

From: IN%"BEHNKE%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet" 10-DEC-1991 23:39:51.88
To: ccirn@Lbl.bitnet, m.topping@waikato.ac.nz%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet, conklin%
CC:
Subj: Final Draft CCIRN Minutes Santa Fe Meeting

Return-path: behnke%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet
Received: from survis.surfnet.nl by SURFnet.NL; Tue, 10 Dec 91 23:39 MET
Received: from hearnvax.nic.surfnet.nl by survis.surfnet.nl with SMTP (PP) id
<23571-0@survis.surfnet.nl>; Tue, 10 Dec 1991 23:46:33 +0100
Received: from HEARN.BITNET (MAILER@HEARN) by HEARNVAX.nic.SURFnet.nl with
PMDF#10216; Tue, 10 Dec 1991 23:47 MET
Received: from Lbl.Bitnet by HEARN.BITNET (Mailer R2.07) with BSMTMP id 7843;
Tue, 10 Dec 91 23:42:25 CET
Received: from Csa2.LBL.Gov by Csa3.LBL.Gov with INTERNET ; Tue, 10 Dec 91
13:58:58 PST
Received: from vax.darpa.mil by Csa2.LBL.Gov with INTERNET ; Tue, 10 Dec 91
13:42:11 PST
Received: by vax.darpa.mil (5.65c/5.61+local-4) id <AA07596>; Tue, 10 Dec 1991
16:41:50 -0500

Date: Tue 10 Dec 91 16:41:48-EST
From: BEHNKE%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet
Subject: Final Draft CCIRN Minutes Santa Fe Meeting
To: ccirn@Lbl.bitnet, m.topping@waikato.ac.nz%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet,
conklin%educom.edu%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet,
streeter%NSIPO.ARC.NASA.GOV%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet
Cc: stgeorge%ARIEL.UNM.EDU%DARPA.MIL@Lbl.bitnet
Message-id: <692401308.0.BEHNKE@VAX.DARPA.MIL>
X-Envelope-to: NEGGERS@SURFNET.NL
Mail-System-Version: <VAX-MM(217)+TOPSLIB(128)@VAX.DARPA.MIL>

Very few comments on the minutes were received. Either the minutes are good or you are all very busy. I will be optimistic and believe the former, thus making this the final draft. I have incorporated Kees' comments into the text, and I noted Mark Topping's comment about the abrupt ending of section 8.g. on the Link Coordination Policy discussion, however, I do not have anything to add to that section. The more meaty discussion occurred at the CCIRN meeting that afternoon, as I recall, as well as a few days after the meeting over e-mail.

If anyone would like to add anything else, please let me know. This is the first time the IEPG has seen the minutes, so those attendees may have some corrections.

Regards and have a very enjoyable holiday,

Lynn Behnke

Final Draft Minutes
CCIRN Meeting
Eldorado Hotel, Santa Fe
14-15 ~~May~~ 1991
November

A. List of Attendees

Attendance to CCIRN Meeting:

Shoichiro Asano	NACISIS	asano@nacsis.ac.jp
Lynn Behnke	FNC/Meridian Corp.	behnke@darpa.mil
Rob Blokzijl	HEPnet/RIPE	kl3@nikhef.nl

Bill Bostwick	FNC	bostwick@darpa.mil
Kilnam Chon	ANC	chon@cosmos.kaist.ac.kr
Jim Conklin	CREN	conklin@educom.edu
John Demco	CDNnet	demco@cs.ubc.ca
Robin Erskine	AARNet	robin.erskine@anu.edu.au
Steve Goldstein	NSF	goldstein@nsf.gov
Peter Kirstein	UCL	kirstein@cs.ucl.ac.uk
Barry Leiner	IAB	bleiner@ads.com
Fernando Liello	INFN-Italy/RARE	liello@trieste.infn.it
Kees Neggers	RARE	neggers@surfnet.nl
Paul Mockapetris	DARPA	pvm@darpa.mil
Glenn Ricart	FARNET	glenn_ricart@umail.umd.edu
Art St. George	CNI	stgeorge@ariel.unm.edu
Roxanne Streeter	NASA/Ames	streeter@nsipo.nasa.gov
Sven Tafvelin	NORDUnet	tafvelin@cd.chalmers.se
Vincent Taylor	DND/DRDCS	vktaylor@ncs.dnd.ca
Mark Topping	TUIA	m.topping@waikato.ac.nz
Tony Villasenor	NASA	villasenor@nasa.gov

