

**Draft Minutes of Annual CCIRN Meeting
26-27 April 2006
Arlington, VA USA**

Attendees

Asia-Pacific Delegation

Xing Li (Co-Chair)	CERNET	China
Shigeki Goto	APAN	Japan
James Seng	SingAREN	Singapore
Andrew Howard	AARNet/APAN	Australia
Fay Sheu	TWAREN	Taiwan
Jun Matsukata	SINET/NII	Japan
Javed I Khan	Kent University (US)	Bangladesh

European Delegation

Kees Neggers (Co-Chair)	SURFnet	Netherlands
Vasilis Maglaris	NTUA	Greece
Dorte Olesen	TERENA/UNI-C	Denmark
Bert van Pinxteren	TERENA	The Netherlands
Matthew Scott	DANTE	United Kingdom
Thomas Lenggenhager	SWITCH	Switzerland

Latin American Delegation

Eriko Porto	CLARA	Brazil
-------------	-------	--------

North American Delegation

Heather Boyles (Co-Chair)	Internet2	United States
Dave MacNeil	CANARIE	Canada
Grant Miller	NCO IT R&D, JET	United States
Maxine Brown	NLR, TransLight/StarLight, UIC	United States
Warren Matthews	Chair, Internet2 Emerging Networks	United States
Don Riley	SIG, Georgia Tech Board Chair, IEEEAF University of Maryland	United States
Ana Preston	Internet2	United States
Christina Siroskey (Scribe)	Internet2	United States
Ken Klingenstein	Internet2	
Chris Robb	NSF IRNC TransPAC2 project, Indiana University	United States
Matt Mathis	PSC	United States
Julio Ibarra	WHREN-LILA project, FIU	United States

African Observers

Nezar Sami	ENSTINET	Egypt
Ola Wagieh Laurence	ENSTINET	Egypt
Andrew Alston	TENET	South Africa

International Observer

Mike Nelson	Internet Society	United States
-------------	------------------	---------------

1. Opening

Heather Boyles, acting as the North American CCIRN co-chair, opened the meeting. The proposed agenda for this meeting and the attending delegation list were handed out along with minutes from the last meeting. As hosting co-chair, Boyles developed the agenda with the other co-chairs. It was noted that in the past, CCIRN meetings were general presentations and updates which were duplicative of other events taking place at TERENA, APAN, and the Internet2 International Task Force meetings. This year's agenda came out of last year's proposal by Kees Neggers and Karel Vietsch to modify the format of the CCIRN meeting, so as to focus discussion on items of relevance to CCIRN representatives regarding the management of continental research and education networks. Boyles reminded the assembly that the meeting is intended as a forum for discussion. The proposed discussants listed in the agenda could frame the issues, prompting discussion among the CCIRN.

Delegates introduced themselves, noting their affiliations and responsibilities. In addition to continental delegations, representatives observing from the African continent were introduced in addition to Mike Nelson from the Internet Society.

Thanks were given to the co-chairs for bringing together the delegations.

It was noted that the evening CCIRN session would have three main topics for discussion; the first picking up on on-going technical discussions and the ITF presentation on routing issues between R&E Networks in general. The second topic came up at the last CCIRN meeting as something the CCIRN could take on, using the TERENA compendium as an example of an extremely useful resource that is used by emerging networks. Finally, a GLIF progress update was planned, again noting that the CCIRN should not duplicate work of the GLIF, but rather act as a global body that is well placed to understand where the GLIF is going. Riley noted that the agenda could benefit by providing a fibre roll-out update, noting that what was happening in Eastern and South-eastern Europe was surprising. Neggers seconded taking this up under agenda item 4.

Boyles noted that an authentication and authorization issue discussion was scheduled for the morning, due to the discussants Thomas Lenggenhager and Ken Klingenstein being involved in other meetings. A second item for morning discussion included action items on how CCIRN should go forward. Vietsch's terms of reference were mentioned, with the intent to discuss future issues and direction for the CCIRN. Vasilis Maglaris suggested that if the meeting isn't to be just about these issues, he suggested putting an emphasis on digital divide issues, and the CCIRN's role in addressing the digital divide. Andrew Alston suggested that he could provide an update on activities in S. Africa. Maglaris also noted that the CCIRN should try to encourage engagement from participants from Africa, perhaps nominating a co-chair for Africa. Boyles suggested revisiting this topic in the CCIRN activities agenda item. No other agenda suggestions were made.

