# UK MAN Managers Group

# Notes of Meeting held on 26 June 2006 at the University of Edinburgh

Present:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mike Byrne (Deputy Convenor) | LeNSE |
| Kit Powell (Secretary) | SWERN |
| Paul Kentish | Kentish MAN |
| David Hayling | Kentish MAN |
| Andrew Kerl | LMN |
| Jason Bain | NorMAN |
| Pete White | LMN |
| James Hendry | MidMAN |
| George Howat | EaStMAN |
| John Linn | AbMAN |
| Linda McCormick | ClydeNET |
| Craig MacDonald | C&NLMAN |
| Ian Griffiths | EMMAN |
| Steve Percival | UKERNA |
| Tim Robinson | NetNorthWest |
| Denis Russell | UKERNA |
| Mike Whitehead | FaTMAN |

Apologies were received from:

| | |
|---|---|
| Joe Burns | NIRAN |
| Chris Cheney | "EastNet" |
| Ed Carter | YHMAN |
| Barry Forde | C&NLMAN |
| Roger Williams | WNL |
| Andy Mason | SWERN |
| David Stedham | North Wales MAN |
| Ian Sugden | SWERN |
| Malcolm Pitcher | NetNorthWest |
| Jem Taylor | UHI |
| Dave Vinograd (Convenor) | |

# 1   Notes of previous meeting

### 1.1   Accuracy

There were no corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27 April 2006.

### 1.2   Joint meeting with UCISA-NG, concentrating on the delivery of special-purpose bandwidth within institutions

It was pointed out by Ian Griffiths and Linda McCormick, and generally agreed, that as the institutions were key in the delivery of SPB it was essential that the correct audience was identified before any meeting was arranged, as otherwise key players might not be included. Management of expectations of the facility was important.

Tim Robinson said that before any meeting was arranged the process of application for SPB would have to be agreed and made available.

It was suggested and agreed that he should take over the SPB role on JDAG from Mike Byrne, and Mike in turn would take responsibility for QoS from Tim.

Tim undertook to produce a briefing note setting out the issues surrounding SPB provision, suggesting procedures, timescales, and who needed to be involved in meetings about it.

**Action: Tim Robinson**

*[Denis Russell and Steve Percival joined the meeting at this point]*

### 1.3   RNOs intentions for delivery of special-purpose bandwidth across their regions

*Discussion had been deferred until UKERNA's representatives arrived.*

Tim Robinson summarised the discussion that had already taken place.

Many RNs had provided information about their intentions for SPB transit and these had been circulated.

Ian Griffiths said that from the UCISA-NG point of view the issues were around the processes for getting SPB, and how researchers related to those responsible for network resource management in their institutions.

The clarification and further information on SPB given by Jeremy Sharp at the previous week's SJ5 planning meeting were welcomed, particularly the provision of channels up to 1Gbps free of charge and the funding of transmission resources for RN transit to endpoints. Steve Percival pointed out that there was no guarantee that all requests for "free" channels could be granted.

There was a discussion about what the procedure for applying for SPB channels should be. The basic principle was that the RNO should make the application to UKERNA on the end user's behalf.

Denis Russell said that the costing model and the procedure would avoid issues of judgements having to be made on the scientific merit of the activities for which SPB was requested.

## 2   Report from RPAN contract changes team

*Discussion had been deferred until UKERNA's representatives arrived.*

Mike Byrne opened the discussion. The negotiations concerned RPAN 2.5, which would run to the end of September 2008. The principles of the changes from RPAN 2 had been approved by UKMMG at its previous meeting. UKERNA had consolidated the changes and discussed with the UKMMG team, and the revised contract had been sent to UKMMG lawyers for comment. He had circulated the latest drafts in both clean and marked-up form to the Group. The aim was to finalise RMPA 2.5 by the end of July.

It had been agreed that some issues could and should be deferred for incorporation into RPAN 3.

Ian Griffiths summarised the comments received from the UKMMG's legal advisors. As Mike had mentioned, it was agreed that some issues, although substantive, should be left for RPAN 3 to address.

He summarised the main points raised by the solicitors that would be deferred:

- FOI (including the definition of Disclosure and Wrongdoing)
- Liabilities after termination
- Procurement, in the EU regulatory context
- Third party rights

Ian then drew the meeting's attention to the outstanding points raised by the solicitors, with reference to the latest draft:

- Comment on 7.9, to be addressed in RPAN 3
- Amendment to 10.4 suggested by solicitors, UKERNA requested to include
- Wording change to 13.2 had been suggested, but the team were content not to have this made
- Additional boilerplate in 23.2 would be requested

Steve Percival undertook to take the second and fourth points back to UKERNA.


## 3   Report the SLA negotiation team

Jason Bain said that the revised text of the next SLA had been sent to UKERNA for checking and signature. It contained no major changes.

Discussions on the major root-and-branch changes to the SLA would start in the Autumn. Jason would be invited to join these.

Ian Griffiths added that UCISA-NG, which he now chaired, might ask for representation at these meetings.


## 4   Report from JDAG

Mike Byrne said that there was little to report since the JDAG on 26 April 2006.

The *Joint Development Programme 2005/6* document had been revised and circulated by Denis Russell. The guides for IPv4 and IPv6 Multicast had been circulated for comment. John Linn commented that the v4 document was very useful.

Mike said that, as had been suggested, the regional champions of developments would be invited to the next JDAG meeting on 26 July 2006. He added that there were a number of documents of various sorts whose production and distribution had been promised, and that it was important that these actions were progressed.