Attendance to CCIRN/IEPG Joint Meeting in addition to above:

Guy Almes	ANS	almes@ans.net
Borka Jerman-Blazic	YUNAC/RARE	jerman-blazic@ijs.ac.mail.yu
Hans-Werner Braun	SDSC	hwb@sdsc.edu
Neville Brownlee	TUIA	nevil@aukuni.ac.nz
Robert Collett	NSFNET ICM/Sprint	rcollett@icml.icp.net
David Conrad	PACCOM	davidc@hawaii.edu
Tim Dixon	RARE	dixon@nikhef.nl
Peter Ford	LANL/NSF	peter@lanl.gov
Hugo Garcia	RedMEX (MEXnet)	hugo@mtecvl.mty.itesm.mx
Elise Gerich	Merit/NSFnet	epg@merit.edu
Phill Gross	ANS	pgross@ans.net
Tony Hain	ESnet	alh@es.net
Geoff Huston	AARNet	g.huston@aarnet.edu.au
James Hutton	Joint Network Team	j.hutton@jnt.ac.uk
John Houlker	TUIA	j.houlker@waikato.ac.nz
Peter Lothberg	Swipnet	roll@stupi.se
Olivier Martin	CERN	martin@cearn.cern.ch
Jun Matsukata	ISAS/NACSIS	jm@eng.isas.ac.jp
Jun Murai	WIDE/Japan	jun@wide.ad.jp
Torben Nielsen	U. Hawaii/PACCOM	torben@hawaii.edu
Bernhard Stockman	NORDUnet	boss@sunet.se
Tim Symchych	DREnet	symchych@ncs.dnd.ca
Claudio Topolcic	CNRI	topolcic@nri.reston.va.us
Warren Van Camp	NASA NSI (HSDCG)	vancamp@nsipo.nasa.gov
Jessica Yu	Merit/NSFnet	jyy@merit.edu

B. Agenda

1. Welcome

2. Updates from Regional Chairmen

- o European Update
- o Asia-Pacific Update
- o North American Update

3. Next CCIRN Meeting

4. Expansion of the Commercial, International Internet and Its Relation to the CCIRN
5. IEPG Link Coordination Procedure Document
6. Transit Traffic Policy Statement
7. CCIRN/IEPG Joint Session, Day 1
 - o Role of the IEPG
 - o NOC/NIC Coordination and Operation
 - o Reporting of Operational Statistics
 - o Maps and Link Database
 - o Transit and Traffic Flow
 - o Level of Service from Network Service Providers
 - o Protocol Infrastructure
 - o End User Services
 - o Link Coordination
 - o Suggested Priorities
 - o Reporting Mechanism
 - o Link Coordination Revisited by CCIRN
8. CCIRN Response and Guidance to the IEPG, Joint Session, Day 2
 - o Maps and Link Database
 - o NOC/NIC Coordination and Operation
 - o Transit and Traffic Flow
 - o Level of Service from Network Service Providers
 - o Protocol Infrastructure
 - o End User Services
 - o Link Coordination
9. CCIRN Paris Meeting Minutes
10. Link Coordination Process Continued
11. Acceptable Use Policy
12. CCIRN Participation in INET '92, the Joint European Networking Conference '92, Interop, and the Internet Society
13. Report on Multimedia Teleconferencing Meeting
14. Role of the CCIRN in Developing International Standards
15. Preparation for Next Meeting

C. Proceedings, Day 1

1. Welcome

The meeting is chaired by Bill Bostwick. Minutes will be prepared by Lynn Behnke.

