

Notes of UK MAN Managers Group

Meeting held on 1st July 2008 at UCL, London.

Present:

<i>Mike Byrne</i>	<i>LENSE (chair)</i>
<i>Craig MacDonald</i>	<i>CANLMAN (secretary)</i>
<i>Andrew Kerl</i>	<i>LMN</i>
<i>Chris Kelly</i>	<i>NIRAN</i>
<i>John Linn</i>	<i>ABMAN</i>
<i>David Hayling</i>	<i>Kentish MAN</i>
<i>Ian Griffiths</i>	<i>EMMAN</i>
<i>Brian Gillmore</i>	<i>EASTMAN</i>
<i>Tim Robinson</i>	<i>NNW</i>
<i>Mike Whitehead</i>	<i>FATMAN (lunch)</i>
<i>Neil Frances</i>	<i>SWERN</i>
<i>Paul Kentish</i>	<i>Kentish MAN</i>
<i>Ian Sugden</i>	<i>SWERN</i>
<i>Mark Jameson</i>	<i>CANLMAN</i>
<i>Jason Bane</i>	<i>NORMAN</i>
<i>Ed Carter</i>	<i>YHMAN</i>
<i>Geoff Cooper</i>	<i>LMN</i>
<i>Linda McCormick</i>	<i>CLYDENET</i>
<i>Rolly Trice</i>	<i>JANET (after lunch)</i>

Apologies: Andy Mason, David Steadman, Peter White, Jem Taylor, David Vinograd

1. Notes of previous meeting, (produced by Clydenet) 22 April at HEFCE, London.

1a) Accuracy

Minutes accepted as accurate.

1b) Matter arising.

Action on 'near misses'. IG reported he had not been contacted about this, but that we were now 'over the hump' and that pressure on JANET(UK) is no longer required; they are happy for this group to discuss service and reliability issues with them.

IPv6 updates. Some MANs (ABMAN, CANLMAN, NIRAN) had not yet circulated their status to the group, would they please do so. Jason Bain collating.

ACTION: Remaining MANs to circulate their IPv6 status.

Item 1.2.3 from previous minutes. MW still concerned about service desk which had been discussed at the previous day's JDT: Where are calls logged and how are calls routed? Who is the main point of contact, the RNO or the JSD? MW felt that the situation was currently confused. TR reported that organisational changes had occurred within JANET relating to the running of the service desk. Now John Seymore (not Shirley), they now have the concept of a single service desk. In addition, while some RNOs required that specific technical contacts contacted their help desks, JANET's view expressed at the JDT had been that anybody should be able to report a fault. The group's view was that JANET should be asked to provide clarity.

GC suggested that 08 numbers could be used to route calls geographically, which might allow calls to be routed to RNOs first, which is his preferred option.

ACTION: GC to speak to JANET about single helpdesk number with automatic call routing.

There was also general comment that RNOs should be invited to see and approve communications from JANET to the edge sites. TR said that each MAN needs to make sure that the wording of those letters is correct, and that they go to the right people at the institutions.

ACTION: MB to request that letters to sites are vetted by the site's RNO.

MB reminded the group that they have one more opportunity to declare budget for the JPA to Steve Percival before end of July. However TR had spoken to Doreen Bestmann on the issue and she had said that the deadline would be at the end of the year. Some MANs will be asking for consideration of the operating reserve.

MB mentioned that some RNOs still had not signed the JPA, remaining ones reported no issues in doing so though.

2 JPA

Following comments by TR, MB summarised that the meeting felt that the bandwidth figures in schedule 4 of the contract are no longer an issue.

IG reported that EMMAN is formalising access to PoPs, including access till midnight 365 days a year. IG asked if any other RNOs were doing similar. The replies were that some were thinking about it, YHMAN doing the same and SWERN have already done it. (LeNSE and LMN already have full 24x7 access).

3 Report from SLA negotiation team.

IPv6 – JB & TR reported that the SLA is now signed and sealed, and that as far as they knew, there were no further changes to operational matters. The SLA is expected to be published during August. It was noted that next year we need to ensure that our views are taken into consideration at the earliest appropriate time.

JL reported that ABMAN has v6 multicast up and running along with a v6 m'cast source and beacon. JL asked who was responsible within JANET for v6 issues such as address scoping.

TR expressed concern that implementation of v6 might destabilise the network. The general feeling was that MANs will make v6 operational then leave alone, i.e. there is not much demand at present.

The JDT had heard that v6 licences for edge site routers would be available only when sites request v6, as a blanket upgrade was unaffordable.

ACTION: JL to bring up issues with TDA.

4 Halls of Residence

EC reported that JANET(UK) has decided to allow commercial HoR providers access to JANET, including provision of circuits to RNO PoPs. The first two providers are Unite and Cablecom. The JDT had heard that the provider would need to speak to the university where the PoP or RNEP is in the first instance.

LM stated that RNOs should have control over who has access to their comms rooms. While JPA schedule 1 6.5.7 states that JANET or its sub-contractors can get access to RNEPs, these providers are not sub-contractors so RNOs could deny access.

