MINUTES
Communication Technology Coordinating Committee
December 10, 2015, 1:00pm-2:30pm
5102 ITS-Manning

Committee members present: Chair- Brad Ives, Jim Gogan, Andy Johns, Tammy McHale, Christopher Payne, Chris Williams Also present: Steve Haring, Camilla Posthill

Excused: Brian Smith, Brent Comstock

Greeting and Introductions   **B. Ives**

Review of Committee Charter and Current Priorities   **J. Gogan**
Jim Gogan provided background on the Committee. Formed in 2010 its principal task was to develop a funding model to address the need to adequately fund the campus network.

Jim Gogan asked the Committee to review service priorities provided by Communication Technologies. The representation on the Committee lends valuable expertise needed for prioritizing emerging network requirements and how funding needs associated with legitimate demand may be addressed. An example can be seen in the growth of cloud applications and the impact on bandwidth usage.

History and Status of Communications Technologies Rate Model/Funding   **S. Haring**
Fiscal Year 2013 saw the first year the rate model was entirely in effect. Steve Haring shared the break-down of the core data fees cost by user with the committee as well as the cost of network operations, e.g. bring a new building on-line, voice services, etc. Committee members requested to see additional detail further to identify trends or opportunities for rate model refinement. The Committee discussed a few unique circumstances and off-site locations.

Steve explained that the rate model provides the foundation for lifecycle planning. This is guided by Communication Technologies' rolling 3-year strategic plan that identifies planned network investments.

Noteworthy is that the existing rate model does not include cost or support for pervasive wireless, e.g., residence halls, but the committee notes that it may be reasonable to expect the "refresh" for pervasive wireless may come out of rate model. The Committee also asked if Communication Technologies has benchmarked UNC-CH's bandwidth requirements against peer institutions.

Open Discussion for Future Meetings/Agenda Items/ Topics
Jim Gogan asks the committee for their recommendations network lifecycle refresh priorities.

The Committee agreed to meet annually. Jim Gogan will solicit feedback on issues and updates on a quarterly basis via email. The Committee hopes to see sources and streams of revenue broken up, e.g. reoccurring versus non-reoccurring. The committee would also like to see a comparison of old model versus new model. There was consensus by the Committee that the funding model is a revolutionary one admired by peer institutions and acts as a fair and equitable proxy for network use.

Meeting adjourned at 2:03pm.