2. Review minutes of the last CCIRN meeting (Poznan, 4-5 June 2005)

The minutes were approved without change, with thanks to the editor, Kevin Meynell.

3. International R&E network routing issues

Boyles asked Chris Robb to build on the solutions proposed during the routing issues discussion raised at the ITF. Potential solutions outlined included more rational interconnection agreements amongst int'l peers (e.g. to understand what routes are being passed and how traffic is routed.) He noted that not all of these solutions are plausible or "implementable", yet he noted how regional aggregation and a fuller mesh of "tier1" R&E" peerings- starting to move in this direction today. Robb recommended the creation of an R&E routing mailing list (NANOG-like), so that engineers could immediately become aware of issues on the network similar to peers in the commercial world. A fourth solution Robb proposed was stricter filtering, perhaps based on route registries.

Dave Meyer at University of Oregon suggested a solution implementing rfc 4384 "BGP communities for data collection" with extensions. A sixth proposed solution was to use tunnels for MPLS traffic exceptions instead of poking holes in network on an ad hoc basis. He explained that if research necessitates specific

routes, typically one very large route is set up, fixing the one application but bringing many other people (millions) along as a side effect.

In addition to formalized backup agreements, Robb briefly brought up a number of other solutions including the following.

8) Reduction of asymmetric routing policies (e.g. Internet2 Federal Network-ITN transit) – Abilene is making good strides in this area

9) Removal of a localpref controls (route tagging to influence traffic), which is difficult to troubleshoot without access to the network. Hence, Robb suggested removal of localpref controls in favour of BGP meds and AS-path prepending.

10) Formal communications and separation of customer routes from transit routes. In regards to the standard on naming these routes, Robb noted that the formal distinction between customer routes and transit routes is also a unique difference between R&E networks and commercial networks.

11) Responsive NOC-NOC communication – Robb noted that while it is much easier to work asynchronously, for individuals with 24/7 uptime requirements and with language barriers, good real-time communication is critical. Alston commented that South Africa implemented an IRC server to allow institutions to communicate.

12) Use more debug tools such as the Routeviews project at the University of Oregon, which enables researchers to create maps of the global network. Robb encouraged folks to contact the project, which is aware that R&E community is interested. He also noted that about eight networks are peered today with Routeviews.

Boyles noted that there are a large number of ideas there to discuss from this presentation. While CCIRN isn't a technical body, she proposed a discussion on what role CCIRN might take in promoting or furthering these solutions to address this issue.

Xing Li referred to slides to make his remarks (appended). He noted a published guideline for TEIN2 routing to provide a flexible and transparent routing policy to TEIN2 NRENs.

He noted various activities in the IETF discussing BGP scope, and TTL. TEIN2 is also trying to build a better database since the current routing database does not include community info. APAN JP proposed a matrix-based approach to routing, which is complicated but combined with earlier tools can provide global view.

The academic research and education network operators group suggested by Robb was seconded by Li and discussed.

Neggars noted that this is a real issue and that the CCIRN can recognize that this is a big mess and address it. He emphasized how R&E networks have to coordinate to survive. Alston said that best idea is to form a technical network group and that CCIRN could play a role in the formation of such a group.

It was agreed that a technical group mailing list be created. In addition, there was discussion about a technical face-to-face meeting to follow in conjunction with TERENA, APAN, I2 meetings. Howard suggested a meeting of Tier 1 networks at a regional meeting such as APAN, after which the group could then bring topics back to a global meeting.

David MacNeil noted a concern that four different problem definitions were voiced during this discussion, noting a concern that the technical RENOG group is formed before there is consensus over the problem. He suggested that the charter for the RENOG group address this.

