

### OECST F2F Meeting Notes August 18 & 19, 2016

**August 18' 2016**

**4-6:30pm MT**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Community Attendees: James Deaton, William Deigaard, Steve Fleagle (arrived while meeting in session,) John Krogman, Dave Lois, Charlie McMahon, Dave Swartz, Kelli Trosvig

I2 Staff: Alison Ferreira, Kathleen Kay, George Loftus, Linda Roos, Rob Vietzke Charlie, Steve Fleagle

Not in Attendance: Steve Corbato, Kathy Gates, Patty Giuntoli, Pankaj Shah

❖ **PRE-WORK ON VISIT TO INDIANA**

The August 18th meeting of the OECST was convened for committee members who arrived in Denver early to begin preliminary planning for the site visit to the Indiana University (IU) GRNOC. Results of an earlier Doodle poll indicated that October 3rd was the best date for the majority of the committee to visit IU. Discussion took place regarding which Indiana site to visit in order to have access to the personnel the group wanted to meet. It was decided that the group would visit the Indianapolis site.

The committee turned its attention to topics of discussion at IU and brainstormed areas of interest and questions they would like to explore. Topics included IU's delivery model, service metrics, service desk, shift reporting, change control, escalation process and implementation of Service Now. Clarifying the confusion between the network existing as a partnership or being a community resource was considered important.

The committee requested information on Internet2's (I2) hiring of additional technical staff and the roles that staff would play. Internet2 discussed new postings for an Optical & MPLS engineer. The vacancy of the last remaining tier-3 engineer at the GlobalNOC was shared. Knowledge that the network will look different 2-5 years from now prompted Internet2 to issue a call for papers at TechX 2016 to determine what the community feels the next network will/ should look like. It was agreed that it is difficult to assess what the engineering need will be in the future.

Discussion continued on definition of the network as a research network or a production network. The committee felt strongly that it is a production network; that while it does move research traffic, it is primarily a production research and enterprise network. Preliminary results from the benchmarking survey reveal that all of the respondents required some production level (some level of "9s"). About 1/3 of respondents plan to put an ITSM plan in place. It was stated that there is a need to give clarity to the Internet2 Board of Trustees that the Internet2 network is a production network with a level of at least 4 "9s."

Software Development and Systems Development resources were discussed. (Each group accounts for 4 FTE in the agreement.) It was noted that systems development is an area that helps other customers of the GRNOC. This group has developed over 20 years, and has a very good event correlation engine and other backend databases. The Software development team writes custom software for Internet2 like the OESS and FSFW packages. The committee felt there is a need to determine what the roadmap may be in both areas, what is to be funded as a community activity; and what ownership the community has of the products.

**August 19, 2016**

**8am-1pm**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Community: James Deaton, William Deigaard, Steve Fleagle, Kathy Gates, Patty Giuntoli, John Krogman, Dave Lois, Charlie McMahon, Michele Norin, , Dave Swartz, Kelli Trosvig

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

Not in Attendance: Steve Corbato, Pankaj Shah

**ACTION ITEMS**

- Benchmarking committee chair will send links to the regionals survey out to the committee
- Chairs will notify IU as to the date, attendees, interviewees, proposed agenda/timeline
- IU to be notified that an RFP is not planned by I2
- Open google docs for question submissions

❖ **EXECUTIVE SESSION 8-9:15AM**

❖ **WELCOME**

Dave Swartz convened the open meeting of the committee at 9:15am. He reported that the Internet2 Board of Trustees was complimentary of the update given to them prior to their August 3, 2016 meeting. He noted that October 3<sup>rd</sup> was chosen as the date of the site visit to Indiana University and that a report out from the committee is due to the Board by their November 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

❖ **MINUTES**

With a majority present, Dave Swartz called the meeting to order and requested a review of the minutes from the July 26, 2016 OECST Meeting. Following the review, there was a request for approval. A motion to approve was entered by John Krogman and seconded by Steve Fleagle. The minutes of the July 26, 2016 meeting of the OECST stand approved and will be posted on the committee's website.

❖ **BENCHMARK SURVEY UPDATE**

Kelli Trosvig said she is encouraged by the level of participation in the survey to date and that the survey emphasizes how unique the I2 relationship is with the GRNOC. The survey is to be made available to the committee, and an anonymized version is to be made public. Results indicate that 1/3 of respondents are interested in service management, and most are shooting for 3.5-4 "9s." in light of the tight timeline, it was suggested that the group move ahead with the representative number of surveys already received.

Noting that the committee's purpose is to reflect better what the community wants to see in the next agreement between I2 and IU, it was decided that the committee would make clear that I2 is proceeding without an RFP. The OECST is laying out the framework for an agreement between I2 and IU.

❖ **INTERNET2 FUTURE SCENARIO PRESENTATION**

There was a discussion of key principles for the next agreement, the state of project work, provisioning examples and report development. A fourth item, talking about the network as a community project was tabled, as it had been discussed elsewhere.

**Principles:** Three foundational elements were discussed as necessary in the next-gen agreement between Internet2 and the GlobalNOC:

1. Measurability (later changed to Accountability by the committee):

Using defined metrics and records to assess those services and service components upon which reliable network operation is built. This includes areas such as:

- trouble tickets
- response to problems
- change management
- provisioning
- continuous improvement
- training
- resource-tracking
- consistency

2. Flexibility:

Maintaining the features and capabilities that allow us to work collaboratively to address the unique needs of the R&E community. This would affect:

- how I2 implements new services,
- the hands-on approach to service I2 provides to members,
- the interaction between I2 and IU employees, and the
- ebb and flow of the need to have the right mix of people to support new technologies and services, and to sunset others during an agreement.

3. Visibility (later changed to Transparency by the committee):

- Providing the community with information on how services are utilized and paid for,
- Ensuring resources or tools created by this investment are available to Internet2 and the entire community,
- Recognizing the GlobalNOC as a community resource, and Internet2 as a key contributor to the financial health of this asset
- Providing I2 and the community visibility into commitments made and performance against them, as with any investment on the community's behalf.

It was agreed that all 3 of these principles should be applied mutually.

**Project Work:** A discussion of recent progress in collaboration with the GlobalNOC centered on executive sponsorship and management engagement, definition of resources and resource tracking, working more as a team without duplicate meetings, and documenting long-standing practices to ease introduction of new team contributors.

**Provisioning, Reporting** – (Daily Interactions around workload, provisioning, experiences) - There was a discussion around the provisioning process and reports that the business and customer relations group needs. There is some forward movement and additional increased communication and management oversight is needed between the time the service desk receives the request and the time the engineer begins the provisioning work. Replacement of “tribal knowledge” with documented processes is viewed as a possible approach to help in areas like the

decommissioning of services. In the instance of community members requesting increased capacity there is a need to prioritize reports that have been difficult to get for many months.

[Dave Lois and John Krogman left the meeting at 10:50AM MT to get flight.]

#### ❖ **PLANNING FOR VISIT TO INDIANA**

The committee decided on the groups of people they would like to talk with during the Indiana University site visit and came up with a draft agenda, pending input from IU.

A preliminary outline for the OECST report was established.

The Meeting was adjourned at 12:30pm.