

Network Nebraska—Education Advisory Group Meeting #4
Thursday, December 17, 2009; 1:00pm-4:00pm CT

Remote 1: Varner Hall, Lower Level VC Room, 3835 Holdrege St., Lincoln, NE

Remote 2: ESU 10, Videoconference Room, 76 Plaza Blvd., Kearney, NE

Remote 3: Wayne State College, Technology Building, Wayne, NE

Remote 4: Elwood Public Schools

Remote 5: SCC, Milford

Remote 6: MPCC, North Platte

Remote 7: Pope John XXIII, Elgin

Meeting Notes

K-12 Attendance: John Stritt (Kearney), Bob Uhing (Wayne), Scott Jones (Elwood), Betty Getzfred (Elgin), Kirk Langer (Lincoln), Mike Danahy (Fremont)

H.E. Attendance: Mike Ruhrdanz (Lincoln), Debbie Schroeder (Kearney), Gene Beardslee (Peru), Dennis Linster (Wayne), Ken Clipperton (Lincoln), Lyle Neal (Milford), Charles Osteen (North Platte)

CAP Liaison Attendance: Rick Golden, Walter Weir

Absent: Dan Hoelsing, Gary Monter, Gene Beardslee, Tip O'Neill, Michael Winkle, Stacey Decker, Brenda Decker, Don Phares

Staff: SuAnn Witt, Tom Rolfes

1. Co-Chair John Stritt convened the meeting at 1:02pm and welcomed all of the videoconferencing sites to the meeting. Roll Call found twelve members and two CAP liaisons present to start the meeting.
2. Review 11/16/2009 Meeting (Co-chairs)
 - a. [Meeting Notes of 11/16/2009](#)—No changes were made to the Meeting #3 notes.
 - b. Feedback from November Meeting -- John Stritt asked for feedback on previous meetings as members introduced themselves.
 - i. Charles Osteen asked that meeting notes be sent earlier.
 - ii. John Stritt mentioned that we have every possible codec technology present today and interconnected over the ESU 10 bridge.
 - iii. Scott Jones appreciated the videoconferencing access.
 - iv. Bob Uhing thanked Tom Rolfes for generating the downloadable pdf of meeting documents.
 - v. John Stritt highlighted items from the November 16 meeting: network characteristics, participation fee balance sheet, Network Nebraska survey, charter, new membership.
 - c. Comment on the meeting format
 - i. No changes, videoconferencing is appreciated and should continue.
 - d. What can we do to improve the flow of the meeting?
 - i. No changes
3. Network Nebraska [Marketing Survey](#) update (SuAnn Witt)
 - a. Timeline: Survey was issued on November 30 and closes on December 18. Initial data will be ready for report on or about the January 7 Ed Council meeting.
 - b. Distribution: Invitations to participate were sent out by various individuals to every educational sector in the state, to members and nonmembers of Network Nebraska. A reminder broadcast was sent out on December 11. Ken Clipperton reported receiving multiple reminders to complete the survey from different sources.
 - c. [Sample Data:](#)

- i. SuAnn Witt reported that as of December 16, 328 individuals had opened the survey and 231 had completed the survey, yielding a 70% completion rate.
- ii. Dennis Linster asked if the responses can be sorted by administrator, instructor, technical. Answer: only by IP address.
- iii. John asked if the answers can be sorted by geography? Answer: No, but can be next year.
- iv. Mike Danahy offered that other survey products other than Survey Monkey do perform this function.
- v. Dennis Linster offered his survey product for next year. Mike Danahy suggested that if IP addresses are to be used for data analysis, then the participants should be told. All members were in agreement with this warning.

4. Network Nebraska Budget

- a. Revisions to the [2009-2010 document](#) (e.g. Revenue received)—Tom Rolfes highlighted the changes to the Participation Fee budget document, including category subtotals and “revenue received” at the bottom of the spreadsheet. Tom Rolfes and Rick Golden reported that two new independent colleges will be joining Network Nebraska in the next month, Doane College and Clarkson College.
- b. Discussion of the 2010-2011 Network Nebraska Participation Fee—Tom Rolfes and Rick Golden highlighted the changes and expenditures that will change for 2010-11, based on 2009-10.
 - i. Input from advisory members—Dennis Linster shared that the current fee structure for the participation fee does not make any sense. Trafficshaping, as a service, needs to be discussed before fees are set. If the Network were to charge for services ala carte, then each service could begin to be more expensive. Kirk Langer agreed that we need to identify the core services and the premium services. Keeping costs low is a very important benefit identified by our participants. Lyle Neal said that if a tiered service would be provided, the more entities that used it, the less expensive the service would become. **John Stritt asked that all advisory group members use the next 30 days to consider different tiered service structures and be ready to discuss at the January meeting.**
 - ii. [Traffic Shaper RFP](#)—Tom Rolfes reported that the Traffic Shaper RFP was posted on the UNL Purchasing website on 12/3/2009 and the bids will be opened on 1/5/2010. Dennis Linster commented that most higher education entities would not find much value with such a service, if charged to all the members equally. Mike Danahy said that using the traffic shaper to control the traffic into K-12 is very important, especially if it originates from higher education in the form of videoconferencing.
 - iii. Help desk—There are some differentially tiered services that could be employed that may better address the needs of higher education vs. K-12 with respect to help desk services.
- c. Recommendation of [Affiliate Member Category and Associated Fees](#)—Tom Rolfes introduced the 3-page handout that defined the current “Full Membership” and proposed “Affiliate Membership” membership criteria and fee structure. John Stritt and Dennis Linster reinforced that we need to explore the value that Affiliate entities bring to the network. If the participation fee is made to be too high, then it may be too inhibitive for these entities to join. Walter Weir expressed that the future of Network Nebraska could offer virtualization of servers and services that may prove of value to new network members. John Stritt commented that potential programming and marketing of services needs to be a growth process. Dennis Linster asked what the fixed costs would be to