The Chairman welcomes all attendees to Santa Fe, especially those from the Asia-Pacific region; they are now full members of the CCIRN.

2. Updates from Regional Chairmen

2.a. European Updates

Kees Neggers highlights developments in Europe:

- o As the RARE CoA has endorsed the establishment of the RIPE Network Coordination Center (NCC) as a RARE special project, arrangements for hiring personnel and site selection have begun. The RIPE NCC will play a key role in technical and administrative coordination and development of IP networking in Europe.
- o The CoA endorsed the report of the RARE Services Task Force, issued last September, to go ahead with the formation of the an Operational Unit for future pan-European services. The Task Force has been requested to detail the proposal and to develop a shareholders' agreement as well as to approach potential investors to seek initial commitment. Finalizing the establishment of the Operational Unit is estimated at six months.
- o The RARE CoA endorsed the Ebone 92 initiative and approach. Ebone 92 will be an interim backbone infrastructure providing value-added open networking services for Internet IP and pilot ISO CLNS created by combining and enhancing existing facilities. In 1993, Ebone 92 will be integrated into the full multi-protocol services and the operational responsibilities passed on to the Operational Unit, presuming the Unit has been successfully created by that time.
- o The CoA has agreed to support proposals by Working Group 8 to stimulate the setting up of Incident Response and Security Teams. The CoA will encourage European networks to set up such teams and to join FIRST (Forum on Incident Response and Security Teams). WG 8 will act as an interim task force and will apply for liaison membership of FIRST as soon as possible and promote the creation of the teams.
- o RARE has agreed in principle to become a charter member of the Internet Society and is currently discussing bi-laws and conditions with the ISoc initiators.

2.b. Asia-Pacific Updates

Robin Erskine discusses developments in the Asia-Pacific region:

- o The APCCIRN is currently represented by members from five nations-- Australia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, and the U.S. The region has been defined as the area between the Indian subcontinent and the western U.S. The two meetings held so far have been joint meetings with the APCCIRN and APEPG.
- o Being such a large area, most of the region's links are international and intercontinental. IBM presented a proposal to begin a study on research networking in the Asia-Pacific area and on regulatory controls. The study should be done by the end of March, after which the Asia-Pacific representatives will meet with the technical group that will then split off to draw up a comprehensive regional networking plan. It will be circulated as a draft and then finalized in June at a meeting in Japan.
- o Another objective is educating the community about APCCIRN. Robin

would like to have a half day meeting at INET '92 to explain to the attendees about the APCCIRN.

2.c. North American Updates

Bill Bostwick gives a report on NACCIRN activities:

- o The NACCIRN met in October 1991, and unfortunately no commercial providers were able to attend, but they were invited.
- o Since the Paris CCIRN meeting in May, there is still no appropriations bill signed by the U.S. Congress for HPCC, although all of the agencies involved have NREN activities included in their budgets.
- o NSF has hired Bob Aiken as NREN Program Director.

3. Next CCIRN Meeting

The chairmen are asked to determine when and where the next CCIRN meeting will be. The week before INET '92 in Japan is selected, tentatively 10-12 June, probably in Tokyo.

4. Expansion of the Commercial, International Internet and Its Relation to the CCIRN

Barry Leiner discusses the role of the Internet Society as a global policy authority, an example being the resolution of conflicts over naming and address space. Barry asserts that ISoc is the only body in a position to assume this kind of authority.

The attendees comment on commercial traffic within their regions. Ebone is intended for the use of research and education which includes some commercial networks engaged in those types of activities. Glen Ricart of FARNET comments that the trend in research and education is broaden charters to include commercial networks and the CCIRN should do likewise. Rob Blokzijl adds that it may be worthwhile to try to define exactly what is meant by commercial. Mark Topping says that the APCCIRN has discussed this issue and their perspective is that user demand is pushing for access to commercial services. Paul Mockapetris asserts that it is useless to argue the separation of commercial from academic. What is important is showing that by keeping control over links, you are not unfairly subsidizing a commercial entity.

