (area director) and then he brings up to the NAG? For the technical stuff, group would want to make sure that the community gets to comment.

Suggestion that on strawman diagram that the “review” box (i.e. review process) is placed within the NAG group. NAG has responsibility to manage the process.

Process should have something to do with sponsorship. Way to get away from random idea – things that may not have a lot of merit, but many would. Maybe more than one individual agrees to it and then it places/brings up for consideration by the NAG.

Rick brought example within HOPI: within HOPI, a proposal may come from a network researcher (may be preceded with some discussion before hand) but essentially proposal is put to the consideration of the HOPI design team. Network researcher/proposer puts a quick paper/submission on what work is being proposed. HOPI design team then reviews and decides collectively to give the green light. For New Network, could have similar scenario – idea/submission is passed to the NAG. There’s minimal formality but just enough.

Discussed that want to make sure that all submitted “ideas” are followed up. Importance of following up even if it is minimally by an acknowledgement or official response made by the NAG.

Process entails an informal level of checks and balances – have more kind of a traditional process. Opportunity to do something that has very little bureaucracy to it. Can add more “process” if it is something that may involve more effort. Sponsorship → one of the functional directors could be the “entity” / impact assessment or something of the sort (level of effort or impact)

For informational RFCs there is not a lot of review that takes place. NAG could have a process that entails a draft that gets submitted; is reviewed by the NAG and if it looks good, then it is thrown back to the community for input and comments. It sits out there for some period of time (or can be case by case basis) depending on feedback. NAG then could decide to push forward or back. Set period of time to review and get comments. Someone in the community may have things to add that nobody thought of. Group consensus about not wanting for things to drag on indefinitely – more about how you can come up with an idea and then how it gets presented.

Importance of being transparent while “avoiding using sledgehammer to kill a fly”. Community involvement includes setting up a structure by which then, if a member(s) of the community wants to be involved, there is a way for feedback and participation. Community in turn needs to come back and get involved. It’s ok if they don’t take advantage of it at least the mechanism is there.

Mechanism is transparent – e.g. general announcement of interest – that people are made aware of this, that people know how to become involve and how – that may be sufficient.

Lightest amount of bureaucracy to be sufficient to make it work. Consensus on process that involves submitting a formal request, review is done by the NAG. If it passes the NAG “initial review” it is put somewhere out there where community has the opportunity to comment/ratify or if no one comments, NAG can decide to move forward. And work with functional are director to move forward

Ideas don’t necessarily need to spawn a new working groups – could be combined into other things. Can take advantage of groups that are currently in place. NAG can assign to other groups.

ACTION: based on input and discussion, Paul offered to alter the strawman. He will circulate to all and will also start articulating some draft language on what has been discussed.

Discussion around how working groups could be formed, or on what specialty areas. Within NAG, there may be some subgroups around specialty areas.

Preloading a few working groups – jump starting the process. Build the basic structure – not too formal on how the subcommittee may want to form/not be prescriptive. Suggest options for various subcommittees and what these may be.

Communication channels should be two ways → with advisory structure, with functional directors and with working groups and initiatives as necessary

Discussion on who/what criterion for selection for membership within NAG

From last call, recapped that we want to make sure we have technically strong people, technical innovators. Approach should be though that it is an open process.

Discussion on terms for NAG members. 3 year terms – 6 years (good turnover). There can be a year off. Provides opportunity to refresh/bring new ideas but also, this could help members exit gracefully. Three year terms, rotating, two term limits – if someone drops off – allow for provisional back fill of the position so that rotation stays intact. Group consensus on 3 year-terms. Can go for two consecutive terms; can go for another three but then take a year off.

How many nominations go? Filling the slots – responsibility of the nomination committee is to see if those nominated are willing to serve (gives an out) but also opportunity to get nominated and elected. Open process. Will continue discussion on next call.

Ana Preston mentioned that if the group was interested, next call could include a quick update from Internet2 on the status of the changes and timeline going on the wider advisory structure within Internet2. She alluded to the current call for nominations for the Governance and Nominations Committee. Encouraged NAG to contribute ideas (can send by email to govnomcomm@internet2.edu, talk to Internet2 staff, or use the wiki set up for this). NAG encouraged to suggest individually or as a group. Consensus that for next call would be good to have an update on this.

ACTION: Ana to get someone from Internet2 staff to do this and/or get an update on the next NAG call.

Next call: July 13, 4 p.m. EDT

NOTE: James Deaton and Mark Johnson will not be able to make it

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Preston