

**Internet2 New Network Advisory Structure Group
Conference Call, July 13 – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

In the call:

Paul Schopis (OARNET)
James Deaton (OneNet)
Michael Krugman (Boston Univ)
Greg Palmer (MAGPI)
Garret Yoshimi (Univ Hawaii)
Peter O'Neil (NCAR)
Greg Palmer (MAGPI)
Ben Colley (MOREnet)
Ana Preston (Internet2)
Barbara Nanzig (Internet2)

New Action Items:

ACTION 1: Chair to talk more during next call about make up of the NTAC – New Network Advisory Committee.

ACTION 2: Ana will take a first crack at coming up with the main points (outline) of for what could end up being the executive summary. Will work with chair to make sure main points are covered

No pending action items from last call.

Notes/Minutes from call:

Update on Governance and Nominations Committee and changes in broader Internet2 governance

Barbara Nanzig (Internet2) provided a quick update from Internet2 on the status of the changes and timeline going on the wider advisory structure within Internet2. Barb talked about the Nominations and Governance Committee that is being lead by Diana Natalicio (President, University Texas at El Paso). One of the group tasks is to provide recommendations on what Internet2 needs to address regarding issues in governance. One of the issues was/is broader representation of RONs and CIOs in Internet2 Advisory structure and governance. Barb provided some background on what lead to this effort. Issues identified when merger discussions were underway between Internet2 and NLR. Input continued to come in regarding modifications to governance structure of Internet2. Now formally effort formed to help address this. Call for nominations for the Governance and Nominations Committee went on through July 12. About 30 people nominated; expect group to eventually be sized to about 12 individuals, some thinking that roughly five will be from the Board. Advisory council chairs will sit in the group. Process still being defined on selection of members. Trying not to be too prescriptive here. Want to allow the membership (vs. Internet2 staff) to define process moving forward and how selection of members will take place. Anticipate that first meeting of this group may be next week; chair of this effort (Diana) will convene. Anticipate being able to have final selection and announcements by July 28. Would like to have recommendations and how group will be “looking” by Fall Internet2 meeting (early December 2006).

Definitely want this group to have Interaction with NAG. Recommendation that the NAG has direct communication with the Governance/Nominations group (G/N). Want direct participation of NAG group and relationship to the G/N group.

Ideas and recommendations can still be sent to govnomcomm@internet2.edu or talk to Internet2 staff. There's also a wiki set up.

Discussion on draft sent by Paul on where group currently stands on structure of group and processes

Comments from group included to desire to get more of the framework and outline better articulated first – before adding prose. Would like to come to an agreement on the overriding principles (and agree on them). Less language and more specifics – almost exec summary in nature – something that is digestible, and then go from there.

Suggestion to think about developing something like an executive summary. A one pager delineating the issues identified and what we recommend – articulating what we see as the critical principles. Then can start word smithing. More important to lay forth issues and then articulate further, Keeping it short, concise and understandable. Want to also avoid being overtly prescriptive. Identify the key essential elements (example was brought up on the development of the framework for the Group A report).

As August 1st deadline comes up, suggestion to also do a divide and conquer type of approach – volunteer an editor.

Succinct framework may just cover what was changed (or what should be changed) and what we recommend. What the relationships should be. If we run out of time, offer this as the skeleton back to Internet2 than then can get more thoroughly developed

Some discussion on the key outline of principles/things that this group sees as main issues and things that at least this group has agreed on:

1. Basic relationship between the New Network Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) and the other components of governance and functional areas. See Figure 2 from document that Paul sent around – in agreement that this figure does capture what we want.
2. Representation of the Internet2 community. All the stakeholders – the researchers, users, corporate members, etc → all that have a stake in this new network and how will input process will go. Determined that simple and something that emulates the IETF like process would be good. Specific recommendations which may entail how one can make a proposal to the group and how the process will go. See figure 3 from document that Paul sent around.
3. Relationship and communication channels that NTAC will have with other councils and with functional areas within Internet2. 2-way communication channels, also with working groups and initiatives.

Discussion around the type of communication that may be needed. One idea is to have a liaison type person or a voting member from each of the councils. Should those liaisons be members of the NTAC? Group consensus that b/c of volunteering and effort/time required this may be too much to ask. At minimum, consensus that what may just be needed is a mechanism in place that provides regular (or as needed) updates on what the issues are for them to make the decisions they need to make – any subcommittee in this structure should have the opportunity to request info from meetings – from all the different committees/councils

Some kind of regular status reporting and updates. NTAC should operate independently – mostly behind the scenes. Post meetings – anybody in the community should have access to the notes/minutes and major issues decided or to be decide by group.

Just as with community, want to promote engagement and be able to communicate things back to advisory councils, take what is being discussed, what being responded and/or resolved. Any formal decision that the NTAC makes could be shared with other

councils for comments or FYI, depending on issue/decision. Example of VoIP → technically very attractive – from policy may present issues – example with regulatory constraints may over power what may be technically doing. As a topic/theme could be something that the NAG could put up for comments – be recorded and be available. Anything substantive that is decided may need to be sent to the other councils – pushed but at minimal, some open medium to communicate/have info posted here

There is recognition that it is hard to ask people that are volunteering to play that liaison role. Need support on this from Internet2. This should be a common underlying framework that underpins all internet2 activities.

Regular communication channels (website, minutes, etc) – things get posted. Significant resolution gets communicated and all of those details
Internet2 should provide support (it's more than admin but rather supportive) to ensure that information is communicated and effectively and across the board. Somebody from Internet2 that can help shepherd this and make sure that it is done consistently. This support person/liaison can help keep track of things; work with group to make it happen – extent to what is formalized and done – procedures and what is done.

Would still have Internet2 Area director that would sit in that group. Group consensus that both area director and both admin support can help the group – can enable proper sensitivities and communication channels and work with group to make sure that the issues and follow up get properly deferred.

4. Make up of the NTAC. Should not be prescriptive. Understand that want representation from the community. Want to have people that know about what the technology is – want expertise in network engineering but also folks with expertise in applications (or other layers). Because of the complexity of the new network, would want to make sure, for example, that there are people in the NTAC with expertise in optical networking. Group can further define the make up of what it wants/needs. May just need to recommend some process here. Suggest a mechanism and highlight general desirable qualifications.

ACTION: Chair to talk more during next call about make up of the NTAC

ACTION: Ana will take a first crack at coming up with the main points (outline) of for what could end up being the executive summary. Will work with chair to make sure main points are covered

Next call: July 20, 4 p.m. EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Preston