The CCIRN agrees to the following statement:

The CCIRN recognizes the need to cooperate with commercial network providers and to coordinate network implementations and operations in order to maximize the CCIRN's research and education goals and objectives.

5. IEPG Intercontinental Link Coordination Procedure Document

The document produced by the IEPG before the meeting is discussed. There is objection to the use of "mandatory" in the document, to the document's length, and to the lack of authority the CCIRN has in enforcing

coordination.

Barry Leiner is tasked with writing a coordination procedure document to be discussed at the joint meeting with the IEPG.

[The CCIRN's version of this document is included in Appendix A following these minutes. The IEPG has since issued a revision over e-mail that is still being commented upon.]

6. Transit Traffic Policy Statement

Steve Goldstein drafted a transit traffic policy document before the CCIRN meeting. Steve emphasizes that many groups are doing traffic analysis and we do not want to set a policy until we know what that traffic data looks like. He suggests that the CCIRN task the IEPG to find a uniform means of measuring transit traffic, and based on that, the CCIRN can make a long-term policy.

Attendees express concerns over underreporting of traffic, on the definition of a bounded network system, and on how networks would negotiate agreements to accept each other's transit traffic. Steve explains his desire to reach an agreement to avoid possible State Department involvement over carrying transit traffic.

It is agreed that the document will not be completed at this meeting.

Action Item-1: Steve will incorporate suggested changes to the Draft Interim CCIRN Transit Traffic Policy and send it to the CCIRN for further comment.

[This discussion was interrupted by the CCIRN/IEPG Joint Meeting, however the notes above cover the agenda item for both before and after the joint meeting.]

7. CCIRN/IEPG Joint Session, Day 1

Bill Bostwick chairs the joint meeting. IEPG co-Chair Geoff Huston makes a presentation on the role of the IEPG, and he presents the areas of intercontinental networking that have been getting particular attention.

7.a. Role of the IEPG

The members of the IEPG perceive their role as follows:

- 1) IEPG provides technical and engineering support to the CCIRN by--
 - o identifying and prioritizing key technical activities of a time-sensitive nature;
 - o developing a workplan;
 - o stimulating progress on identified engineering activities.
- 2) IEPG is an engineering agenda setting group.
- 3) IEPG identifies issues that may be developed by other national or regional groups such as IETF, RIPE, RARE, etc.

The IEPG's Terms of Reference were developed over the last two meetings and signed off in June 1991. The major issue highlighted in that document is that the group is made up of network engineers selected by the CCIRN. Stability of membership in the IEPG is important for allowing effective, quick tackling of issues.

The IEPG presented several issues that are now receiving particular attention, described their importance, and provided the CCIRN with its recommendations. [See below.]

7.b. NOC/NIC Coordination and Operation

Areas of concern include trouble ticketing to resolve, in a timely fashion, end user and infrastructural problems; finding better ways to provide cheaper service; and making end-to-end service as seamless as possible.

Within the IETF ORAD activity, there exists a UCP Working Group that is dealing with these issues and will take on link outage notification. The IEPG recommends that the CCIRN support this effort.

7.c. Reporting of Operational Statistics

Reporting requires engineers to examine deployed resources and to ask if they are doing the job for the level of usage required. Also included is policy and management reporting, which looks at whether funds and resources are accomplishing strategic objectives. The two areas of concern are architecture of measurement and methodology of presentation of data. The OpStats Working Group of the IETF should produce a draft document on this subject in two weeks.

The IEPG recommends defining a common architecture of management as well as agreeing upon the methodology of data presentation so that usage report comparisons can be made.

7.d. Maps and Link Database

Maintenance of link databases is a valuable activity in the intercontinental forum. RARE hopes to continue its international database and mapping activity. Associated with this are topology maps, which would assist the entire global community.

The IEPG recommends that the CCIRN recognize the value of these activities and endorse them.

