

Network Nebraska Advisory Group

Membership Task Group

January 6, 2012, 2-3:30pm

Attendance: SuAnn Witt, Ron Cone, Rick Golden, Debbie Schroeder, Dan Hoelsing, Mike Danahy, Ken Clipperton, Kirk Langer, Walter Weir, Tom Rolfes

1. Goal for the Task Group: Develop fair and equitable written (recommended) guidelines for membership and membership fees on Network Nebraska.
2. Mike Danahy: ESU feedback so far is that the fee structure should not be discounted for one class of entity over another. Others agreed.
3. Mike Danahy: A potential reduced trial fee may be tolerable with the understanding that it would involve a limited number of entities for a limited amount of time.
4. Ken Clipperton: The fee structure must be based on actual costs. What constitutes actual costs?
5. Mike Danahy: The one entity, one fee structure is more equitable, especially for the smaller rural schools that have two different providers serving two different circuits to one entity.
6. SuAnn Witt: We must be careful when dealing with aggregation fees as potential community scenarios or regional scenarios could severely impact standalone entities.
7. Mike Danahy: We should be mindful of the amount of bandwidth that each entity uses when connecting to Network Nebraska.
8. SuAnn Witt: The group agrees that the draft Service Level Agreement (SLA) should be modified and used to clearly delineate the responsibilities and requirements of the partner entities as well as the services and responsibilities of the University and Office of the CIO.
9. Ken Clipperton: Is it desirable to keep the State and University networks separate?
10. Rick Golden: Yes, for the time being.
11. Ron Cone: We need to decide fee structures now, so prospective entities know how much it's going to cost for 2012-13. What about the Participation Fee being charged per organization and the Interregional Transport Fee be assessed on the basis of tiered bandwidth and/or number of circuits?
12. Kirk Langer: 1) With the current membership, is the network doing the things that we set out to do? 2) Are we positioning ourselves to begin to develop an application layer?
13. Ken Clipperton: Right now, the other statutorily eligible entities do not have a voice at the table of NNAG.
14. Walter Weir: It is widely perceived that Network Nebraska is comprised of the Education Network, the State Government Network, and the Telehealth Network.
15. Tom Rolfes: To clarify, more recently, it has been defined according to statute as the University Network, the Government Network, and the Education Network.
16. SuAnn Witt: Should non-education entities be incentivized to join Network Nebraska, at least for a limited amount of time?
17. Kirk Langer/Mike Danahy: Value-added services are the next logical step of development on Network Nebraska.
18. Tom Rolfes: Should Network Nebraska-Education be in the business of incentivizing community aggregation and charge them accordingly? If the answer is 'yes', what rate is going to be assessed? If the answer is 'no', might Network Nebraska-Education hand off their traffic to the state government network? Might there be a router pass-through cost?
19. Kirk Langer: Changes in budgets and state aid could risk Network Nebraska participation, especially for the larger entities.
20. Dan Hoelsing/Deb Schroeder: We agree with the points that have been made and that we do not want to endanger the coalition.

21. Walter Weir: I am going to talk with Rick Golden to discuss fixed costs of adding additional entities and talk to Brenda about the most appropriate pathway for these municipal or non-education entities to reach the state backbone.
22. Synopsis: After much discussion, the tendency of the group would be to recommend no changes to the way that the Participation or Interregional Transport fees are calculated at this time and only involve education entities in the K-20 sub-network. They further recommend that any non-education or local government entity wishing to join Network Nebraska should approach the Office of the CIO, understanding that there is a state government backbone that already serves county government and out-state state agencies.

Meeting notes recorded by Tom Rolfes and reviewed by the NNAG Membership Task Group.