

UK MAN Managers' Group

Minutes of meeting held on 21st January 2009
at HEFCE offices, London

Present:

David Vinograd	-	(Chair for Item 1)
Craig MacDonald	C&NLMAN	(lunch)
Linda McCormick	ClydeNET	
Sam Wilson	EaStMAN	
Ian Griffiths	EMMAN	
Mike Whitehead	FaTMAN	(Notetaker)
Bob Day	JANET(UK)	(afternoon only)
Rolly Trice	JANET(UK)	(afternoon only)
David Hayling	Kentish MAN	
Paul Kentish	Kentish MAN	
John Aldington	Kentish MAN	
Mike Byrne	LeNSE	(Chair for Item 2 onwards)
Andrew Kerl	LMN	
Geoff Cooper	LMN	
Peter White	LMN	
Chris Kelly	NIRAN	
Tim Robinson	NNW	
Jason Bane	NorMAN	
Neil Frances	SWERN	
Jem Taylor	UHI	
Ed Carter	YHMAN	

Apologies:

John Linn AbMAN

1. Election of Chair and Deputy Chair

David Vinograd convened the meeting and conducted the election of Chair and Deputy Chair. Following this he relinquished the chair to Mike Byrne.

Chair

Agreed unanimously that Mike Byrne be appointed for three years.

Deputy Chair

Jason Bain and Tim Robinson volunteered resulting in a discussion about whether or not to have two deputies. Linda was keen to have difference governance arrangements represented (consortiums and companies).

Agreed after discussion that Jason Bain would serve for 3 years

Agreed after three years to review the term of **both** Chair and Deputy Chair.

Thanks

On behalf of UKMMG, Mike Byrne presented a gift and paid tribute to all the work done by David Vinograd over many years – including the recent period which has been voluntary and unpaid.

David recognised a significant change in the group over the years as it moved towards its current stability. He cautioned that there was still much for the group to do and that it should ensure that it maintains a watchfulness in the context of a contract which we have to fulfil.

2. Administrative Matters

Dates of Future Meetings

Agreed

- to meet at HEFCE for the foreseeable future. We are welcomed here because JISC recognises our vital role in the delivery of JANET services.
- that London is the most convenient location for our many distant travellers. Therefore summer meetings will be in London instead of visits to RNOs.
- that EMMAN and LeNSE should be omitted from the minute-taking rota because they provide secretarial services and the chair.
- to start future meetings at 10:30 to facilitate additional items.
- to reaffirm an invitation to any region which retains a representative entity even where its regional network is operated by JANET(UK). So Welsh Network Ltd (WNL) is welcome but MidMAN has dissolved and we are therefore unable to invite them.
- to future meeting arrangements:

29 th April 2009	London HEFCE offices	Lunch: NIRAN	Minutes: Kentish MAN
24 th June 2009	London venue TBC	Lunch: UHI	Minutes: LMN

Action: Andrew Kerl offered (on behalf of LMN) to seek a venue for 24th June because the HEFCE premises are not available for that day.

Style and content of minutes (Mike Byrne)

Agreed that minutes should generally be minimalised to ensure that there is clarity in the salient points. Chair should help by clearly stating the actions and decisions before moving on.

Agreed to send minutes to JANET(UK), to JISC and to Chairs of MANs after they are confirmed by email discussion.

UKMMG web site (Peter White/Mike Byrne)

Peter White and Mike Byrne suggested improvements to the website which hasn't changed style since 1998. Peter said it does get lots of hits, some ancient material needs to be removed and he invited comments on what to change.

Action: All send suggestions to Peter White.

Agreed to retain the name "UK MAN Managers' Group" because it is specified in the JPA contract as UKMMG.

Action: Tim Robinson to reserve the domain name ukmmg.org.uk

Action: Peter White and Mike Byrne will update the content, remove the annual report reference, and retain meeting notes and reports from MANs. Terms of reference to be included. Any suggestions received will be incorporated.

Ian Griffiths was keen to ensure that the links to other groups such as JISC and JANET(UK) are clearly stated.

Action: Mike Byrne to revise/renew the UKMMG terms of reference by email within the group.

3. Notes of previous meeting (produced by EaStMAN):

Accuracy

The minutes were accepted.