Boyles asked if it made sense for CCIRN to post overviews of each networks routing policies on websites. Alston suggested that it would be better to get a draft policy formed in the RENOG group.

Boyles then recapped the following list of action items that arose.

ACTION 20060426-1	Set up Mailing List for RENOG
-------------------	-------------------------------

ACTION 20060426-2	CCIRN representatives to Encourage respective communities to designate appropriate technical members to that group
ACTION 20060426-3	Develop charter for operating group (Alston, Li, Robb)

4. Making the case for R&E networks (in countries with emerging and existing NRENs)

Bert van Pinxteren - TERENA

Making the case for NRENs is a big topic with much interest. TERENA is taking on more activities supporting emerging NRENs. Assistance to development of research and education networks in less advanced regions is a part of GN2, which conducts country needs assessments. More information is available on this on the TERENA website.

The Approach for the TERENA Compendium:

The basic approach used by the Compendium is an organizational approach (what is each NREN organization doing). TERENA sees the Compendium as a complementary activity to ongoing networking activities, in that it documents progress being made. This is similar to other complementary activities like the forward-looking studies SERENATE and EARNEST.

Most NRENs see the value of having a compilation as much greater than difficulties involved in answering the questionnaire. The Compendium respects the wishes of NRENs not to include data at an NREN's request. It also takes about a year to publish the data.

Van Pinxteren elaborated on the results from having the Compendium available. Many countries have found the information to be helpful for political conversations, with interest from policy makers, researchers and corporate entities (like Cisco). It acts as a single place where the information can be found. In 2005 edition, there is a summary of key findings.

For 2006, a review panel said it would be nice to also get information from NRENs outside of Europe. Hence, Van Pinxteren asked the CCIRN representatives. A mini-version of the survey with fewer questions has been made, allowing NRENs to choose between taking the full survey or a mini-survey. Van Pinxteren noted that if an NREN is interested, TERENA would create a record for them in their database and allow online entries.

Boyles was unaware when putting together the agenda of TERENA's interest in opening up the Compendium to other non-European NRENs. Her original thinking was that the CCIRN might be in a position to compile a global compendium. In a paper last year, it was suggested that CCIRN act as a portal.

Shigeki Goto mentioned that they would look at the shorter version. He noted that there are two kinds of data for APAN (with 15 members), some of which is already covered by the Secretariat, and other questions for major developments. Collectively APAN has similar information, but would have to harmonize the data with TERENA. This meeting is a good trigger to investigate a way to harmonize. He also noted that the APAN member survey is available on the website, including information by country.

The issue of geographical scope was raised. CANARIE has welcomed regional networks to take survey as well, even though they are not national in scale. Boyles asked if there was a list of organizations TERENA was targeting for the next year; Van Pinxteren responded that because this is first time, they are interested in gathering all available data. Boyles asked if there was role for CCIRN to encourage this further into the communities. Van Pinxteren said that if so, TERENA would be very grateful.

Riley commented that it would be great to be able to answer the "so what" regarding why comparisons matter. Some networks have shared their value propositions/rationales with others in Europe; perhaps this is something we could do. Boyles suggested one idea, for the CCIRN to build a repository of documents. She noted that previously there was talk about the CCIRN website being such a repository for holding documents.

7:33. Boyles summed up the action items that came out of the discussion as follows:

ACTION 20060426-4	Point the CCIRN website to the TERENA Compendium.
ACTION 20060426-5	Suggest links to documents/resources that may be helpful such as TERENA Compendium for CCIRN website. (All)
ACTION 20060426-6	Build a section of the CCIRN website for articulating the value proposition of national research and education networks.
ACTION 20060426-7	Encourage NRENs to answer the TERENA Compendium questionnaire and investigate harmonization between continents

5. Authentication and authorization infrastructure issues

Thomas Lenggenhager, SWITCH

Ken Klingenstein, Internet2

Boyles noted how Middleware is a topic at the APAN meetings. She asked Klingenstein to discuss this topic from the U.S. perspective and asked Lenggenhager to present with a European perspective. She highlighted that mainly this agenda item is update-oriented for the CCIRN; however the group may want to think about if there is an ongoing role for the CCIRN here.

