

**PRENTICE  
COMPUTER  
CENTRE****THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND  
ST. LUCIA 4067  
AUSTRALIA**

DIRECTOR:

J.D. NOAD, M.Sc., M.A.C.S.

Telephone: (07) 377

International 61 7 377

Telex UNIVQLD AA40315

Facsimile: (07) 371 8380

## FACSIMILE MESSAGE

TO:

Name.....

ALAN COULTELL

Location.....

Down town

FAX NO. ....

221-8051

No. of Pages

(including this one).....

6

FROM:

Name.....

Graham Rees

Telephone No. ....

377 3288

TIME:

.....

1253

DATE.....

3 JAN 89

PLEASE CONTACT (07) 377 3018 IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES

COMMENTS:

## Notes on Funding Model presented to the AVCC Steering Committee, December 14, 1989

Compiled by Graham Rees

### Major Points

A summary of the budget for 1990, as far I can make out, is:

#### Expenditure 1990

AARN National Network Expenditure	\$1,220,036	Page 1. (Backbone Costs)
Regional Networks	\$1,275,227	Page R7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,495,263</b>	

#### Revenue 1990

University Contributions	\$988,975	From last 2 pages (not numbered)
College Contributions	\$191,502	
CSIRO	\$361,286	
QLD Private X.25 Network	\$53,500	
ARC	\$900,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,495,263</b>	

#### Problems and queries:

1. The equipment configuration and funding model for the Queensland region of the network has been changed, since our previous correspondence with Geoff Huston, effectively without notice.

2. Some items of equipment have been missed in the Queensland regional network expenditure. Presumably this is the \$53,500 worth of gear mentioned in the revenue side, but these dollars do not appear anywhere on the expenditure side. On this basis the Qld regional expenditure should be increased from \$269,585 by \$53,500. It would appear the total budget figures are down \$53,500.

3. I don't understand the reasoning for singling Queensland out (ie the \$53,500) simply because Qld already has an X.25 network. In AARN documentation this will be a service to be offered nationa wide at some later date. Isn't this the same source of revenue in any case, that is, the institutions in the Qld region. The reason for IP and DECnet is that these protocols are already in wide use. X.25 is in wide use as well. What is the reasoning behind this?

These are not really the correct items of equipment associated with the X.25 network.

4. The configuration for connection of the CSIRO at Mill Rd has been changed to a Hybridge from a serial SLIP line. Why is this and why is it a more expensive device than the other Hybridges?

5. The Gold Coast CAE is now a College of Griffith University and will therefore need to be considered in teh same terms as DDIAE and CIAE with its own connection. The appropriate person at GCAE is on holiday until the 22nd January.

6. Has the BCAE and GCAE operating grants been included into QUT and GU for calculating their share of the network funding?

Other queries not directly related to the Queensland region.

Page 2 Para 1.1 & 1.2 Do not reflect the latest Telecom charges of September 1989.

3.2 & Page R4. Univ Melb appears to get 2x\$25,000. Why another \$25,000 for national network management? Or if so why all the national staff in Item 3 and equipment in Item 3.4?

### **Minor Points**

1.1 & 1.2 Is it realistic that we assume Telecom charges remain constant (with inflation)?

2. Basis for costs? Increase in 1990 and assume no increase over Aust inflation? No allowance for additional links to NZ, Japan or the UK. Surely this would happen in 5 years?

2.2 No increase in growth in Austpac costs?

3. What is the basis for the salaries? They are too high. What about yearly increments or performance review? Contingency of \$30,000 in \$1M sounds a bit low?