Matters Arising

IPv6

John Linn had circulated a document including a statement from Rolly Trice about funding site routers to run IPv6. JANET(UK) would not pay for upgrades unless they were part of the managed router scheme and there was a definite requirement for IPv6 at this site.

It is expected that IPv6 will soon be included in the standard Cisco IOS version rather than needing an additional licence.

No-one present was willing to predict when IPv6 will be required.

JANET(UK) had been intending to offer a course for implementing IPv6.

David Hayling stated that it is relatively easy to implement IPv6 on a RN but far harder to implement on a local site network.

Other actions

Some items are covered on the meeting agenda. Other ones:

- Mike Byrne – not yet contacted David Steadman
- Tim Robinson – action on SAG reporting removed – to be discussed at JDT
- David Hayling – action on Netsight. Done - see below
- Jason Bain – JANET SLA item on agenda below
- Ian Griffiths – item covered under UCISA-NG report below
- Rolly Trice – is presenting responses later in the meeting

ITT for JANET Lightpath

In addition to Rolly's response on the ITT for JANET Lightpath procurement, it was noted that older ITTs remain available on the JANET web site - See the URL - <http://www.ja.net/company/invitations-to-tender/history.html>

It is essential that RNOs get a clear statement of what is required – expect the TDA to discuss the technical detail so that our procurements are properly aligned with JANET Lightpath design and operation. We should not have to rely upon the JANET(UK) vetting process to ensure that our ITTs are valid – although if JANET(UK) approves them it should ensure that we get what we need (or have a “guarantee” from JANET(UK)).

Agreed: to raise this again with RT this afternoon and take it off-line for further discussion to ensure that RNOs know exactly what is required.

NIRAN

NIRAN – will not be allowed a 3rd connection but JANET(UK) will explore ways to get a 1Gbps link into the JANET core

4. RN Reports

Many RNOs apologised for late delivery of reports.

JANET(UK) is expected to start a push on branding. Noted that some RNOs are single branded and others dual-branded. A suggestion to have a single URL style (xxxRNO.ja.net) was not agreed by all, so it is best to raise such issues at a JDT meeting.

Agreed that all our home pages should have a clear link to the JANET web site.

Ian Griffiths is proud of the EMMAN DR plan and Risk Register which he brought for people to see. Some elements are confidential but he is willing to send other sections of it to other RNOs on request.

YHMAN are using consultants to help them to design and enact some DR scenarios.

5. Liaison between RNOs and JANET

Joint UKMMG and JPA RNO Managers' Meetings with JANET

JANET(UK) had requested a more formal meeting between JANET(UK) and the RNO managers to cover items which were not appropriate for the JDT which was attended by operational RNO staff. Members were generally happy with the proposal but would not wish to lose the chance to raise issues with Rolly which arose during the morning meeting.

Agreed In the spirit of partnership, we are keen to accommodate Rolly's request to hold JPARM meetings even though they are not a contractual requirement of the JPA. Two of the four UKMMG meetings each year will have the afternoon sessions reserved for potential JPARM meetings, which will be chaired and minuted by JANET(UK) as long as we are still able to raise any issues which arise from our morning meetings.

Liaison Meeting Attendance Schematic (Mike Byrne)

Agreed – this was accepted as a valuable contribution to clarity.

6. JANET Partner Agreement:

Procurement Audits

NIRAN were audited on 27 Nov 2008 (Sue Weston and Glenn Fletcher of Achilles). JANET(UK) asked for a large number of documents going back a number of years (though JDT were told that this would be no more than 1 year). NIRAN is in the early stages of procurement for NIRAN-2.

Glenn advised that if a contracting authority wants to consider suppliers on their capacity, technical ability, and financial standing, then they should do so in a Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ). This is due to the interpretation of the ECJ "Lianakis" ruling wherein such company evaluations are no longer deemed acceptable in Open Procedure processes.

NIRAN accepted the JANET(UK) recommendation to use the restricted OJEU procedure and has since launched a PQQ in the OJEU.

JANET(UK) also advised on changes to the way Award Criteria were being used in Tender documents and alerted NIRAN to the need to enhance such sections in their ITT. NIRAN accordingly enhanced the Award Criteria of their draft Tender document but was slightly concerned that JANET(UK) were subsequently reluctant to comment on NIRAN's "fixes" to the ITT documents. The group suggested that it may be best to address such issues via the RNO's JANET(UK) contract manager or Steve Percival if necessary.

