

**Internet2 New Network Advisory Structure Group  
Conference Call, June 23, 2006 – 1:30 p.m. EDT**

**In the call:**

Jacqueline Brown (Univ. Washington)  
James Deaton (OneNet)  
Ray Ford (Univ Montana)  
Mark Johnson (NCREN)  
George Loftus (OSHEAN)  
Peter O'Neil (NCAR)  
Greg Palmer (MAGPI)  
Michael Krugman (Boston Univ)  
Paul Schopis (OARNET)  
Ana Preston (Internet2)  
Rick Summerhill (Internet2)  
Cheryl Fremon (Internet2)

Not able to be present: Scott Gerstenberger (Univ Michigan), Garret Yoshimi (Univ Hawaii)

**Notes/Minutes from call:**

Chair (Paul Schopis) introduced participants. Provided quick background leading to Internet2 Community Design Workshop (CDW) and discussion on last day of workshop leading to the proposal of chartering a group, made up of members of the community tasked with providing input and recommendations on advisory structure for Internet2's New Network Infrastructure. Alluded to variety of ideas thrown around. Became clear that small group could come up with some recommendations about advisory structure. Paul offered to chair and recruit participants.

Chair pointed to draft scope statement previously circulated and asked for comments:

**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.*

Chair invited input on anything that should be added to scope statement and solicited input. Added desire to have group be inclusive of members of the community at large in R&E in the US. Would like to keep group at manageable size.

Group in agreement that size is ok, and representative; if determined that others need to be included, group can approach and include them.

Chair mentioned that Scott G offer to help if group needed more people. Chair asked if group was ok with this. Group in agreement.

Chair discussed August 1<sup>st</sup> deadline and suggested working backwards from date. Chair alluded to email sent around that included graphic on Internet2's working group relationships and shared a document (see <http://www.internet2.edu/wg/> ) Some discussion on understanding relationship between advisory groups, working groups and Internet2 staff (area directors). Cheryl Fremon provided background on relationship between advisory groups, engagement and roles for area directors (within Internet2).

Discussion around charge(s) for this group. Cheryl Fremon provided further information on anticipated "role" for this group – clarified relationship of other advisory bodies (NPPAC for example and how envision that if for example, if NPPAC is coming up with a particular policy issue, task for this group would be to help understand the bridge/communication between council and this group).

MACE-type (advisory structure) could be something to look at (see <http://middleware.internet2.edu/MACE/> for additional information).

Discussion around this group providing clear recommendations on groups and also providing input on process for creating other groups as necessary for Internet2 Network Infrastructure. Expected that this group will "report" back (recommendations and assessment) back to Rick Summerhill and Cheryl Fremon.

Discussion within group about understanding/acknowledging the need to include input/establish user oriented process particularly in light of current environment and tensions.

Discussion and further background provided on current Abilene 'advisory structure' – currently the Abilene Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Rick provided background on how the group was formed, functions in terms of input and advice on technical operations and technology for Abilene network. Group includes representatives from connectors, commercial partners, people with particular skill sets within the community. Met monthly, sometimes face to face. Process was more informal than what anticipate for the NewNet Advisory Group (NAG).

From Internet2 perspective, would like for this group to provide advice back on how to run the network, provide advice on process. Rick alluded that with Abilene, charge/TAC had a less complicated role than what would envision for NewNet Advisory Group (NAG) – dealing with more complicated network. May want to think about some kind of hierarchy and make recommendations on this and the advisory structure. Recommend working groups (in what technical areas) and process by which electing/putting representatives on this group (i.e. selection process). With regards to working groups, recommendations may include to have some more permanent "life" for particular areas/technical issues; some other ones may have shorter duration. Want NAG group to provide suggestions on mechanism(s) for creating working groups and advisory structure, who is/are in them, on what criterion. Process needs to be open and transparent.

Discussed relationship (e.g. dash line) back to NPPAC. Rick mentioned importance that this NewNet Advisory Group have a close relationship/communication and NPPAC – has not happened in the past. Details to be developed/recommended by this group.

Discussed that a way of illustrating how this could go about – look at diagram provided by Chair on working group/advisory groups/area directors.

**ACTION 1:** Chair offered to provide a refinement on this diagram, use as "strawman", based on discussions during the call and tailor for the roles for the NAG.

Question was asked about how quickly recommendations from NAG may be implemented. Internet2 staff responded that past, Aug 1<sup>st</sup>, implementation would be as soon as possible.

Some discussion around current advisory councils and process in place going on regarding changes. Time table for this is separate from NAG tasks and in different time frame (December/January)

Discussed regular meeting times. Group consensus that Thursdays, 4 p.m. EDT may be workable for majority.

**ACTION 2:** Send out call information to the group (make standing call every Thursday 4 p.m. EDT) (Ana)

**ACTION 3:** Create mailing list for this group. Decided to name, for the time being, as [nag@internet2.edu](mailto:nag@internet2.edu) (Ana)

**ACTION4 :** send notes to full group (Ana)

Respectfully submitted,

Ana Preston