

**Internet2 New Network Advisory Structure Group
Conference Call, July 20 – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

In the call:

Ben Colley (MOREnet)

Paul Schopis (OARNET)

Michael Krugman (Boston Univ)

Greg Palmer (MAGPI)

Garret Yoshimi (Univ Hawaii)

Peter O'Neil (NCAR)

Greg Palmer (MAGPI)

Ray Ford (Univ Montana)

Ana Preston (Internet2)

New Action Items:

ACTION 1: for next call, **please review document sent around and provide comments.**

ACTION 2: Peter offered to investigate on IETF RFC nomination process and get back to the group

ACTION 3: Paul offered to talk to Rick about initial working groups that may be recommended (in areas critical for new network infrastructure). May also discuss during next call.

No pending action items from last call.

Notes/Minutes from call:

Paul asked group for input on outline/points distributed by Ana earlier. Group had not been able to read.

ACTION 1: for next call, please review document sent around and provide comments.

Paul reported back on input received from Joint Techs meeting (he was asked to give an update on the discussions so far from the NAG group). Input from people in community included:

- Liaison role between NTAC and other advisory councils – in addition to Internet2 staff providing support, suggestion that a member(s) of the NTAC would also play liaison role as well.
 - o Discussion on issues around consistency – rolling liaison may not be conducive to consistency.
 - o Internet2 staff assigned to do this liaison – their job to do this. Make sure person(s) has the ability to understand the procedures, tools, and policy within structure and be able to communicate effectively and consistently. Facilitating role
 - o NAG should feel comfortable (and others should too) in requesting openly this from Internet2. We are stakeholders and need to be opened about this.
 - o Continuity and fluid communications → best served by person assigned to do this. May be difficult to assign to rolling NTAC liaison.
- Suggested that chair of the NTAC be a member of the community.

Paul mentioned conversation with Laurie Burns on suggestion that he send a quick email to the governance and nominations committee list – and try to articulate NTAC expectations for two-way communications. Awareness that NTAC will be a critical component and advisory body

Also, Paul reported on conversation with Cheryl Fremon on Internet2 hoping to have recommendations from this group (short list perhaps) on working groups that the NAG group may think it would be good to get going for new network (even as NTAC is getting formed and articulated).

Make up of NTAC

Discussion on NAG group wanted to make sure that there is the right balance and representation in terms of expertise and make up of the group, while avoiding being too prescriptive.

Make up of NTAC should encompass technical experts. Suggestion that we look at something like the ISO model and maybe suggest that at all layers, there is expertise represented.

Areas could include:

- Optical/Layer 1
- Switching/layer 2
- IP/routing
- Middleware
- Applications
- Security (added as another area that is important)

There should be balance and representation from members of the community. Example, on the IP/layer 3: would want network engineers that could represent GigaPoP community (expertise on this) but also, perhaps a person from a campus/university.

We may suggest a range for numbers of members (NTAC). Could be no less than 12. Suggest that we provide a range that may also provide flexibility for the final make up of the NTAC

NTAC can identify subject matter experts. If one particular area is deemed important (other than those suggested already), NTAC can request/seek out that subject matter expert

During self-organizational phase, NTAC can further identify and specify areas. If one particular one cannot be filled, one idea could be that the NTAC charters a working group.

What may the guidelines for nominations for NTAC members be like?

Question about whether nominations should be something that the NTAC should do or work with for example, the standing nominations/governance committee being set up?

Discussion about pros and cons of each. While centralizing this function may be a good thing, for NTAC what may make sense is to have a separate nominations standing committee that has technical background to make assessment

Although desire to centralize – could make case here that a separate group – nominating committee that has technical background and expertise to assess and make recommendations on subject matter experts and areas of interest.

Suggestion that group look at the IETF model (RFC) for nominations.

ACTION 2: Peter offered to investigate on IETF RFC nomination process and get back to the group

Discussion on possible working groups that may be recommended as a starting list. These will be new groups that particularly serve a purpose/function that is critical in support of new Network infrastructure being built out.

Suggestion that Rick Summerhill may be a good person to suggest/talk to regarding what he thinks are key areas.

ACTION 3: Paul offered to talk to Rick about this (or Ana can do this too). May also discuss during next call.

Next call: July 27, 4 p.m. EDT

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Preston