

Great Plains Network

Executive Council Meeting

Friday, October 25, 2008

Attendees: Claude Garelik, Michael Ruhrdanz, James Deaton, Bill Mitchell, Denise Stephens and Mike Abiatti (for Bob Zimmerman). Also attending: Executive Director Greg Monaco, Gordon Springer, Dale Finkelson and Greg Silvey

Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Claude Garelik at 8:40 a.m.

Claude Garelik asked if there were additional agenda additions and there were none.

Bill Mitchell suggested that “thank you” notes be sent to Dave Lois and Myron Lowe for attending the GPN Strategic Planning Meeting.

Minutes of prior meetings

The September minutes were presented for approval. Denise Stephens moved to approve the minutes as presented, Bill Mitchell seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Strategic Planning Meeting Recap and Discussion

There was a lengthy discussion about the direction GPN should be heading. The participants “voted” on the following research functions and then ranked the “yes” functions as high/medium/low priority:

1. Grant Proposal Development & Participation – NO
2. Facilitating & engaging members about CI – YES/High
3. Training Workshops YES/High
4. Repository YES/High
5. K-30/education/enrichment – NO
6. Information Outreach – YES/Medium
7. Grant Participation Process – if approached by a member and they pay – YES/Low
8. Educate Members on the value proposition of state/regional/national research networks – YES/High
9. Researcher referral service YES/Low

Number 1 had a considerable amount of discussion and it was clarified that we would participate in grants depending on the nature of the grant and whether it fit GPN’s role based on the Strategic Plan. It was further stated that our goal is not to initiate grant activity although we would help others complete grant applications.

Claude Garelik reported that the two items that received the lowest votes from those attending the strategic planning meeting were:

1. Writing and initiating grant proposals
2. K-20 education and enrichment activities.

High support was for:

1. Facilitating and engaging members in cyber infrastructure.
2. Workshops and training in hopes to educate members in the value proposition of state, regional and national networks.

Dale Finkelson felt it would be fine to involve GPN in grants that fall within our fundamental cyber infrastructure.

Greg Monaco felt regionally there are emerging opportunities that are not available to certain Universities but do have a synergy with GPN. He felt as opportunities arise they should be handled through Executive Council.

Bill Mitchell felt maybe the Research Advisory Board should no longer be a formal organization. He feels that the strategic plan should clearly determine this role and decide whether this board should continue and what role they should play.

Michael Ruhrdanz questioned whether if not doing grants weakens GPN's value to each entity.

Claude Garelik stated if GPN pulls away from research that it would be a problem for him. He feels a Research Advisory Board is different than grant writing and proposals.

James Deaton felt the Research Advisory Board focus could be refined to cyber infrastructure.

Mike Abbiatti asked what do you get for a GPN membership and that since everyone does cyber infrastructure what separates GPN from everyone else.

Bill Mitchell suggested GPN go to regular meetings of researcher officers and others in the research community in addition to the Research Advisory Board meeting alone.

#### Review Executive Committee Calls and Structure for New Participants

1. Structure/purpose of monthly calls.
  - Claude Garelik discussed current structure and purpose of the monthly conference calls which normally last approximately one hour.

## 2. Structure/purpose of face to face meetings.

- Claude Garelik stated that the Executive Committee tries to meet face to face every three to four months. These meetings are typically adjacent to other meetings.

Denise Stephens felt that as a new participant these calls were very helpful to her. She also added that it might be helpful if an agenda of the proposed topics/issues were sent out in advance

James Deaton suggested that video conferences might be helpful in keeping everyone's full attention throughout the duration of the meeting. All agreed that this was a good idea and MOREnet will handle the logistics with each member.

The November 6<sup>th</sup> Executive Council meeting will be cancelled since it's only a few weeks away and the December 4<sup>th</sup> Executive Council meeting will be done as a video conference.

Michael Ruhrdanz suggested they plan a face to face meeting each quarter for scheduling purposes. Bill Mitchell suggested an all day video conference in lieu of a face to face meeting. Bill Mitchell also suggested we schedule a quarterly face to face that can be cancelled if it's not needed.

It was discussed whether they could piggyback a face to face meeting with the I2 meeting in April. It was agreed that they would take ½ day out of the I2 meeting April 27-29 to conduct GPN business and that this will replace the May Executive Council meeting.

### Council Member Rules

It was discussed that everyone wanted consistent representation to the national groups. Meeting notes should come back to the Executive Council for review in case action is needed.

Bill Mitchell suggested that there should be someone involved in these different groups representing GPN. He also feels this could be or is a staffing issue.

Discussion on Executive Council roles for Chair, Secretary and Treasurer will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

### Executive Director Report

Greg Monaco gave an update on research initiatives. Shibboleth training was held in Kansas City and had twelve attendees. Greg also discussed the work he was doing to plan a cyber infrastructure summit to be held in Kansas City on December 12<sup>th</sup> or the 19<sup>th</sup>.

### Network Program Update

Dale Finkelson reported on the needs that should be addressed.

1. Don't have the ability to add 10 gig ports in the suite.

2. Can't get any more power in the suites. He thought we should go to Fiberco and ask for another rack which would allow for more power
3. There are a number of sites interested in peering with I2

Announced South Dakota had connected.

Claude Garelik reported on the I2 connectors meeting. He felt there were three main issues.

1. I2 Resources
2. Bandwidth allocation
3. Business model- How does it operate with connectors?

Claude Garelik reported I2 is working on a pricing model for DCN and second connections.

Asset management was also an issue as I2 is at their 10 wave limit.

### Financial Issues

Greg Silvey provided an overview of the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter FY09 Financial Statements. It was noted that since True Broadband Network's fees were never paid they were never an affiliate. Greg Silvey also pointed out that the actual in the annual meeting expense was for the FY08 annual meeting and should have been accrued for FY08. This could mean both FY08 and FY09 annual meeting expense could show up in FY09. It was brought up that the amount budgeted for Dynamic Wave will not occur until FY10

Motion made to accept the financials. James Deaton motioned, Denise Stephens seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

### State Updates

Missouri: Bill Mitchell gave an update on the status of the deployment of the new Fiber backbone. Bill Mitchell also noted that we they have secured the rights to a second pair of SURA fiber from Kansas City to St. Louis. Bill Mitchell also mentioned they have decided not to acquire SURA fiber to Chicago at this time and that they are currently working on wavelength pricing.

South Dakota: Claude Garelik stated that the GPN map needs to be re-drawn due to South Dakota connecting plus the addition of MOREnet's new backbone. They are getting close to a North Dakota wave. It was decided that the Network Committee will update the map by obtaining information from each state.

Arkansas: Mike Abiatti asked what the others had heard regarding AERON. He noted that they have very few actual research institutions. Mike Abiatti has been talking to each campus about their

expectations from ARE-ON. Mike Abiatti mentioned that they have great support from legislators and other high ranking officials.

Kansas: Denise Stephens reported that the State Department of Information has acquired space in Wichita as a disaster recovery site.

#### Other Business

Bill Mitchell noted that nominations are open for the advisory council for I2 through 11/21/08. He encouraged everyone to be an active representative for GPN on those committees.

#### Adjournment

Bill Mitchell moved to adjourn the meeting, Mike Ruhrdanz seconded and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:20 am.