

## GPN Executive Council Meeting – KCMO - 11/20/2009

Attending: Kansas: Denise Stephens, Nebraska: Mark Askren, Missouri: Hank Niederhelm, South Dakota: Claude Garelik, Arkansas: Bob Zimmerman, Oklahoma: James Deaton. Bill Mitchell, GPN, Greg Monaco, GPN, Michael Ruhrdanz, UNL

Garelik called the meeting to order and there were no new agenda items.

Deaton moved, Stephens seconded approving the 9/15/2009 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

Zimmerman moved to change the GPN consortium agreement, section II.B.6, by modifying the reference “II.A.3” to “II.A”. Askren seconded to approve the change. Motion passed unanimously.

Zimmerman moved and Deaton seconded a motion to accept the financial statement for October 31, 2009. Garelik noted that GPN is spending down its reserve within two years. Zimmerman asked for background on this and Garelik stated that business officers among several universities were concerned about the high level of the reserve and this was the reason for spending the down the reserve. Garelik called the vote and the financial report was approved unanimously.

Mitchell presented his Executive Director report. He has spent much of his time getting prepared for this meeting as well as getting to know the organization and considering various options both technology-related and organization-related.

Monaco gave his report regarding re-purposing some of the groups. Garelik asked about communications, e.g., newsletter, and Greg mentioned that he had discussed this with Kate at the beginning of the week—Kate will begin working on communications.

The next CI item discussed was the CI priorities for 2010 document. Mitchell modified the document by 1) adding wording that included advancing partnerships among GPN members, 2) adding a row in the table for Network-Enabled Services that may generate revenue or result in cost-containment and 3) including state EPSCoR directors as a target audience. Askren moved and Deaton seconded accepting the revised priorities and the motion passed, unanimously. Discussion as far as the composition of the Advisory Committee are to keep it small (5 to 8) and to involve folks that reach deeply into their communities.

Ruhrdanz updated on the Networking Program meeting that preceded this meeting. Two groups were formed, one to look at technical issues and the second to look at business services. There was also discussion of commodity peering services and utilization. Discussion of approaching Internet2 regarding adding a pro-rated 2<sup>nd</sup> 10G connection. Bill will follow-up.

Mitchell discussed the Internet2 fee proposal for hybrid port fees for additional capacity. There was discussion of how this would affect commercial peering services. Ruhrdanz explained that the cost per meg could be as low as \$2.50. There was discussion of how this might work out for a non-connected state.

Mitchell and Monaco asked for ideas regarding the Annual Meeting.

State Updates: Most of the state is participating in Network Nebraska. President of University of Missouri is looking at shared services, fiber ring is being completed in KCMO, universities are looking at participating in GPENI, part 2. In Kansas they are waiting to hear on the KANREN EPSCoR proposal to upgrade the KANREN backbone. In Arkansas they are looking at co-locating with LEARN in Texas creating new opportunities; they are also waiting on several proposals for MRI and ARI. In South Dakota, there is an ARI proposal to connect ND and SD and will, ultimately, connect GPN within Northern Tier. In Oklahoma, they received an award for AV—HD videoconferencing.

Mitchell said we may want to consider a GPN meeting at the Spring Internet2 member meeting. Deaton also mentioned an upcoming Quilt/Statesnet meeting that could also be an opportunity to meet. Phone meeting is the first Thursday of the month. We will skip the December 2009 meeting. Deaton moved and Zimmerman seconded adjourning the meeting. Motion passed unanimously.