George Howat suggested that the proposal that there be a joint development slot at Networkshop should be considered again. Mike undertook to look into this.

**Action: Mike Byrne**

[*Noted after the meeting:* It would be helpful if Denis Russell could look into the possibility of an article on JDAG and its activities in *Network News*.

**Action: Denis Russell**]

John Linn pointed out that some developments raised more issues for end sites than for transit networks such as the JANET backbone and the RNs, and suggested that UCISA-NG could be involved in some way.

**Phase II QoS**
Mike said that those involved had met since April. Inter-team communication had improved. The intention had been to try to carry out tests during the SJ5 transition, but slippage of the migration timetable had had a knock-on effect on this. He would report progress to the Group.

David Hayling and Tim Robinson provided an update from the point of view of the implementors and testers.

**Performance measurement and monitoring**
David Hayling reported.

Ian Griffiths remarked that EMMAN was buying traffic anomaly detection and measurement systems. George Howat observed that cost savings and consistency would be achieved by the adoption of a common approach to this across the community.

# 5  UKERNA issues

## 5.1  SJ5 status

Denis Russell said that the previous week's SJ5 planning meeting had covered progress and he did not wish to add anything to what had been said there.

Verizon would make detailed information on the collector arc fibre routes soon.

## 5.2  UKERNA-RNO issues

Steve Percival noted that the six-monthly RPAN contract reviews were now complete.

Some minor transfer of responsibilities between Penny Gould and John Littledale was planned with effect from October.

Steve said that he had circulated the notes of the second meeting of the joint UKERNA-Chairs of MANs working group on the next RPAN contract. Bob Day had drafted a report from this group to be considered by the full Chairs of MANs meeting on 11 July 2006. The key points were an evolutionary approach, strengthening the partnerships between UKERNA and the RNOs and improving technical compatibility and consistency.

When approved by the Chairs of MANs, the document would be issued to all RNOs. During the rest of 2006 UKERNA would discuss with each RNO its willingness to enter into an RPAN 3 enshrining the principles that the document set out. If not, work would start on defining how the RNO's responsibilities under RPAN 2.5 would be handed over when that contract ended in 2008. Otherwise, the RNOs would be engaged in the task of finalising the RPAN 3 details.

Jim Hendry pointed out, and it was accepted, that entering into discussions on the content of RPAN 3 would not commit an RNO to entering into the contract, once finalised.

The meeting agreed that it was important that relevant staff in each RN had sight of the report to Chairs of MANs as soon as it was issued to the Chairs in early July (Steve Percival undertook to mail the mans-liaison list to alert them of this), so that they could provide comments to their Chairs to inform the discussion on 11 July 2006.

Mike Byrne suggested that an *ad hoc* UKMMG meeting might be arranged at which the changes proposed could be presented and discussed, though it was noted that given the likely timescales, holidays, etc. it might be difficult to fit this in before the next UKMMG meeting on 9 October 2006.

## 6 Review of RN SuperJANET5 connection progress

There was general disquiet at the slippage of the project, reflected in the re-scheduling of the SJ4-5 migration programme. Denis Russell said that the contract with Verizon contained clauses covering delays, and these had been and would be invoked.

Widespread adverse comments were made of Verizon's installation of fibre and equipment at the RNEPs for the collector arcs.

[*Noted after meeting:* Dave Vinograd had suggested that after connection RNs should comment on the process to the mailing list.]

## 7 Liaison with Chairs of MANs Group

*UKERNA's representatives were not present during this item*

Ian Griffiths outlined the timetable for RPAN 3 discussions. The RPAN3 UKERNA - Chairs of MANs Working Group had met for the second time on 12 June 2006. Steve Percival had circulated the minutes to mans-liaison. The deliberations of the working

group would result in a document to be produced by UKERNA by 30 June 2006 which would be considered at the CoM meeting on 11 July 2006. The paper would address the evolution of the RPAN contract model, which would result in RPAN 3.

It was agreed by all that the implications of the changes that were likely to be proposed made it vital that members of the Group got sight of the document as soon as the Chair of their MAN received it, absorbed it and its implications, and gave feedback to their Chair.

A joint meeting of CoM and UKMMG at which the implications of any proposed changes could be properly discussed was believed to be highly desirable.


## 8   Liaison with UCISA-NG

David Stedham having sent his apologies, Tim Robinson reported.

NG had discussed SPB.

There was interest in the expected announcement by UKERNA of a JANET VoIP service. It was noted that *prima facie* the networking impact of this would fall primarily on the institutions using it and not on the RNOs.

NG had a number of issues that it wished to be addressed in the coming SLA review, including
  • the status as holidays for RPAN purposes of the May Bank Holidays, as they were working days for many institutions
  • scheduled JANET maintenance being carried out between 08:00 and 09:00
  • testing of network resilience during production time

The Group discussed resilience testing and how it should be presented to the user community. It was noted that the way the test was presented to the user community would affect its attitude to it, and that the testing did not have to be carried out under peak load conditions.


## 9   Dates of future meetings

Monday 9 October 2006, HEFCE London (ClydeNET to pay for catering)
Wednesday 10 January 2007, HEFCE London (NorMAN to pay for catering)
Tuesday 24 April 2007, London *venue under discussion* (NetNorthWest to pay for catering)

## 10  Other business

Mike Byrne thanked George Howat for arranging for the University of Edinburgh's hospitality to be extended to the meeting. The Group thanked him for all his work in network development over the years, and offered him their best wishes for his imminent retirement.