Lenggenhager explained that Research and Education Federations (REFEDS) – is an informal group that talks about how different federations could operate. It evolved from follow up on initial attempts to tackle inter-federation issues. REFEDS now has resources allocated to it on a volunteer basis. Three meetings have taken place since its launch. Current work items include: a data protection directive for federations, finding a common denominators among policies, assuring level of assurance (LoA), and peering between federations. Mainly this takes place via discussion on a mailing list and a few short meetings over dinner. There are no guidelines there.

Klingenstein then started his presentation with respect to what's happening in the U.S. He started by noting two distinctions for the US. 1) In Europe and Australia, federations are established under NRENs or semi-governmental affiliation. In the US, no government shelter is available so liability and indemnification are an issue. As a result, in Europe many countries are coming along; but in the US have to handle the issues with each University, lawyer by lawyer. So far, 30-35 universities are in the U.S. federation. However, there are thousands of installations of federated software, and state university systems are forming federations themselves, becoming the places where there are existing business relationships.

Klingenstein noted that the second distinction is that folks are trying in the U.S. to have this relationship peer with the federal government relationship. He hopes to have it done by September 30, 2006.

The marketplace for federations is starting. Generally, in the commercial sector companies will set up federations for business purposes and then knock it down. In R&E, we are trying to set the federations up for as long as the University will last.

Klingenstein has also been talking to the grid community about bringing this to them. He noted that in this community, there is not a lot of reusing innovation; there are twelve grid/shib projects but they are not talking to each other. So, there is an issue of using these technologies in the grid space and getting grid community to coalesce around a common set of approaches. There is work in Tokyo coming up next month, with people are interested in deployment in this space.

Discussion

Boyles recalled that from the Cotswolds meeting (hosted by JISC and UKERNA to discuss these issues among countries operating federations) there were 2 things that came out, including: getting to practical interconnection/peering of federations and promoting the idea of federations to emerging NRENs.

Lenggenhager noted that REFEDS is an open forum so all of the documents are open. It might be better for an individual to come to the Euro-camps or US camps on setting up federations where introductory information is available. Howard noted that the Singapore APAN meeting will have a session on this. James Seng said that he needs to understand how to bring this back to his NREN. Boyles noted that part of the Cotswolds outcome was to help educate NRENs on what it is. She asked if it would make sense to write a cookbook, Lenggenhager suggested that it's a moving target and so a cookbook would be outdated very quickly. Howard asked if it is possible to use the Research Channel to gather and publish videos of introductory talks. Klingenstein said this was a good idea, that perhaps maybe every month or two we could also have a video conference/status discussion and capture that as well. Boyles reminded the room that something discussed yesterday was how the CCIRN could serve as resource for this. She asked if there is a current repository for these federation resources. Lenggenhager responded that on the REFEDS page there is a pointer to terena.nl/activites/refeds/index. He noted that Internet2 also has a list. There is also a documents section on the SWITCH page (current AAI documents, service agreement, fed. partnership agreement and other specification documents). Klingenstein summarized that this effort is moving along with an international community working on it. He reminded the group that grids do not need this today – but when they understand they need it, it will be there.

Boyles thanked Lenggenhager and Klingenstein for the update. No actions came out of this discussion.

6. Short GLIF update – rescheduled from Wednesday

Last year the GLIF was one of main agenda topics of the CCIRN meeting. Normally regular updates are done during the conference, but Neggers agreed to provide a short update. He reminded us that as was illustrated in the previous routing discussion, it is important to have global coordination on the growing routing and circuit switched network. He provided a short background on the GLIF development and mission and iterated that the GLIF website is meant to provide updates. He noted that TERENA is providing a light secretariat for the GLIF. He suggested that we point to this from the CCIRN website, which lists participants and sponsors. There are a number of working groups, such as the technical and control plane groups which are quite active. The next GLIF meeting. is scheduled for September 11-12, 2006 in Tokyo and all are invited.

