

**Internet2 New Network Advisory Structure Group  
Conference Call, June 29, 2006 – 4:00 p.m. EDT**

**In the call:**

Jacqueline Brown (Univ. Washington)  
James Deaton (OneNet)  
Ray Ford (Univ Montana)  
Mark Johnson (NCREN)  
George Loftus (OSHEAN)  
Ben Colley (MORENET)  
Michael Krugman (Boston Univ)  
Garret Yoshimi (Univ Hawaii)  
Ana Preston (Internet2)  
Rick Summerhill (Internet2)  
Cheryl Fremon (Internet2)

**New Action Items:**

ACTION 1: Recommended that group members see what is in place at IETF (see <http://www.ietf.org/tao.html> and <ftp://ftp.isi.edu/in-notes/rfc3777.txt>)

ACTION 2: Rick will touch base with Paul about input received on strawman and what may need to be changed there.

ACTION 3: Ana will also make sure that Paul has the notes in preparation for next call.

**No pending action items from last call.**

**Notes/Minutes from call:**

Rick moderated call due to Paul being on vacation. After introductions, Rick reviewed basically tasks for this group. Read over charter of group (included at the end of the notes) noting how this group could help Internet2 think about the new network infrastructure advisory structure: how to organize; process(es) for involving and getting community input; how members for the group (and hierarchical group structure) could be chosen/selected; communications with other Internet2 advisory bodies/councils and recommendations for working groups.

*1. Discussion on the diagram that Paul sent last week (strawman): a first cut for hierarchy and the organization of this group and the relationship to the wider advisory structure and processes. Rick asked for input/comments on this.*

Question: How different than the way(s) that current working groups work today?

Rick mentioned that today we have working groups in particular areas, say technical areas, ipv6; but that there's minimum or no communication lines for transferring the advice of these groups back to the current "advisory" group for Abilene network (Abilene TAC).

New advisory structure could encompass a structure with overall advisory group and then specific areas that have working groups associated with it, e.g. working group on specific technical issue relevant to New Network infrastructure. Could envision creating/chartering working groups that could be long standing dealing with longer-term "themes" or for example, a group associated with peering issues. Looking in fact for recommendations on what the initial working groups should be about.

Envision that these working groups are part of and provide input to overall advisory group. Different than what we have on the Abilene structure. New Network is much more complicated; have a new set/new features and different kinds of services [resulting in different set of issues]. One reason why envisioning needing a sort of hierarchical structure to be recommended. Working groups could be created to be long standing (i.e. in issues that may require providing

constant information/input into Network advisory group) – or could be short-term, i.e., network Advisory group could charter a working group with short term deliverables. Network Advisory Group (NAG) could suggest charter, deliverables, short term groups would go away or be discontinued once work is finished. Should be careful on the labeling of groups (i.e., should not be confused with other working groups serving other functions within Internet2). In the case of what we are talking about here, these are technical groups with specific tasks/charters related to new network and where specific outcomes are expected. Should make sure that distinction of “working groups” is made or how to characterize these groups (i.e., groups of people working on a particular project/set of issues relevant to New Network). Perhaps call them subcommittees?

Some discussion about similar processes in place with the IETF.

**ACTION 1: Recommended that group members review what is in place there:**

<http://www.ietf.org/tao.html>

Discussion around lines of “communication” to advisory groups (lines from strawman from network advisory group to advisory councils). Should not think that all these lines need mean that every working group (in Internet2) should have lines for the advisory structure. Notion here is more to go with a hierarchical setup. Group discussed further that maybe the diagram could be even further simplified.

Diagram should be made simpler – suggested that some boxes are cut; take out ideas out, take SIG, collapse boxes for advisory councils into one (advisory councils). Want to have something that is easy to explain to people.

**ACTION 2: Rick will touch base with Paul about this before the call next week.**

**ACTION 3: Ana will also make sure that Paul has the notes in preparation for next call.**

Discussion on what may be the process(es) in place for community input. Idea box perhaps? What are the thoughts on how to set up groups?

