

Dear Robin

I agree that staff costs for projects should be based on salary plus salary related costs. There is a difficulty in distinguishing between developmental proposals and research proposals. You also seem to have added another condition in respect of project 4 (AP Broadband over AARNET) is that to be eligible a project must be developed using AARNET.

I think we should also remember that one of the reasons for setting up the AARNET project fund was to maintain the expertise at member institutions. ~~Let~~

My comments follow

1. ~~Project~~ x 25 network. Impulsive of ^{the result} ~~access~~ of sites I believe the AARNET Board would be unlikely not to provide a facility for full x.25 access. Even the interactive only facility of a Telnet / x.29 gateway is not a trivial job (address translation, security authentication), ~~number~~ of member sites to which provide distance education (the number of these are likely to increase) require secure charging and finally full x.25 will eventually be required to enable AARNET users to gain access to services not which may not be available ^{over} ~~via~~ AARNET through x.25. I don't think ^{capital cost} the project should ^{be} ~~be~~ ^{imposed} ~~imposed~~ ^{on} ~~on~~ ^{member} ~~member~~ institutions to many users. I suggest we commission an appropriate site (not UG) to undertake a study and report to AARNET at board and allocate \$3000.

performed by external consultants even at initial staff costs would need to ensure ^{of transfer of copyright to UoA} AARNET owned copyright.

13 X.400 & AARNET DISAGREE ^{STRENUOUSLY} WITH GEOFF AND ROBIN AARNET must move to an international medium mail system. We are already in problems with a few installations including our own using EUDORA.

14 Antarctic Connector. I agree that it would be beneficial to connect the Antarctic Division to AARNET. Unfortunately I cannot find a reason to waive the ^{application} fee that could not also apply to other highly regarded research entities. I have no objection to Geoff lending AARNET equipment surplus to requirements.

15. FAX Project - Not supported

X-25 -

1. Partially supported

2. Under - supported

3. Introspective - Not supported

4. A/V Best Packet System - Strongly support

5. Lang. Video - Not supported

6. Language Learning - Not supported

7. Line Release - Strongly support

8. Lang. Courses - Not supported

9. Archive - see 10 - support subject to joint proposal with 10

10. Archive - ^{the 9} - support subject to joint proposal with 9

Both projects groups should meet to provide a coordinated proposal of future development of Archive Service at Aarnet. ~~If the above is accepted initial salary rates and overheads of GAV the they should also be included.~~
Suggest 3000 allocation for travel and report a \$20000 held in reserve.

11. Homeless Release - Not supported (helpful) available for Debi

12. GAV - Not supported

13. X.400 Mail Service - Strongly support the need for X.400 at AARNET

14. Antartec - Partially support

15. Not supported.

You comment that the sum of money set aside is far too high is of concern and I do not agree. We should ourselves include

proposals. by the Board Management and what we would do

in Accordance with a matter of considerable importance
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3

4 - 1/2 of the total

5 - 1/3 of the total

6 - 1/4 of the total

7 - 1/5 of the total

8 - 1/6 of the total

9 - 1/7 of the total
 10 - 1/8 of the total

11 - 1/9 of the total
 12 - 1/10 of the total
 13 - 1/11 of the total
 14 - 1/12 of the total
 15 - 1/13 of the total
 16 - 1/14 of the total
 17 - 1/15 of the total
 18 - 1/16 of the total
 19 - 1/17 of the total
 20 - 1/18 of the total

21 - 1/19 of the total

22 - 1/20 of the total

23 - 1/21 of the total

24 - 1/22 of the total

25 - 1/23 of the total

26 - 1/24 of the total
 27 - 1/25 of the total
 28 - 1/26 of the total
 29 - 1/27 of the total
 30 - 1/28 of the total

AV-CC**Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee**

(INCORPORATED IN THE A.C.T.)

Ref: AARNET/50/91
29 April 1991**The Australian Academic and Research Network
1991 Submissions**

The AVCC has received two additional project submissions after the April 15 deadline. Copies of these submissions are enclosed with this note. The complete summary of submissions is now:

	Institution	Project	Amount Requested
1	University of Queensland	Private X.25 network feasibility	\$10,000
2	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology	Training Video	\$5,000
3	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology	Interoperability Test Centre	\$23,506
4	University of Sydney	A/V Broadcasting over AARNet	\$16,250
5	James Cook University of North Queensland	Training Video	\$33,500
6	University of Technology Sydney	Transputer User Interface	\$14,000
7	CSIRO, DMS	AARNet Time Reference	\$7,400
8	University of Technology Sydney	AARNet Training Courses	\$7,000
9	University of Sydney	Information Archive Directories	\$20,000 ✓
10	University of Wollongong (plus Deakin & Adelaide)	Archive Servers	\$50,000 ✓
11	University of New England	Novice User Interface	\$13,000 + print costs
12	University of Adelaide	Guru - Text Database	\$38,000
13	University of Queensland	X.400 mail services	\$15,000

Received on April 26:

14	University of Tasmania	Antartic Connection	\$35,520
15	Griffith University	Fax Project	\$52,900

1-5 Geils Court,
Deakin, ACT
GPO Box 1142, CANBERRA, ACT 2601

Telephone: (06) 285 8200
Fax: (06) 285 8211

Technical Comments (Geoff Huston)

The criteria used in formulating these comments were based on a judgement as to whether the project would offer tangible results which would be of benefit to the AARNet user community, and additionally that the proposal was in support of an activity which would not otherwise be undertaken as a part of the institution's normal academic, research or service support activities.

Project #14 - Antarctic Connection

This project could be accomplished at substantially lower cost than that proposed. The MGS router is not required for this activity as there is a surplus AGS router located in Victoria following the upgrade of the Victorian hub to an AGS+ unit. Thus, if required, the existing CGS chassis could be shifted over to the AAntartic division. Thus there are solutions which imply no capital equipment costs. In terms of recurrent communications costs I suspect that a 64K ISDN line or a 128K 4 wire circuit, may be potential alternatives here, both of which have a recurrent element of \$4,000 p.a..

The major issue here is perhaps one for the AARNet Advisory Board to consider of why should Affiliate Membership fees be waived for this activity. As a component of a Commonwealth Government Department, and as a Commonwealth funded program the major query in reference to this project is why should normal Affiliate membership policies be waived in this particular case

Project 15 - Fax Project

Fax communications over computer networks is an area of rapid development, and commercially available hardware/software solutions are now reaching the marketplace. At this stage I am not of the opinion that further development on possible hardware and software configurations is warranted.

The questions related to this area have shifted over the last 12 months to uncertainties relating to the cost effectiveness of such a fax gateway message service, the costs of accessibility of such an AARNet-based service to those areas of the institutions who generate and receive faxes, and the associated control mechanisms related to access and usage for such gateways. Such issues are not addressed in this proposal.