ACTION 20060426-8	Point to GLIF from CCIRN website
-------------------	----------------------------------

Matthew Scott provided his PowerPoint on this topic, with an update on the GEANT2 service portfolio and how future developments relate to international connectivity coming into GEANT.

Apart from IP access, GEANT is developing point to point services. For the on fibre group, the standard is for NRENs to get a 2nd 10G port for GigE (or a portion of 10 G path) to allocate to points in the GEANT cloud. Service can be requested and at any time can have a route provisioned on the GEANT network. The off fibre group can also reserve dedicated paths by reserving part of their existing bandwidth. For the on-fibre group, point-to-point access is bundled. Additionally, primary and backup 10 Gb paths across the network are also available for an additional marginal fee.

Scott also noted the trial 1G point-to-point service starting with Internet2 and how technical and commercial policies have to be developed.

Next Scott provided an update on regional networks, starting with news on a possible East African study potentially financed by the European Commission. DANTE is submitting a proposal with European NRENs to the EC for a feasibility study for networking in southern and eastern Africa.

Maglaris noted that he has been approached to do something similar in sub-Saharan Africa and noted interest in getting together with Americans and Canadians who have similar interests in this matter. Alston then asked to provide an update on activities from an African perspective.

Alston began by discussing what TENET is doing to encourage growth in Africa. He noted a study project developing regarding the feasibility of network infrastructure implementation. He also noted a combined

effort between TENET and the UBUNTU alliance, with the focus of looking at application specific alliances to see how to increase collaborations in specific areas of research like malaria, HIV, etc. Within the south-eastern Africa there is the UBUNTU alliance – a group of NRENs from along the south-eastern African coast that are considering creating a network like GEANT. These NRENs are working toward getting international gateway licenses. Incumbent telecoms can do cross-border fibres, and KENET and Mozambique have gotten these licenses for educational purposes. TENET is still working on this, but they have to do this fairly quietly to avoid litigation/politics. Tanzania is also thinking about this. If they could get a license, they could work on cross-border fibre to Mozambique, where they can meet the international cables off the Mozambique Coast. Alston noted that many of these initiatives are being pushed by NRENs that aren't heavily government-related. He noted that instead of governments, the universities are leading the efforts. This arrangement also assists with pursuing funding from private foundations that wouldn't otherwise be accessible by government controlled initiatives.

Riley noted that out of Tunis an effort evolved trying to buy a research and education seat for EASSy cable and the World Bank was asked to not put money into it unless there was open access. He asked if there was a role for CCIRN. Boyles noted that perhaps from the Internet Society perspective - if there were ways IS could work on these regulatory issues and let CCIRN know how they could work in partnership on this.

Boyles asked for thoughts on the CCIRN role in this issue. Alston suggested that more African representation on the CCIRN would result in better understanding, informing actions that could come out of that. He noted the importance of support and representation for making arguments and building skill-sets.

No actions came out of this discussion.

7. CCIRN role, activities review

Boyles noted that this agenda item is intended to cover: draft terms of reference from Vietsch, an update on website support, website management and mailing lists, representation of the African continent, and topics for further discussion under the CCIRN.

Boyles reminded the group that after the last meeting, Vietsch had an action item to draft new terms of reference (ToR) for the CCIRN. The previous 1997 ToR and the proposed 2006 version were handed out. Boyles noted that Vietsch and Neggers put together a background paper on this and notes from the last meeting. Boyles asked for comments/questions on the proposed draft. MacNeil wanted the distinction between CCIRN and GLIF to be clarified and asked what value the CCIRN proposed to GLIF. Neggers responded that the CCIRN has an open agenda, covering everything relevant to global research and education networking. The GLIF differs in that it has a specific focus. Riley noted that between the two versions of the ToR, there is a significant shift in language presuming that each continent is developed in the same manner. He also asked whether Mexico should be involved in North America delegation. MacNeil suggested, and Boyles seconded, a suggestion to keep the North American CCIRN language referencing both the current co-chair and others.

