June 27, 2016
1-3pm ET

ATTENDEES:
Community Participants: Wm Dieggard, Charlie McMahon, Dave Swartz, Dave Lois, James Deaton, Patty Giuntoli, Kathy Gates, Kelli Trosvig, Steve Fleagle, Steve Corbato

Staff Participants: Alison Ferreira, Kathleen Kay, George Loftus, Linda Roos, Rob Vietzke

DECISION:
• The team decided to shorten the draft community benchmarking survey. Volunteers to make the first attempt at this:
  o George Loftus, Kelli Trosvig, Steve Corbato, William Deigaard
• The team decided on the timing of the OECST face to face meeting at an airport hotel (probably Denver):
  o First Day: Arrival and dinner
  o Second Day: 4 to 5-hour meeting and departure

ACTION/ FOLLOW UP ITEMS:
• George Loftus speaking to Jen Leasure re: Quilt cooperation in customer satisfaction survey effort
• Doodle Poll to be created to identify date in August for Team F2F meeting
• Patty Giuntoli to post tools from the European NOC in the OECST Box folder
• Michele Norin to work with Kelli Trosvig to organize site visit to the GRNOC

❖ Minutes Review
Dave Swartz called the meeting to order and requested committee approval of minutes submitted:
  o 160517 Minutes of the Global Summit Open meeting
    ▪ Kelli Trosvig made a motion to approve,
    ▪ William Deigaard seconded the motion.
    The minutes stand approved and will be posted to the OECST website,
  o 160603 Meeting Minutes
    ▪ William Deigaard suggested adding the committee decision to make a September visit to the GRNOC to the minutes.
    ▪ Michele Norin made a motion to approve the minutes with the suggested addition inserted,
    ▪ Dave Lois seconded the motion.
    The minutes stand approved and will be posted to the OECST website.

❖ Follow Up/ Action Items from Last Meeting
  o Traffic Report - Rob Vietzke
At its June 3rd meeting, the steering team requested a more detailed look at network traffic. Two traffic graphs were displayed for the committee. The first report captured the traffic from April, prior to school getting out (897Gbps displayed.) It was noted that the data is imperfect since we don’t have a mapping of what the vendor uses to closely identify the traffic (e.g., video vs. web content.) “Web” traffic is where most of the NET+ traffic is captured. The second report shows traffic from June (558Gbps displayed) when dorms are out, fewer classes are held and K-12 is out. This is when science is probably the predominant traffic, followed by web traffic.
Customer Satisfaction – Rob Vietzke

At the June 3rd meeting, a more comprehensive explanation of the existing customer satisfaction survey results was requested. It was explained that when a service ticket is closed, an automatic request goes out for rating. The following chart was displayed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number of Tickets</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Excellent Rating</th>
<th>Satisfied Rating</th>
<th>Poor Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rob pointed out that the possible responses are excellent, satisfied and poor and there is a low rate of response (1-4%). Rob noted that some of these tickets start as an automated event because of an alert, an email inquiry becomes a ticket. Some are events, some are problems, some are service requests. If it is a major incident, there may only be one ticket opened, but many more people may have called in, talked to staff at IU or Internet2 or expressed concern in various forums. So, a single survey may underrepresent actual feedback. Dave Swartz stated it would be helpful to pull some data and/or perform targeted follow-up with ‘responders’, or the community at large, to determine satisfaction levels. He suggested forming a subgroup to develop a satisfaction survey. Some members of the team expressed concern over “survey fatigue” and the idea of contacting people directly with a Q & A format was suggested, as well as requesting that the regionals survey their campuses, perhaps involving the Quilt in the exercise. It was noted that there is a need for an organized document that will ensure the consistency of response to ensure collection of useful data.

Benchmark Items – Patty Giuntoli

The team next discussed ongoing benchmarking activity at ESnet. Patty stated there is a need to consider NOC services as they design ESnet 6 and their growth to include international networking. They have already looked at two community NOC’s and 4 commercial operations.

Taken into consideration is Staffing, Volume, Tools and Automation. Patty did not see much in the way of automation across all organizations, although one of the overseas community groups has put effort into reorganization and automating work. Patty’s stated intention is to continue benchmarking until September, then create strategy and budget to present to leadership for a possible build out in 2017. She added that she is looking to have a SOC as part of the NOC, with dDoS as an initial consideration. Patty noted that if R & E networks look at the way we collect data, it could take us in a whole new direction. She briefly discussed her interesting results from a tools survey which she will share with the committee.

SLA Information – Kelli Trosvig

Kelli stated she is reaching out to Stanford and hospital networks such as Johns Hopkins, Emory, Yale, Northwestern, Penn, Washington for Service Level Targets. She is trying to find differences between the way they run hospital and campus networks. Dave Swartz asked if the hypothesis is that campus and hospital networks are different in terms of SLAs? Kelli responded that they run different service levels for campus and hospital but wind up running at about the same level.
Data Analysis Subgroup and Review of the Draft Survey

Highlights of the draft benchmarking survey to go to R & E leadership were displayed on screen:

- The survey states what will be done with the data. Nothing will be uniquely identifiable, and will be shared.
- Three key elements are considered: size of regional organization and network, how the NOC is organized, and what metrics are important to you today and what will be important in the future.

The committee was asked to review the survey and provide input. A great deal of discussion ensued regarding whether or not to include customer satisfaction data, and whether current or future expectations (or both?) should be included in the questioning. Concerns were raised over the length of the survey and the time commitment necessary to obtain the level of data to enable the committee to make decisions. The team considered which questions were of the greatest value in determining the services and metrics the community anticipates needing now and in the future. A subgroup of individuals volunteered to help shorten the survey. Rob asked if the Quilt might have foundational/organizational data they could share. Dave Lois and James Deaton thought they might have older data that might still be appropriate.

Proposal for Steering Team Face to Face Meeting

Dave Swartz stated that the face to face meeting held at the Global Summit was very successful and the team would like to have another meeting to discuss two topics:

1.) Preparation for the Indiana site visit
2.) Presentation of Internet2 staff “future” scenarios and requirements for various areas of operations support.

A doodle poll will be created to determine a date and the team decided on a timeframe: fly in the night before, meet 4-5 hours the next day, then fly out.

Planning for Visit to Indiana

Dave Swartz recommended that the subgroup organize their thinking around what the team will want to accomplish during the visit. There was earlier discussion of a presentation from Indiana of their plans for service management and the upcoming years. What would the team like to hear? Ideas expressed by the team include:

- Would like to understand policies, practices and procedures as they stand today.
- Has the organization matured to the point where they need to be?
- Would be interesting to understand from operations staff and leadership what they feel is working well now, and what needs to change.
- Ask about vision; give ample opportunity to represent themselves.

The committee discussed which location to visit and considered the following:

- The secondary NOC and the bulk of the staff (50-70:100) are in Bloomington.
- The 7x24 operations are in Indianapolis and it would be good to spend time there with service desk staff.

No decision was made.

The Operations Excellence Community Steering Team went into Executive Session at 2:27pm.

Adjourned

Next Meeting: July 26, 2016