Robin,

I am concerned about some aspects of the present method of operation of the AVCC AARNet Technical Working Group. There is almost a complete lack of information circulated to its members (well at least to me). Because of this there is the possibility that decisions could be made which are not truly representative of the group members. A corollary is that, the Working Group having made a decision, I have very little information on which to support and 'sell' a decision. Some particular examples are:

There does not seem to have been a final technical report detailing the basis for selecting the particular equipment/supplier. As you are aware, Mark Williams represented myself during the evaluation of this equipment. After the Sydney meeting which Mark attended, an interim report was prepared which detailed the present status of each proposal and the required followup. Some discussion ensued via electronic mail, the decision and then nothing! What was presented to the AVCC Steering Committee meeting of December 14? Surely they required a technical report to give them a warm feeling about recommending contract negotiations and spending such a large sum of money? Personally I don't feel very warm about this decision at all. It may be a very good decision based on the evaluation of available information at the time, but I'm a member of the group that made the decision and I don't have all the available information or indeed a report summarising same and the reasons for that decision.

I have been discussing with Geoff for some time about the configuration of the Queensland regional network. His latest mail to me of November 20 indicated a configuration and some comments about the financial arrangements. However the model presented at the December Steering Committee changes both the configuration and funding model without effective notice. Certainly Geoff rang me a day or so before to say he had made 'some' changes, which I did not understand over the phone. It seems that this model was being rushed to be presented at the December Steering Committee meeting. My main point here is that information is not being disseminated to the Working Group members in a timely fashion, if at all. It's difficult for us to help if you don't disseminate information and delegate tasks.

I thought the funding model as presented to the Steering Committee was an appalling document, mainly because of lack of any explanation. Surely we should be producing quality work, decisions and documentation for the Steering Committee - I think they have a right to expect it.

Following are some comments about this model and the equipment configuration which I am sending to Geoff and QUESTnet Management Committee members.

(We have changed the name from QTInet to QARN to QUESTnet, the Queensland Education, Science and Technology Network. This is definitely the last name change (I hope). The main reason being that QUESTnet will be much easier to market).

I think it important that the Technical Working Group be fully informed at all times. I know we are all busy people, but we do have electronic means of communications at our disposal - which is, after all, what we're trying to sell to the academic and research community. We don't really have an excuse.

I would be pleased if you circulate this to the other Group members for their comments - perhaps its just me that's paranoid!



From: PSI&CSC.ANU.EDU.AU::RXE900 "Robin Erskine" 3-JAN-1990 09:48:15.9:  
To: PSI&UQVAX.UQ.EDU.AU::CCREES  
CC:  
Subj: RE: AARNet

Graham

The Working Group has ceased to exist. Its job was over when the recommendation was made to the AVCC Secretariat. Mark has the preliminary report and the one page final recommendation for cisco.

The budgetting model is nothing to do with the group, or indeed with the steering committee. It was decided upon by the VCs themselves at one of their meetings, I presume on advice from the Secretariat.

The Technical and Steering Committees have been disbanded. The running of AARNet is in the hands of the AVCC Secretariat and is just part of the overall AVCC budget. Geoff and Peter Elford are charged with the technical implementation.

Geoff is pulled this way and that way all the time by competing forces within the AVCC. He has written a large document, over 50 pages, which was deposited with the AVCC just before Christmas. I hope they have distributed it. It was scheduled to go to VCs, Directors of Computer Services and the various members of the now defunct committees. I shall try to find out if it was distributed.

Replies to the document were required by 15 JANUARY 1990 on matters such as configurations etc.

I won't distribute your queries onward since there is no committee to send them to. Have you spoken to Al~~an~~ Coulter about the new structure - A Board and ad hoc Technical working parties as needed. I believe he has been invited to a meeting in Canberra on 24 January to clean up the management structure paper.

Best Wishes for 1990

Robin

From: PSI&CSC.ANU.EDU.AU::RXE900 "Robin Erskine" 3-JAN-1990 10:01:46.9'  
To: PSI&UQVAX.UQ.EDU.AU::CCREES  
CC:  
Subj: RE: AARNet

Graham,

I have just checked with AVCC. The document did go out before Christmas to VCs and Directors.

Thinking about your spreadsheet comments. I believe that they should not have been tabled at the committee as they just confused people. Geoff was given short notice of the requirement and they were, as you said, not well commented and explained.

The Working group had no hand in them. Indeed, the Steering Committee did not see any of the financial work as having emanated from the Working Group. As for the Technical Committee it, as you know, has not met since April.

Robin