JANET(UK) also recommended that NIRAN should review some services with a view to re-procuring them via the OJEU – this particularly applied to the operational network services provider. It wasn't clear whether this is legally required because NIRAN is a company and may be able to contract with one of its members to provide services without need for OJEU procurement (though an internal procurement is still sensible).

Action: David Hayling offered to provide the words required to ensure that an "internal" or "members-only" procurement is acceptable. One issue is the risks involved.

BAPs

At the last meeting, no BAPs had been agreed. Most RNO BAPs have now been agreed with the exception of:

- a) LMN. An issue of a few thousand pounds still to be resolved.
- b) EMMAN. They have been given a small reserve.

It was noted that all RNO reserves are likely to dwindle because the contract now offers funding according to need thus avoiding any operating surplus.

One or two RNOs expressed concern that they are subsidising a portion of their operating costs because not all costs can be included in the formal claims.

Steve Percival has agreed to fund all fibre rates – but only those you actually have paid (ie no funding for anticipated rates demand).

7. Liaison with UCISA-NG 3rd December 2008 (Ian Griffiths)

Deferred.

8. Halls of Residence

SWERN and some other RNOs have had requests for quotes with NorMAN and LeNSE having had formal orders. Only connection requests from CableCom have been received so far.

EMMAN noted that CSIRT is seeing many more security issues re Halls of Residence, but these should really be handled by the contract holder not the RNO – i.e. the people who run the Halls of Residence.

Agreed any RNO receiving such a CSIRT issue should return it to JANET(UK). This item will be taken off the agenda.

9. Other relevant/timely items

(a) IPV6 (John Linn)

John had circulated a note by email – the contents are covered in Rolly's report.

Mike Byrne has been talking to Tim Chown at Southampton about providing tools for testing IPv6. JANET(UK) intend to provide similar tools at the IPv6 beacons but these are not expected for at least 6 months

Action: All to send Mike Byrne any suggestions for facilities to be offered by the proposed new LeNSE multicast beacon.

(b) Netsight 2 (David Hayling)

Still not as many RNs yet covered by the new Netsight as JANET(UK) had hoped for by now and David is still awaiting responses from Mark Leese. He will continue a dialogue about any further concerns raised by RNOs. Still not clear what will happen to an old Netsight should it fail (as has the one at Kentish MAN).

NetFlow – JANET(UK) say they have no money to do a NetFlow project.

(c) School Connections (Tim Robinson/Ed Carter)

This is a very complex issue in England. Some MANs will connect a non-LEA school as a sponsored connection either through the RNO or a member institution. Most will not connect an LEA school unless the LEA agrees. **Agreed** to raise this with JANET(UK).

(d) Connection of other public bodies (Ian Griffiths)

EMMAN being asked to connect Police, health and LAs and/or provide advice for them. LAs do not always follow their connection strategies for their region.

Ian Griffiths wishes to retain a relationship with LAs and noted that there is a need to ensure that publicly funded circuits cannot be used for other purposes without ensuring that there is adequate recompense/charging to cover the increased bandwidth especially where an upgrade is required to provide adequate bandwidth.

(e) SLA negotiations (Jason Bain)

Jason Bain gave a note of some minor changes soon to be proposed by JANET(UK). There had been no discussion concerning changes to JANET SLA figures.

Action: Jason Bain to ask RNOs again about the current status of their IPv6 provision.

David Hayling asked whether everyone rigorously check with the site that their “return to service” has been successful – mostly after an FEC power cut. Answer – yes.

(f) Taxation (Chris Kelly)

Chris Kelly presented a summary of the current position which enables NIRAN – a company limited by guarantee – and its auditors to declare that it is a facilitator rather than a trader and therefore avoid liabilities for corporation tax.