7.e. Transit and Traffic Flow

Olivier Martin presents statistics to give a picture of traffic flows. In October 1991, the total traffic at CERN was 185 gbytes. 45% of this was transit traffic probably related to HEPnet. From January to October, IP traffic increased from 25 gbytes to 185 gbytes. On the NSFnet, the total T1 traffic was 1.6 terabytes or eight times that measured at CERN. EASINET statistics show that 220 networks use it for primary access to the NSFnet. There is a great deal of traffic coming from the U.S. and much less going to the U.S. from Europe--42.66% from the U.S. and only 13.37% going to the U.S. in October 1991.

The IEPG recommends that CCIRN members support activities to gather and analyze traffic flows within the intercontinental domain.

7.f. Level of Service from Network Service Providers

The IETF has been considering an Internet draft document proposing minimum service levels of mid-level networks (e.g. NTP, Net news, file cache or index.) The regional and national structures could provide services to enable reliability of service through local provision and the rational use of link resources.

The IEPG recommends that minimum services for regional structures should be investigated and defined (possibly by IETF ORAD). The CCIRN should note the resource implications in providing such services in a production environment. The end users' insistence on reliability and quality cannot be ignored.

7.g. Protocol Infrastructure

BGP has features to support network policy restraints, however these are only partially tested. The design has been inclusive, but deployment is not yet tested with policy restraints.

Concerning GOSIP profiles, the CCIRN should be aware of a concern that various GOSIP versions may not interoperate.

The IEPG recommends support for pilots to investigate the untested features of BGP and other protocols that will aid in implementations with policy content.

7.h. End User Services

International character sets--the IEPG considered the issue and noted the engineering implications required to support this within the application set. An active project is in process supported by COSINE.

E-mail--the IEPG has been considering a document [title? whose document?] that defines end-to-end transport issues. It needs to be refined to note the inadequacy of the mail application reader interface and the mail application reader database. [I could use some help in describing what it was the IEPG was getting at here.]

File services--the IEPG considered Brian Carpenter's paper concerning FTP reliability and performance. The IEPG feels that the issue at hand is broader and more important than just file services. File services is only a component of the information publication and dissemination issue.

The IEPG recommends that 1) the mail document be refined and passed to the CCIRN, with an initial draft available in November 1991; 2) the CCIRN paper on file services should be refined to this issue as a component of information publication and dissemination; 3) the IETF or RIPE/RARE be encouraged to develop and deploy WAIS and that the ARCHIE Working Group activities be endorsed.

7.i. Link Coordination

In July, an IEPG paper on link coordination and planning was submitted to the CCIRN. The IEPG agrees that there is mutual benefit to the broad user community in connectivity, and hence a requirement to coordinate activity should be stated explicitly. Currently there is no forum or common policy for link coordination.

The IEPG recommends that the CCIRN call on interested parties to participate in a joint activity to seek a common forum in order to develop

a process of acceptable connectivity arrangements. The IEPG feels that it does not have sufficient policy guidelines to deal with connection requests, and creating policy on the fly is undesirable.

7.j. Suggested Priorities

- 1) Coordination and connectivity in the total global matrix. The CCIRN should address the lack of a common forum to consider policies.
- 2) End User Services. Long-term viability of the matrix is dependent on reliable operation of end use services. This requires resources from the CCIRN member networks.
- 3) Other topics as presented are considered equal in importance as outstanding issues.

7.k. Reporting Mechanism

The IEPG proposes that the CCIRN take the meeting notes from this session and details from working documents that describe the current issues, and publish an Internet RFC and a RARE document inviting further comment.

7.1. Link Coordination Revisited by CCIRN

Bill Bostwick explains the differences that CCIRN members have with the IEPG's draft Intercontinental Link Coordination and Planning document.

Barry Leiner presents a draft CCIRN document on link coordination that reflects the CCIRN's vision for establishing a well-managed, coordinated Internet. The document also reflects the need to better convey information back to the network managers about their links. The process will rely on peer pressure to motivate individual regions to coordinate their links.

The IEPG is asked to prepare two documents to accompany the coordination process document: 1) a document detailing the format in which presenters should submit information about their planned links; 2) a document defining the analysis process so that anyone in the CCIRN constituency can understand how plans will be evaluated and by what criteria.

