**Community Engagement Program Advisory Group – CE-PAG**

**Notes/Agendas:**

**October 2016**

This meeting took place in person at the EDUCAUSE Conference in Anaheim, CA.

**ATTENDEES**

Mark Askren

Theresa Rowe (video)

Kathy Gates

Carrie Rampp

Jack Seuss

Ana Hunsinger

David Gift

Gail Krovitz

Ann Doyle

John Hicks (call)

Shel Waggener

Glenn Lipscomb

John Morabito

Ann O'Beay

Gigi Youngblood (recording secretary)

**NOT ATTENDING:** Sam Segran, Brice Bible

**1. New ways to engage with industry members — how can we redefine or refine industry engagement to make it even more meaningful to industry and academic members?  (Ana, Dave, Ann O’Beay)**

Ann O'Beay did an overview presentation.  Discussion centered on how to obtain *strategic* value from Internet2 engagement for industry members as well as higher ed members and others.  Ideas:

* -- #1:  Articulate clear expectations the community has for industry membership and engagement (and for the response of other members toward industry members that comport with these expectations).  Expectations should include the following:
* -- Concentrate on thought leadership.  Develop via meetings/presentations, workgroup/project participation.  Clear articulation of this value will help to make it easier to recognize and value across industry leadership turnover (which tends to happen on short time frames).
* -- In support of the above, insist that industry members engage via their technical and product development leaders, not their sales/marketing leaders.
* -- Industry membership should be durable -- i.e., not change from year to year.

Internet2 should lay out its key strategic goals, so that industry members may see how they could participate in shaping and achieving those.  (Parenthetically, Internet2 should continue to look toward the "grand challenges" articulated by the U.S. national academies and key funding agencies as indicators.)

OK for Internet2 to have industry-oriented programs for non-members.  Meeting sponsorship is one area, but we should take care not to head toward the sort of giant exhibit floor that EDUCAUSE has -- not that this is a bad thing in and of itself (large exhibit halls are good ways to discover new products/services) but because we want Internet2 to differentiate in terms of *high-quality interactions* rather than simply large scale.  Again, can we get companies to send solution specialists rather than marketeers?  High value when industry sponsors come hand in hand with a university where they had success.

Also discussed idea of taking incubator projects at university and giving them a pass at internet2 to reach out to members. Can we give start-ups, particularly those arising from our higher ed members, and give them a temporary break (up to 2 years?) in membership fees so that they may gain exposure and participate in the strategic technical discussions?  Good support for this idea.

Internet2 will continue to work on this and before end of this year have  proposed pieces to integrate into 2017 and 2018.

**2.  New fee model:  review plans for "special cases"  (Dave, Ana)**

* **o   System offices**
* **o   “Spec meds”**
* **o   Independent research institutes that grant degrees**
* **o   System memberships**

Dave gave an update on new fee model implementation --  so far so good. Will be sending invoices for January during the first week of November.

Regarding the "special cases", draft document sent ahead of the meeting with descriptions of each case, why they represent unusual circumstances and may warrant special pricing consideration, and proposals for starting-point pricing:

* System offices that are stand-alone individual members.  Wide variety in how they process funds, but the offices themselves are typically very small compared to the academic campuses in this systems.  Support for pricing them at the Minimum Sustaining Contribution level.
* Free-standing medical schools (that may also include nursing, dentistry, pharmacy or other allied health degree programs) not a part of a larger general university.  Modest-sized institutions that tend to have large operating budgets (due to integral clinical operations) and large research budgets (high levels of NIH funding), but only offer a limited variety of academic degrees.  Support for pricing them at 75% of the Maximum Sustaining Contribution.
* Independent research institutes that also grant degrees.  Without degrees would be Affiliate members of Internet2.  Most have modestly large research budgets ($300 million to $500 million) but very small operating budgets in addition to the research budgets.  Support for pricing these at $35,000 Sustaining Contribution.
* System memberships.  Reviewed the current standard pricing model for these.  Support for continuing with those campuses over $40 million annual R&D expenditures paying full Sustaining Contribution, all others getting 20% discount of whatever their SC would normally be; system office is included at no charge, and presently eduroam and InCommon participation fees are included at no additional cost.

**3. Ideas for cross-PAG communication (Ana) — mechanisms to better assure that PAG members know what is going on with other PAGs, and have a better holistic sense of Internet2’s direction**

Thinking about how PAGs communicate and work across PAGs.  What should we do to get more cross-PAG and external visibility?  We'll at least start with each PAG constructing a running summary of their meeting agendas and discussion notes, and see what else we should add or do from there.

4.  John Morabito attended the meeting and welcomed the PAG members to ask him anything about Internet2's approaches to legal work and government relations.

**END OF NOTES**