Neggers noted that CLARA representation is lacking at this meeting. Eriko Porto responded that CLARA's meeting with the European Commission was occurring simultaneously, making it difficult for others to attend. Goto commented that APAN representation is appropriate as defined. APAN takes on a consortium role of coordinating R&E efforts, with representatives from 15 countries and the ability to ask others to join as observers.

Scott commented that he is not entirely sure why the ToR moved towards identifying specific members instead of listing a general representation that is responsible for assembling appropriate parties. Neggers responded that this was discussed last year, with the thinking that CCIRN might operate better if one organization was responsible. Hence, in each continent, there is an organization that takes responsibility for CCIRN chairing – allowing a place for organizations to turn to for activity support, like venue arrangements and logistics. Boyles suggested that since all of the co-chairs were not present, there should be an action item to suggest language back to the CCIRN to clarify the ToR. Dorte Olesen stated that it

would be very good to have more active participation in Africa, and the intent is to encourage more participation. Nezar Sami suggested including a line on the ToR including the African CCIRN, with representation to be determined by organizations from Africa.

Boyles mentioned the co-chair responsibility for setting the meeting agenda, noting how at the last meeting it was agreed that the CCIRN meeting would rotate around the world, to be held in conjunction with other meetings.

Howard noted how Middle Eastern representation is missing. Boyles responded that there are emerging efforts in many Middle Eastern countries, yet the intent is not to force a delegation to form. However, the CCIRN should consider inviting observers from these networks as an idea for the future.

ACTIONS:

ACTION 20060426-9	Suggest new language for North American CCIRN
ACTION 20060426-10	Identify forum for North American R&E Networks to discuss outside of CCIRN
ACTION 20060426-11	Suggest new language for Terms of Reference
ACTION 20060426-12	Approve new Terms of Reference online via email
ACTION 20060426-13	Provide recommendation on African representation at future CCIRN meetings (Alston and Sami)

Goto provided an update on the website and mailing list. He noted that support from APAN focuses on changing the content. (E.g. last meetings minutes and presentations were posted.) However, content was last updated during July/August of 2005, with information about working groups still on the web. He suggested the need for a schema to support the secretariat team. He also noted that regarding the maintenance of the website and mailing list, one organization is responsible for domain names. He also noted that currently the webpage is a physically robust structure; however the design and contents should be updated. Goto reinforced that a solution could be that APAN posts the information, asking others to update the blocks of text. Boyles noted last year's CCIRN action item to submit changes, but she was not sure who to send changes to. She suggested that perhaps a single point of contact for web updates could be helpful. She also proposed that a content editor be designated who attends the CCIRN meetings to understand what's going on, with the editor perhaps attending from a co-secretariat organization. There was a suggestion that the secretaries designate a co-editor to work with the APAN secretariat to update content. Goto will bring the issue to the monthly APAN meetings. Boyles asked if since APAN has the CCIRN.org domain, if it is possible to create mailing lists with same domain. Goto responded that they are now maintaining ten mailing lists, and he will check. Boyles asked for the creation of a co-chair mailing list and a list for co-secretaries.

ACTIONS:

ACTION 20060426-14	Designate information secretaries (Boyles to follow-up with co-chairs)
ACTION 20060426-15	Secretaries to meet to identify website changes/edits and identify a content maintainer. (Boyles to follow-up with co-chairs)
ACTION 20060426-16	Create RENOG.org domain. (Internet2)
ACTION 20060426-17	Identify host for RENOG mailing list. (Internet2)
ACTION 20060426-18	Point to RENOG site/ mailing list from CCIRN site.
ACTION 20060426-19	Identify and invite individuals to join RENOG (all)

8. Date and location of next meeting

Last year CCIRN was hosted by the European delegation, with prior years in Cairns (Australia) and Indianapolis (USA). Boyles noted that next year there are possibilities for Asia or Latin America to host. Porto mentioned that the CLARA 2007 date and location had not yet been determined, and offered to pass on the suggestion to the CLARA board to include this for 2007. Goto noted that the APAN meeting is

scheduled for 2007 for July or August in Xi'an China. Boyles noted that since the APAN meeting is usually a Monday through Friday meeting, it could take place before or after. Goto noted that the exact date of meeting will be decided on July 21 at the Singapore meeting. Li also mentioned to Goto that he would be happy to host.