An ad hoc working group is formed to revise the document to reflect IEPG concerns, and then to resubmit it to the CCIRN.

D. Proceedings, Day 2

The CCIRN/IEPG Joint Session continues for a few hours into the morning of Day 2.

8. CCIRN Response and Guidance to IEPG, Joint Session, Day 2

Robin Erskine presents the IEPG with the CCIRN co-Chairs' responses to their recommendations, but he first asks for comments from other CCIRN members.

8.a. Maps and Link Database

Peter Kirstein asks if there is a link database available for the Asia-

Pacific region. Geoff Huston says it is available as a postscript file through anonymous FTP /iepg on cruskit.aarnet.edu.au.

Barry Leiner asks how the IETF and RARE activities databases can be brought together into a common format. Bernhard Stockman replies that there is a RIPE database format that can be issued as an RFC.

The CCIRN's response to this issue is to endorse ongoing database and topology mapping activities.

8.b. NOC/NIC Coordination and Operation

The CCIRN accepts the IEPG's recommendation to support ongoing efforts in the IETF ORAD UCP Working Group.

8.c. Transit and Traffic Flow

The CCIRN accepts the IEPG's recommendation to gather and analyze traffic flow data.

Action Item-2: The IEPG agrees to flesh out the issues regarding transit traffic in a document and pass it to the IETF ORAD to pursue development of methods to analyze traffic.

8.d. Level of Service from Network Service Providers

Peter Kirstein comments that emphasis needs to be on reliability of service in the intercontinental arena.

The CCIRN approves the IEPG recommendation that minimum levels of service should be investigated and defined, and that resource implications should be acknowledged.

8.e. Protocol Infrastructure

The CCIRN accepts the IEPG's recommendation to support pilots to investigate the untested features of BGP and other protocols.

Steve Goldstein distributes a report by Susan Hares of Merit/NSFnet on "OSI Demonstrations at Interop '91." The report describes how the cooperation of the European CLNS Pilot Project, an Australian site, and several U.S. networks and companies can make OSI applications a reality over the Internet.

8.f. End User Services

Regarding character sets, the activities and progress in Europe is noted with pleasure. There is a comment that the Asia-Pacific region needs to be included in this issue at an appropriate time in the future.

Action Item-3: Regarding the e-mail document, the IEPG should rework it and pass it to the CCIRN for comment.

Regarding file services, Geoff Huston says the IEPG needs more input from the CCIRN concerning information publication and dissemination. The CCIRN will consider this at a later date.

8.g. Link Coordination

Guy Almes and Barry Leiner describe the changes made to the Link

Coordination Process document by the ad hoc working group. The issues of timeliness and predictability are addressed in the document.

Action Item-4: The IEPG is tasked with drafting Appendix A "Format for Description of Link Addition/Change" and Appendix B "Criteria and Process for Technical Analysis."

Phill Gross is given permission to show this draft at the IETF meetings next week to solicit comments.

The CCIRN will continue to review the document at their separate session this afternoon.

9. CCIRN Paris Meeting Minutes

The CCIRN continues meeting in a separate session. The draft minutes from the Paris meeting in May are approved subject to modifying an item under 4.d. regarding the Canadian Update. "...T1 national backbone by a T3 backbone..." will be replaced by "...56Kb national backbone (CA*net) by a T1 leading to a T3 backbone (ISTCnet)...."

10. Link Coordination Process Continued

After much discussion, the CCIRN developed a third draft of the document and returned it to the IEPG for review. [The CCIRN version of the document is attached under Appendix A of these minutes. Subsequently, Phill Gross issued another version of the document that incorporated more IEPG concerns.]

It is agreed that the document can be circulated as a draft for comments, but not as on behalf of the CCIRN. It cannot be published until the appendices have been written by the IEPG.

Robin Erskine asks that the APCCIRN position be noted. All the links in the region are intercontinental by necessity, therefore it is understood that this document refers to interregional links. The APEPG alone deals with links within the region.