Network Nebraska if Affiliate entities would be brought on with little or no fee. Rick Golden responded that there could be additional support costs, especially if the new Affiliate Members did not have their own technical support staff and that additional T-1 ports could cost more to add to our core routers. TLS, MPLS and Q-MOE bandwidth would not cost anything as long as bandwidth is available. Scott Jones commented that museums and science centers offer unique programming that are of tremendous value to schools and they could be incentivized with rebated costs. **Dennis Linster asked that group members recommend a win-win entry level fee and service structure at their January meeting.** Dennis Linster said that Wayne State already has a relationship with the Wayne public library and municipality via a wireless Internet service. As a related issue, Mike Danahy had a question about a new middle school in his area that wants to connect directly to Network Nebraska at 10Mbps. Mike asked what fee would be charged to public schools who don't compete for LB 1208 funds but who want a more substantial connection for Internet. Tom Rolfes responded that the closest example we have to this situation is a former high school that has turned into a middle school, but still kept their separate fiber connection and who pay the full Network Nebraska Participation and Interregional Transport fees. The reverse example is a middle school that connects up to their neighboring high school and then connects to Network Nebraska. This middle school would not be charged a separate fee. If elementary and middle schools want to join Network Nebraska at 10Mbps and be eligible for LB 1208 funds, then a separate fee structure could be developed to encourage their membership.

- i. Affiliate Member Category Names—**Advisory Group members were asked to review the concept of “Affiliate Membership” and be prepared to discuss at their January meeting.**
 - ii. Affiliate Member Category Fees-- **Advisory Group members were asked to review the proposed fees for “Affiliate Membership” and be prepared to discuss at their January meeting.**
 - iii. Affiliate Member Category Criteria for Membership-- **Advisory Group members were asked to review the criteria for “Affiliate Membership” and be prepared to discuss at their January meeting.**
 - d. Discussion of the 2010-2011 Network Nebraska Interregional Transport Fee
 - i. Transport costs—Tom Rolfes reviewed the factors that will affect the 2010-2011 Interregional Transport Fee: Amount and locations for Internet access, amount of backbone transport bandwidth selected, location and number of traffic shaper devices, number of new Network Nebraska members.
 - ii. [New College Park Aggregation Circuit RFP](#)—Tom Rolfes reported that the new aggregation circuit RFP was posted on the OCIO website on 12/15/2009 and bids will be opened on 1/13/2010.
 - iii. [Internet Access RFP](#)—Tom Rolfes reported that the Internet Access RFP was posted on the State Purchasing website on 11/23/2009 and bids will be opened on 12/22/2009.
5. ADD: Review Charter language—Dennis Linster asked that we table the amending of the Advisory Group Charter until the next meeting when the members can have the Charter in front of them.
6. Next Meeting Date & Location—Next meeting date will be considered for January 19-20, 27-29. **John Stritt will post a Doodle poll.** Meeting locations will be via videoconferencing. John Stritt reviewed the assignments given to all Advisory Group members over the holiday break:
- a. **Contact museums/science center staff about the concept of Affiliate Membership**
 - b. **Contact colleagues from their sectors about Affiliate membership and fees**
 - c. **How do we better disseminate information from Advisory Group meetings?**

Items for the January agenda also included: Results of the Internet, Traffic Shaper and College Park aggregation circuit RFPs; Network Nebraska Marketing Survey results.

7. The Advisory Group reached consensus to adjourn at 3:02pm

List of Supporting Documents:

- Meeting notes, 11-16-2009
- Internet Access RFP
- Traffic Shaper RFP
- College Park Aggregation Circuit RFP
- Network Nebraska Participation Fee Budget
- Interregional Transport Fee Budget
- Affiliate Member Proposal Document
- Diagram of Network Nebraska Backbone segments and costs