If RENOG can be set up fairly quickly, hopefully a RENOG meeting could occur before the end of 2006. Boyles noted that RENOG could meet in conjunction with a number of meetings prior to then (e.g. Internet2 meeting in December, APAN in Manila, others). CCIRN then would have to be more active on the email list and plan to meet in Xi'an. Boyles asked for feedback on this plan, and the group affirmed.

9. Any Other Business and Close

Boyles asked for feedback on this meeting's discussion topics, asking if there were standing topics that should be repeated or if there were others that should be taken up. Mike Nelson brought up WSIS and specifically the outcome of the Internet Governance forum meeting in Athens. He noted that there was a lot of interest in capacity building, and asked for feedback and/or comments to take back to the next meeting. Nelson noted that one of the things Internet Society was trying to do was to bring folks together and noted that CCIRN could be more proactive in promoting various activities. He noted a May meeting in Geneva of the advisor committee for the forum agenda. Boyles asked Nelson what opportunities exist for CCIRN and ISOC to work together. Nelson emphasized that providing access to ISOC documents and existing resources would be helpful. He also noted that this community can provide technical advice to governments – noting the disconnect between policy people and technical people, noting the example of Brazil.

Boyles asked for feedback on topics on this meeting: none was provided.

Boyles thanked everyone for coming and participating actively in this meeting. She thought discussion topics went really well, offering opportunities to discuss that don't exist in broader meetings. The group recognized Boyles's job of chairing.

ACTIONS:

ACTION 20060426-20	Report back on if CLARA can host 2008 meeting (Porto)
ACTION 20060426-21	Identify issues where CCIRN can provide input. (Nelson /ISOC)

10. Summary of Actions

ACTION ID	TASK	LEAD
ACTION 20060426-1	Set up Mailing List for RENOG	Robb, Boyles
ACTION 20060426-2	CCIRN representatives to encourage respective communities to designate appropriate technical members to that group	All
ACTION 20060426-3	Develop charter for operating group	Alston, Li, Robb
ACTION 20060426-4	Point the CCIRN website to the TERENA Compendium.	APAN
ACTION 20060426-5	Suggest links to documents/resources that may be helpful such as TERENA Compendium for CCIRN website.	All
ACTION 20060426-6	Build a section of the CCIRN website for articulating the value proposition of national research and education networks.	APAN
ACTION 20060426-7	Encourage NRENs to answer the TERENA Compendium questionnaire and investigate harmonization between continents	All
ACTION 20060426-8	Point to GLIF from CCIRN website	APAN
ACTION 20060426-9	Suggest new language for North American CCIRN	North American Co-Chairs
ACTION 20060426-10	Identify forum for North American R&E Networks to discuss outside of CCIRN	North American Co-Chairs
ACTION 20060426-11	Suggest new language for Terms of Reference	All
ACTION 20060426-12	Approve new Terms of Reference online via email	All
ACTION 20060426-13	Provide recommendation on African representation at future CCIRN meetings	Alston, Sami
ACTION 20060426-14	Designate information secretaries (Boyles to follow-up with co-chairs)	Boyles
ACTION 20060426-15	Secretaries to meet to identify website changes/edits and identify a content maintainer. (Boyles to follow-up with co-chairs)	Boyles
ACTION 20060426-16	Create RENOG.org domain.	Internet2
ACTION 20060426-17	Identify host for RENOG mailing list.	Internet2
ACTION 20060426-18	Point to RENOG site/ mailing list from CCIRN site.	APAN
ACTION 20060426-19	Identify and invite individuals to join RENOG	All
ACTION 20060426-20	Report back on if CLARA can host 2008 meeting (Porto)	Porto/CLARA
ACTION 20060426-21	Identify issues where CCIRN can provide input. (Mike N./ISOC)	Nelson/ISOC