10. Any Other RNO Business

a) C&W takeover of Thus: Jem Taylor initially expected to continue being served by a Thus business unit but then seemed to be told they would be handled by the C&W public sector team. However, other RNOs specifically told C&W that they wanted to continue being handled by a Thus unit.

b) Insurance matters: Tim Robinson reported that the insurance company for Keele won't allow any copper circuits to enter or leave their data centres. This seemed outdated and prevents the use of ADSL services.

c) Sponsored JANET licences for Science Parks: the rules specifically forbid this but there seem to be some allowed in several MANs and primary JANET sites. Univ Ed has a single sponsored licence for the whole of one building which is run by a UoEd spin-off innovation company and contains several start-up companies.

d) Fibre Rates: some RNOs still not been contacted – others have valuation problems.

11. Items from the TDA (Rolly Trice)

Nothing significant to report.

12. JANET (UK) issues (Rolly Trice)

a) ITT issue

Rolly agreed that existing ITTs were not useful for understanding the functional requirements of JANET Lightpaths because the contract was for call-offs. Rolly advised us to talk to Dave Tinkler. JANET(UK) are approving requests to procure JANET Lightpath kit – albeit with some requirements to adjust the size of switch required.

Action: Rolly Trice will ask Sue Weston to make vanilla copies of the ITT available

b) JPA RNO Managers meetings (JPARM)

Agreed to offer two afternoon meetings per year as noted above. Rolly was happy with this.

c) Review of Procurement Audits

Agreed: Sue Weston can address the June meeting to discuss the procurement audits.

d) Connection policy for schools

This was covered by Bob Day who is proposing a policy which will offer all schools connections via the RBCs. (Though some non-LA schools (especially academies) may require special treatment.)

Noted that state sector schools do not need to pay for JANET transit because DCSF has already contributed to JANET costs whereas independent schools need to pay for JANET transit and other overheads.

e) New JANET (UK) organisational structure

Rolly gave a presentation and will circulate the slides. He noted that JANET(UK) had grown to around 140 staff in three sites with the majority at Harwell.

The Business Development Division has been merged into Shirley Wood's Communication and Support division and there is now an in-house lawyer to help with procurements.

Most MANs are using the JANET Central Database Facility (CDF) – Rolly renewed his invitation to those who are not.

Forthcoming changes might see the CPG and RDG merged into a single group and a new relationship management role for non-sector customers, those new to JANET, covering different corporate style through pre-connection and roll-out.

Ian Griffiths asked for better procedures for handling circuit requests. He explained that a simple request for 100Mbps can turn out to be for a resilient link which means that the circuit must be separate from existing routes and termination points/equipment. Therefore, the RNO should be able to have direct discussion with the customer to ensure such requirements are satisfied.

Action: Rolly Trice to take this back to ensure that JANET(UK) gets more information from the customer before contacting the RNO.

f) Other Matters

- Rolly will circulate a document with responses to issues we raised at our last meeting.
- JANET(UK) will be changing many of their 0870 numbers but there has been a delay because of system incompatibilities.
- IPv6 in site routers. As noted above.
- The next JDT meeting will include:

- Talk from Jessica Wu about JANET services
- Talk from Mark Leese about Netsight 2. Rolly noted that it is not tying in properly with the JANET CDF so it was decided to sort this out before continuing with the roll-out.

- Unite and Halls of Residence connections – they are out to tender for connections - no details yet so unable to say if this might make use of JANET/RNO connections.

Action: Rolly Trice to update this group on the outcome of the Unite procurement for HoRs.

- RNO reserves. Steve Percival has offered a token sum to those currently without one.
- SJ6 – Jeremy Sharp attended last TDA meeting to discuss some preliminary thoughts. The current financial climate may delay announcements about SJ6 funding.
- Using 3rd parties to cover out of hours has resulted in calls to JANET during non-cover times (ie early hours of morning) about calls which are not relevant to JANET. The relevant RNOs were asked to check their handover procedures.
- JANET(UK) will shortly initiate a framework procurement for telecoms circuits.

13. Bob Day – JANET and Local Government

Bob gave a presentation and will circulate the slides. It explained how RNOs in England can explore regional collaboration while remaining consistent with JANET policies.

In discussions it was noted that RBC connections are generally 1GB with 10Gbps for London. Local Authorities had 100M or higher (e.g. Kent has 2 x 1Gbps). Schools dominate the traffic so adding the LAs themselves doesn't make much difference.

Cost recovery includes costs for staff time and backbone transit bandwidth.

The main policy change is to be definite about working with RBCs.