

October 20, 2009

NTAC Peering

10/20/09

In attendance: Jeff Bartig, Brian Cort, Bob Collie, David Crowe, Cas D'Angelo, Akbar Kara, Lonnie Leger, Caren Litvanyi, Darrell Newcomb, Dave Reese, Chris Robb, Linda Roos, Steve Wallace, Matt Zekauskas

Agenda

1. Update from Internet2 on peering
2. Discussion re: Proposed Architecture for a Combined CPS and TR Service

Action Items:

Jeff will send a note to the mailing list asking for feedback on the Peering Architecture document.

Meeting Notes

1. Update from Internet2 on peering

Caren Litvanyi mentioned that there is now light between the CPS and TR routers in DC. She also mentioned that there is work on obtaining a riser and cross connect with Akamai in NY. Chris Robb mentioned that the next set of 10GE waves between Houston and LA and between Houston and KC have been lit. Chris encouraged those on the call to investigate the Arbor Network presentation at NANOG:<http://nanog.org/meetings/nanog47/abstracts.php?pt=MTQ1MyZuYW5vZzQ3&nm=nanog47>

2. Discussion re: Proposed Architecture for a Combined CPS and TR Service

The CPS/TR Combined Architecture document is the result of meeting held in September in Indy. Those attending included Darrell Newcomb, Dave Reese, Caren Litvanyi, Matt Davy, Jeff Bartig, Rob Vietzke, Steve Wallace and Chris Robb. Jeff asked those on the call for feedback on the document. Jeff reviewed the following points from the CIC TAC (sent via email to the NTAC peering list on 10/20/09):

The CIC TAC expresses a strong desire that the openness and transparency associated with the Internet2 CPS service be continued in a consolidated service. There is concern about the perceived lack of transparency with TransitRail (no publicly accessible data, graphs, router proxy). As the networks are combined, this lack of access to information will need to be reversed. There is also a strong desire that there be a method for the community to help direct the peering strategy, like there has been with CPS. IPv6 support was not mentioned in the architecture document. While CPS has good IPv6 connectivity today, TransitRail does not. If we will be migrating to the TransitRail ASN, it will need to establish equivalent IPv6 peering before the CPS (AS11537) commercial IPv6 peers are shutdown. IPv6 support is seen as an absolute requirement. Many CPS participants rely on CPS for either primary or backup global IPv6 transit.

The CIC TAC looks forward to seeing the complete consolidation proposal that includes budget and governance details. _Dave Reese mentioned that some of the points raised by the CIC had been addressed in an earlier document. He mentioned that the same tools that have been used for CPS will be used for the combined services. The earlier document also mentioned a strong commitment to IPv6. Transparency is important to the project. Steve encouraged Dave Reese to provide an email response to the CIC. There were inquiries regarding a budget for the combined service and Dave indicated that creating a budget is difficult because the combined budget would include growth and previous budgets for each of the services were static. To deal with this, a static budget was created for the combined services to allow comparison to the static budgets for the individual services. As the project progresses, the peering working group will be involved in budget because that budget will include future growth of the combined service and input from the peering working group is needed to predict the rate of growth.

Steve Wallace mentioned that the group that created draft architecture would like to have feedback from the NTAC peering working group as well as the entire NTAC this week. Jeff will send a note to the NTAC mailing list asking for feedback. The group is seeking feedback on this question: does this document encompass the technical architecture for the combined service?

After receiving endorsement of the document, the next step will be for Dave Reese and Rob Vietzke to ask their organizations for a letter of commitment on the combined service. Work will also continue on the budget for the service.