Ideas included having, like in IETF, schemes like having a RFC – which works as a framework/proposal; reviewed by the community and where input comes in many directions; community is asked to comment. Within IETF, a RFC can go through a multitude of drafts, very formal process. Want to envision something similar but less formal. Idea discussed was to model after the informational RFCs

For diagram: Adding stick figure and have a different flavor of arrow pointed to different places – arrow could be labeled as mechanism for an outsider, representing how they can approach the groups at several layers, want to structure this. We want a process for internal consideration/public consumption, IETF RFC mechanism that has worked – it can be seen as maximally inclusive. Can imagine scenarios where something very formal would need to be structured (i.e., very technical things, virtual networks); something where lot of comments would need to be made to have this ratified. In the case of what we are talking about for new network, we could have something not as formal as an RFC but formal enough so that community can see what the proposal is, and to make it easy to illustrate how does it relate to New Network and so forth. Process would be inclusive from start to finish – everyone has an opportunity to provide input.

Formality implied here is that any idea would get a hearing. What then NAG can do is gage/triage these and see if they/it warrant time and attention

IETF model, similar to the above, forces a mechanism to have not just a say but the ability for people to work on things. Want to have something that is open, that communicates openness, is objective, that says “because we believe in the value of the human capital, want to get community involved. Collaborative that involves the best and brightest to contribute, help out

fundamentally opened to anyone and everyone". What decided (and ideas and suggestions) should be immediately available to the community.

*II. ideas for how members may be chosen for network advisory group? Should there be lengths of terms? Rotating group?*

In the Abilene TAC, Internet2 staff asked staff asked people to be on it – other people could recommend – primarily was about internet2 staff about recruiting people to be on the group. Then they were in it until they didn't want to be.

Group discussion advantages to rotating: new ideas, new people. Disadvantages include, for example, getting people not involved in big picture. Terms are good, should be staggered or rotating. Examples were brought up where continuity became a critical and good thing to have (i.e., providing historical/policy perspective). To the extent that someone is willing to stay and contribute – longevity could be valuable. We could Allow for two consecutive terms → someone could serve for 6 years; be off for a year and then eligible to come back/be brought back.

*III. What may the nomination/selection process be/look like?*

Rick asked group if as network advisory group, there were any thoughts on having representation here from vendor partners; these could be rotated within the vendor organization but not e individuals but not chosen by community. Current Abilene TAC has some vendor representation.

Ideas and discussion on this ensued. Looking at NAG to help Internet2 chose first set of individuals that will serve. Then ask current people on the NAG to choose successors ?

IETF process/model was brought again as something that we should look at. Want to make sure we have technically strong people, technical innovators. Approach should be though that it is an open process. See how IETF does selection of area directors  
<ftp://ftp.isi.edu/in-notes/rfc3777.txt>

Rick then added that hoping that at next Joint Techs (July 15-18, Madison, Wisconsin), in the New Network BoF, currently planned for July 17) that via Paul or someone from this group, there is a preliminary report on what NAG is thinking and get some community feedback. Then, only 2 weeks left until August 1<sup>st</sup> (deadline for this group's deliverables).

*IV. Communication between NAG and other advisory groups and between NAG and other working groups.*

Rick mentioned that it would seem necessary that there be regularly scheduled communications with councils and communications with long standing working groups. NPPAC as one of the principal ones

Ideas included making sure minutes/notes are shared with other councils. Make this a routine, e.g., NAG knows what NPPAC is talking about and vice versa.

Rick brought up how currently, as area director, he works with working groups associated with his area; every six months he asks for a page on work, particular goals they have for next 6 months, solutions they've come up from previous goals.

Want to have a regular process for having the working groups report on various issues and what they are doing. In the case of NAG and New Network, could have some kind of reporting structure that would go back to new net advisory group. Chair could/should then be able to summarize to advisory councils what New Network working groups are doing and vice versa.

NEXT CALL: Thursday, July 6, 4 p.m. EDT.

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Preston

**Scope statement**

*Internet2 Network Technical Advisory Structure*

*At the recent Community Design Workshop (June 15-16, Indianapolis, IN), a hierarchical style advisory structure was described, where an overall group commissions working groups that may either be long- standing to provide advice on a regular basis or short duration with very limited scope. We are asking that a group be formed from community representatives, and be chaired by Paul Schopis. By August 1, this group will provide recommendations for an appropriate advisory structure to provide on-going technical advice on the Internet2 network. While the advisory structure is focused on technical issues, there must be an understanding of how the technical aspects inter-act, contribute to or even constrain the policy aspects. The structure should allow for and encourage community involvement, define the process(es) for community input into this advisory structure, and include a suggestions for both how the members of the advisory group are selected and how the technical advisory structure fits in with and encourages regularly scheduled communications to the Internet2 advisory councils.*