

From: UQVAX::CCCOUTLER 18-JUN-1993 10:06:12.09  
To: D.FIELDING  
CC: CCCOUTLER  
Subj: AARNet Regional Issues

Derek, The following is for your information

Alan C

> From: UQVAX::CCCOUTLER 17-JUN-1993 11:37:05.99  
> To: IN%"T.J.Mullarvey@avcc.edu.au"  
> CC: IN%"questnet-mgt@cc.uq.edu.au",CCCOUTLER  
> Subj: AARNet Regional Issues

> Dear John,

> Paper on regional issues which you requested via John Noad.

-----  
> DISCUSSION ON QUESTNET/AARNET RELATIONSHIPS

> Alan W Coulter - Chairman, QUESTNet Management Committee

> Universities are a national and global community of scholars. We are funded primarily by the Federal Government although there is an increasing propensity for Universities to increase the proportion of funds from other sources.

> In Queensland at least Universities are established under State Legislation and as such they are state public authorities and must meet State Government requirements in such matters as Public Finance Standards, Purchasing, FOI and the like. Additionally, as Public Authorities of the State, they are expected by the Government to contribute to the development of the State.

> Apart from political differences across the various States, there are differences in area, distribution of population, nature of commercial, industrial and primary industry development. There are also differences in climate, for example, the problem of rain attenuation in Northern Australia which can have impacts on communication.

> Within Queensland, there is a great need for regional development. The QUESTNet Management Committee has discussed the desirability of the expansion of QUESTNet through greater distribution to regional areas, particularly havin

> regard to current and projected distance education needs of Universities, rura

> health programmes, TAFE requirements and continuing education programs in primary industry, engineering, teaching, veterinary medicine, regional research

> stations, etc.

> There has been discussion between Directors of Computer/Information Technology Centres at Queensland Universities and I will summarise some of the major conclusions.

> There is a unanimous agreement that the present organisation of AARNet has served us well. We are of the view that the central control of the engineerin

> of the network and standards will remain a prerequisite to future developments that are of the same high quality as has been achieved to date.

> There are certain national services e.g. Archie, Directory Services, VAT and SERT that should be common for the whole "au" domain. We need to be represented on IETF. There is strong argument for critical mass in terms of external representation with external organisations, government lobby, funding national developments, contractual matters, negotiations with service provider

> and so on. The ownership of AARNet by AVCC Inc. ensures that all of the major

> stakeholders are represented through their Chief Executives on the 'holding  
> company' of AARNet.

> Having said this, I will return to the problem that Universities in the main  
> are public authorities of the State Government and they are expected to play  
> their part. The States are vastly different in area, geography, population  
> distribution and so on and will require different network topologies. If, for  
> example, the State established a major high performance computing and  
> visualisation centre and upgraded network capacity, they would not wish to pay  
> AARNet for traffic circulating within the State.

> The problem is not trivial but can be solved. There are many models. There is  
> a general agreement that whatever is adopted should be flexible and meet  
> changing conditions over time. To some extent, we may need to change  
> structures as Internet changes.

> All of the models considered by us through E-mail discussion would seem to  
> point to an AARNet fee comprising of a membership fee and a volume fee. The  
> membership fee for a "basic national service" would be paid direct to AARNet by

> each member institution. (There are some contractual reasons why membership  
> fees for affiliates should be collected by the member institution and passed on

> to AARNet.) The volume charge to AARNet would be calculated on the traffic  
> flowing into the AARNet national backbone from the region. It would be up to  
> the regional organisation to determine the basis for apportioning these  
> charges. I would imagine they would still be paid direct by the institution to

> AARNet to avoid bureaucracy. Such traffic out of the hub would, of course,  
> include traffic generated by affiliated members and ensure AARNet received full

> recompense (which I doubt they do now). Indeed (and without going to the  
> detail now) this proposal will solve most if not all of the problems many of us  
> have now with the affiliate membership scheme.

> There is a strong feeling that the membership of the AARNet Board should  
> include a representative from each region appointed by the AARNet Regional  
> Committee. This immediately assumes that there will be a regional committee  
> which we envisage would comprise the member institutions of AARNet plus a  
> representative from QUESTNet. In the current circumstances of this State,  
> there would be a need for a second committee of QUESTNet which would have much  
> wider representation and deal primarily with State issues.

> I think I have summarised the position at least sufficient to introduce  
> discussion.

> (The matter was discussed by the QUESTNet Management Committee. It agreed with  
> the discussion paper and resolved it be sent on for the information of the  
> AARNet Board)

> Alan W Coulter  
> Chairman  
> QUESTNet Management Committee

> +-----+  
> | Alan W. Coulter Phone: 61 7 365 3521 |  
> | Director, Prentice Centre Fax: 61 7 365 4477 |  
> | The University of Queensland |  
> | Queensland 4072 AUSTRALIA Internet: a.coulter@cc.uq.edu.au |  
> +-----+