Conference call with Laurie Burns
October 8, 2003

In attendance:
Laurie Burns, Internet2
Mark Faulkner, Bob Hogle, Dell Klingensmith, Charles Morrow-Jones, Linda Roos

Laurie Burns agreed to talk with us about process at a more detailed level than was appropriate at the September 19, 2003 meeting between Internet2 and the Ohio Valley Internet2 Consortium.

Chuck indicated that Ohio has not historically been participatory in the Internet2 advisory councils and asked Laurie to describe the four councils. The councils are advisory to board as well as to Internet2 senior management (functionally) and all have 12 members. The four councils are:
application strategy council
industry strategy council
network planning and policy advisory council (NPPAC)
network research liaison council

Detailed descriptions of the councils may be found on
www.internet2.edu/about/councils.html

The nomination process for the councils begins in the fall with a call for nominations. An online form is available for nominations. The nominations are due in February. The number of openings is typically three for each council although that number can vary. The information from the nominations is sent to the nominating committee. Regional representation, public vs private institutions, and size of the institution determine nomination. NPPAC membership has been dominated by individuals from research-doctoral/extensive institutions. NPPAC is primarily made up of CIO's and is the council that advises on planning and financials issues. There is interest in reviving the Network Research Liaison Council.

Mark Faulkner asked whether multiple nominations of the same person or one nomination from the consortium are desired. Laurie recommended that one nomination form be submitted by the Consortium rather than submitting multiple forms. The ideal NPPAC member is one who can look across higher education networking and understand what is in the best interest of the Internet2 community and the membership as a whole including national and international issues.

The Board of Trustees is comprised of University presidents. Each of the chairs of the councils serves on the board. There are one or two appointed slots. A slate of candidates is presented to the board by the nominating committee. Representatives of the regular member institutions vote via postcard.

Laurie indicated that the councils were originally created to be advisory to the board and there wasn't a formal process to disseminate the work of the councils. Laurie indicated that although formal minutes from the council meetings are not regularly kept, some record of the meetings exists. As the membership has grown, some procedures for information dissemination need to occur. She indicated that there is a move toward having minutes kept by Internet2 staff. Chuck indicated that there is a balance between being agile and being communicative and suggested that the councils disseminate a summary of agenda topics and meeting minutes electronically. For strategic and financial information, Chuck would prefer to receive an email (including a link to a web page) rather than having people seek out the information.

Chuck asked if there was any movement on the suggestion from the September meeting that a finance committee be convened. Laurie indicated that Doug Van Houweling intends to raise this issue with the board although the board meeting in Indy has been shortened. The issue does not necessarily need to happen there but will still be visited.

Laurie indicated that they are hoping to send a letter to the presidents of the regular member institutions detailing the value of Internet2 including participation in working groups, the innovations that have occurred within the Internet2 community, research and education community, etc. because the members have paid dues and supported the organization. An important question to be addressed in the letter is: what do I get from my dues vs what does higher ed get from the dues that are paid? Laurie indicated that Internet2 needs the help of the community in getting this message out to the appropriate people.

Currently, Internet2 has a number of one-page glossy documents that provide information regarding tools that have been developed, services that have been deployed, etc. Internet2 is open to suggestions regarding ideas that would help members convey that information to the administration of their campuses.

Laurie indicated that the cyberinfrastructure issue is of great importance on a national level. NSF is undergoing restructuring of programs and seeing Internet2 as the agent by which their cyberinfrastructure agenda is going to be accomplished. Other national funding agencies are taking this approach, as well. The community as a whole is an important part of this picture.

In the future, if there needs to be a dues increase, evidence needs to be provided to support this—if specific work needs to be done, then the argument needs to be put forth to the membership. The board has the job to make the decision regarding dues increases related to important work.

Mark indicated that he would like to know which projects the dues increase is tied to prior to the increase being announced, what the return on investment will be to higher education or individual institution, and expected timing of ROI. Laurie indicated that the membership is asked to comment about dues increases but ultimately the board has the final say in the decision-making process. Chuck indicated that institutions don't want to

be put in purely reactive mode. He suggested that decisions being considered be described to the membership and that a period of time be given for comment. This gives the opportunity for the schools to have input without negatively impacting the timeliness of the governance process.

At the fall member meeting, there is to be discussion regarding a dues increase in 2005. Laurie indicated that the amount of the increase may not be available when budgeting needs to begin, there will be information available on the web site to be used in preliminary budgeting.