

## Yeager, Scott

**From:** stan  
**To:** yeager.scott  
**Subject:** Re: Comments (fwd)  
**Date:** Sunday, September 11, 1994 8:41PM

Scott,

Thought you might like to see this. You remember Peter, right? He's the guy we met with when we started calling on Steve Wolfe waaay back with Bud Caspari....

Stan

> From: "Peter S. Ford" <peter@goshawk.lanl.gov >  
> To: Gordon Cook <cook@mcs.net >  
> Cc: iepg@iepg.org, nanog@merit.edu, nap-info@merit.edu  
> Subject: Re: Comments  
> Date: Fri, 09 Sep 94 16:55:34 MST  
>  
> There have been several questions about MAE-East and the DC NAP.  
> In particular it is asked why the NAP, and the MAE/GIX are separate  
> facilities. I don't see them as separate facilities, instead I see  
> them as 2 virtual networks on top of the very same MFS facilities.  
> Both virtual networks use MFS's ability to offer bridged 802  
> framed/addressed/switched networks in a distributed manner.  
> In fact, there is no really good reason why they have to be separate  
> virtual networks, since they have the same basic technical  
> requirements and have similar implementation policies.  
> There has been some debate that the problem is that the NSF wants  
> control over the NAP, but there does not appear to be any evidence  
> to this line of argument.  
>  
> NSF would like to see the following policies to be  
> in place for the NAPs:  
>  
>       non-discriminatory access to the NAP for Internet Service Providers  
>  
>       NSPs serving RNPs that have NSF RNP awards must advertise routes to  
>       and accept traffic to/from the RNP's US R&E customers.  
>  
>       Bandwidth and service to scale over time  
>  
> It does not appear that this runs counter to the policies of the  
> MAE/GIX.  
>  
> An obvious result of deliberation on the issues at hand  
> would be to simply relabel the things as MAE/GIX/NAP  
> and be done with it.  
>  
> Any such arrangement would of course be contingent on an agreement between  
> the entity that has contracted with MFS to provide MAE-East, and the  
> entity (NSF) who have a cooperative agreement with MFS to furnish the DC  
> NAP service. NSF would welcome the opportunity to open talks that might  
> lead to such an agreement.  
>  
> This line of discussion naturally leads into the issues of "... what  
> about the CIX and California NAP, they are both on PacBell facilities,  
> etc. ...". Here the issues are not so clear as in the MFS case since  
> the PacBell NAP is based on ATM technology and the CIX has elected to  
> use SMDS as their service. This does not preclude interconnecting the