JB stated that the JPA does not mandate that RNOs must provide a service of any kind to these providers. If the circuits were standard nominated connections then they would be subject to the SLA.

In summary MB said the group felt that third party provided HORs should be provided as nominated connections. JB added that these should be provided by the RNO. EC added that there should be no compulsion on the RNO to provide the connections. More generally it was felt that this sort of situation could be dealt with far better in future if JANET consulted with MANs in advance.

5 Netflow Project/Netsight 2

DH reported no new information on Netflow. Netsight2 roll-out starts 21st July.

MB reported that MANs would probably be able to keep the old Netsight box if they were so inclined.

General consensus that Netsite2 needs to have the same level of access and control (for the MANs) as the current version.

5a Membership of UKMMG (item added by IG)

IG asked whether there should be representation on UKMMG from MANs run by JANET.

The meeting agreed that where there was a formal grouping overseeing the MAN, it was appropriate to ask that grouping to nominate a representative.

ACTION: MB to invite user group representatives from JANET run MANs.

6 Liaison with the JDT

MB reported a general feeling that the JDT was JANET – driven, though useful.

There was also concern that only operational staff might attend the JDT and that decisions might be taken that have a contractual impact. JL noted that the JDT has no executive mandate. JB noted that the JDT does have control over the operations manual, and that the JDT debated the halls of residence issue which has contractual impact. All agreed that issues should be debated in the correct forum.

All agreed that the JDT and the UKMMG meetings should be on consecutive days with the JDT first.

Next UKMMG on 14/10/08 at HEFCE, therefore JDT should occur on 13th in London.

7 Liaison with the TDA

TR reported that the TDA was working on the JANET architecture document, there were no major issues, all proceedings will be published. Next meeting 18/07/08.

Rolly Trice joined the meeting at this point.

RT confirmed the architecture document is being re-written, a draft should be presented at the next meeting.

MB asked if forthcoming procurements might be affected. Those RNOs currently procuring should speak to Rolly in relation to the architecture document.

Items arising from earlier in the meeting:

MB asked RT to inform JDT attendees of any substantive issues in advance of JDT meetings, RT undertook to produce early agendas.

MB also informed RT of the suggested date for the next JDT and asked if JANET could arrange venue.

MB fed back the general view that there was not enough time for debate during the first JDT, RT replied that discussion time would be factored in future meetings.

8 JANET UK Issues

MB reported that UKMMG wished the 3rd party provided halls of residence to be treated as nominated connections and that RNOs should provide the circuits. MB also added that the UKMMG should have been consulted on this issue first. RT replied that he would take this back to JANET, but that a way round would need to be found for the two circuits currently on order which were not being provided by the RNO.

RT reported that copper thieves have recently become less active.

RT reported the first 40Gb/s circuit is currently operating on a production basis.

GC asked for news on JANET Talk, RT said he would email the mailing list with an update.

IG reported that Verizon could have performed better during a recent outage on a resilient link. This took a day to resolve.

TR asked for more feedback on SAG reports. RT asked TR to provide suggestions and that he would forward them on.

ACTION: TR to supply SAG reporting feedback requirements to RT.

CK requested advice on adding a third SJ5 connection to NIRAN to avoid future service failures when existing circuits fail.

ACTION: RT to advise CK.

Following a report from JL that ABMAN's v6 multicast trial had been successful, TR asked RT if a v6 only web page might be provided by JANET. This would provide an easy and quick way to test v6 connectivity. RT said he would get back to us.

LM raised the topic of the re-structuring within JANET - she suggested that we get an update on who is responsible for what now. Rolly offered to do us a 20min power point at the next meeting.

ACTION: MB/IG to check the next meeting venue for a projector.

9 RN Reports

GC announced the framework agreement held by JANET for provision of JANET services. See:

<http://www.lmn.net.uk/procurement/>

<http://www.lmn.net.uk/framework/>

The winners were Logicalis, Synetrix & THUS. Mini tender is compulsory, template documentation available on website.

IG reported that a company called Sub-TV may approach RNOs and suggest their equipment was present in the 'ja.net Bracknell data centre'. This is untrue, there is a data centre in Bracknell in which JANET have kit, but Sub-TV's kit is in another part of the data centre. RT asked RNOs to send a copy of inaccurate written info from this company to him.

JL brought up the topic of fibre rates which is adding to the ownership costs. Some members had not yet received bills so were finding difficulty in cost forecasting. LM asked if JANET (UK) had received any assessment from East Renfrewshire Council and, if so, if the assessment was in line with their expectations. Part of ClydeNET is in East Renfrewshire but ClydeNET has not been approached.

10 Liaison with other groups

No issues from Chairs of MANs, which has no plans to meet in the immediate future.

UCISA-NG met on 10th June discussing sustainability and business continuity. Minutes are due out soon. The group needs new input.

11 Dates of next meetings

14/10/08 at HEFCE, London

Lunch: YHMAN

Minutes: EASTMAN

21/01/09 at HEFCE, London

Lunch: CANLMAN

Minutes: FATMAN

29/04/09 London

Lunch: NIRAN

Minutes: KentishMAN

12 AOB

None