11. Acceptable Use Policy

The Chair drafted an Acceptable Use Policy for the CCIRN's comments prior to the meeting. Discussion centers around whether there is a need for a CCIRN Acceptable Use Policy since each region will accept traffic according to its own networks' policies. The document as it exists now implies that a member has to accept any traffic that meets the acceptable use policy of the originating organization. This would not be workable.

The CCIRN agrees not to discuss the issue any further than to acknowledge the previously existing, unwritten agreements among member networks to accept traffic according to individual requirements.

12. CCIRN Participation in INET '92, the Joint European Networking Conference '92, Interop, and the Internet Society

Barry Leiner proposed to the INET planning committee that there should be a session on global coordination. Three papers should be written: one by

the CCIRN on global policy coordination; a second by the IEPG on technical coordination; and a third to be determined. A co-Chair from each of the CCIRN and IEPG could do a paper. Bill Bostwick tentatively accepted to do the CCIRN paper. Barry will gladly accept suggestions for topics for the third paper.

Regarding the JENG, Bill would like the EuroCCIRN to make a presentation on behalf of the CCIRN.

The Internet Society was discussed earlier on Day 1, and was again discussed after Day 2 was concluded and Vinton Cerf arrived. Barry handed out brochures on ISoc to the attendees.

13. Report on Multimedia Teleconferencing Meeting

Peter Kirstein briefs the attendees on a meeting held in Marina del Rey, California on 13 November 1991. The meeting was attended by representatives from Canada, Netherlands, Sweden, the U.K., and the U.S. The purpose of the meeting was to get more nations involved and to facilitate a better mechanism for coordination. Technical issues brought up as being possible roadblocks to the deployment of service included bandwidth requirements, incompatible and closed CODECs, audio problems, changes to routers to allow bandwidth reservation and multicast, whether Hublet architecture is useable, performance needs, and several others.

A proposal was made at that meeting to put together an international videoconferencing pilot project to achieve limited deployment in 1992. The proposal should be completed in approximately three months. The attendees would like to have another Multimedia Teleconferencing Meeting at the time of INET '92 in Japan. They also desire more participation from Asia-Pacific nations, NSF, and NASA. Peter welcomes any names of people who would like to work on the proposal.

Action Item-5: CCIRN members interested in participating in developing the proposal should contact Peter over the next week or two.

14. Role of the CCIRN in Developing International Standards

Progress on X.400 and X.500 global coordination was noted. Further discussion of this agenda item is postponed and will be expanded for the next meeting.

15. Preparation for Next Meeting

Action Item-6: Robin Erskine and Shoichiro Asano are tasked with producing a draft agenda and requesting additional items by the end of December.

The fall 1992 meeting will tentatively be held between early November and the first week of March 1993 and will be held in Europe.

D. Appendix A

The CCIRN provides a mechanism for coordinating research and education networking and services globally. It coordinates the interests and actions of a variety of network and service providers and users worldwide. The interested parties, who participate in the CCIRN process and use the results to help guide their actions, are referred to as the CCIRN constituents.

One major area of coordination is that of installation and modification of intercontinental links connecting to the relevant networks. The goal of this coordination is to provide technical analysis of such links and their impact on global research and education networking, in order to ensure and enhance global performance and effectiveness.

The process by which this coordination occurs is as follows:

1. The party(ies) planning to install or modify links prepare(s) a brief document describing the essential elements of the links. Appendix A provides the format for this document.
2. The document is then submitted to the IEPG with a copy to the CCIRN.
3. The IEPG then selects a group to conduct an analysis of the link plan, paying particular attention to the impact on global research and education networking. Appendix B documents the process and criteria for analysis. It is intended that this process be timely, and as predictable as possible.
4. The results of this analysis are then provided to the link planner(s) and relevant CCIRN constituents with a recommendation for appropriate actions.

While this process is described in terms of intercontinental link coordination, a similar process may be applicable within regions by using the substructure of the CCIRN and IEPG.

Appendix A: Format for Description of Link Addition/Change (TBA)

Appendix B: Criteria and Process for Technical Analysis (TBA)
