

EARN Document

Title: UK contribution 1989
Author(s): F Greisen
Date: 1989/8/18
Committee: Executive
Document: EXEC115 89 EARN-MIN LISTSERV@UKACRL
Revision: 0
Supersedes:
Status: Draft
Maintainer: F Greisen
Access: Executive

As it is apparent from the attached letter, at present the UK is not intending to pay the full central contribution for 1989, which is 74.774 ecu. They will pay 63.7 kecu which is the 10% of the total that was mentioned some time during the negotiations at the Tel Aviv board meeting. I have had several talks and some correspondence with Bob Cooper but after his last letter it seems we must be prepared to take the case to the board in October.

Before that, I think I should talk and maybe eventually write to Bob what we intend to propose, and I present the following draft for comment.

*****CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT*****

Dear Bob

Thank you for your letter of 2 August stating that the UK is not in a position to pay the full central contribution of 74.774 ecu for 1989. I am surprised to learn this, since I had the understanding that EARN was moving in the direction that the UK wanted in two important areas.

Firstly, with the restructured and commented 1989 budget we sent out by end June after the Crete meeting, we have described the use of central EARN funds and the emphasis on improvement of present services as well as preparations to use an OSI infrastructure.

Secondly, with the decision to use traffic data for distribution of central costs as soon as possible, and with actions to make such data available for the 1991 cost distributions we are in agreement with the principles expressed in your previous correspondence.

I am therefore somewhat uncertain of the UK position regarding the funding of EARN. Should it not be possible to find the remaining 11kecu in 1989 but possible to make payment in 1990, then please let me know. EARN would need to look at its budget and see what expenses

could be deferred until 1990.

If the position is that the UK does not intend to pay the full 1989 contribution, I have to take the case to the EARN board in October. Clearly, the board may find options that I have not thought of, but the two options that immediately come to mind are highly undesirable from the point of view of our common wish to further scientific co-operation in Europe.

One possibility might be that EARN needs to cut costs in areas that are not strictly necessary for operation of the present services, like the co-operation with other networking project and committees such as COSINE, CCIRN, or others.

Another possibility might be that the board decided on principles for cases of incomplete payment from a country. These principles might be that if a country only pays 92% it should only have 92% of the services, be it by withholding services for a month or by restricting access to certain classes of service as defined by servers and routing tables.

I would be extremely worried to propose any such measures myself, but it is difficult to explain to other board members that a country that uses the network services fully does not pay the full contribution.

Please let me know as soon as possible what proposals you have for progress in this matter.

Kind regards

Frode Greisen

Letter from R Cooper

D:\RC\LANDM\AUG\Greisen, 16/7
5459

R.Cooper@UK.AC.Rutherford

2 August

1989
Frode Greisen
EARN President
UNI-C
Vermundsgade 5
DK 2100 Copenhagen

DENMARK

Dear Frode

Thank you for your letter of 26 June. Following a meeting of my Management Committee and consultations with the two funding bodies which are providing the UK funding for EARN in 1989 I am now in a position to respond to the points in your letter.

The UK funding bodies have agreed to pay a second instalment to the 1989 EARN central budget but they are not able to increase the total contribution as requested. The UK contribution will therefore need to be pegged at the 63.7K ECU mentioned in my letter of 23 December. I will authorise payment of a second instalment which brings the total UK contribution up to this level on receipt of an appropriate invoice from EARN.

It is important for the EARN Board to note why the UK is not in a position to pay the full contribution requested. The budget for 1989 included both an increase in the level expenditure and a change in the key used to determine the contribution from each country. The change in the key favoured the smaller countries at the expense of the larger. The UK was thus faced with a major increase in its contribution at very short notice. The budget in the UK which covers all our EARN-related costs was increased significantly in response to the request from the EARN Board but it has proved impossible to fund the full amount. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the UK's contribution represents 10% of the central EARN funding in 1989.

As I stated in my December letter, and on several occasions in the intervening period, the UK is strongly against the funding of a service via GNP-based contributions. The funding has to be more service related in order to be fair to all participating countries, which have diverse and changing requirements, and to encourage the EARN management to adopt more service-related policies and plans.

I anticipate that the proposed increase in the EARN budget for 1990 will create similar problems to those encountered in 1989. I am not yet in a position to indicate how much the UK will be able to contribute to the central programme but I doubt that we will be able to provide the full amount requested by the EARN Board in the budget currently proposed. The UK's contribution will depend on how much can be saved in other areas; if, for example, we can exploit IXI to access EARN during 1990 and as a result remove the need for a dedicated access line there will be real financial savings which can be used to

increase funding in other areas. We will be exploring the options during the coming months and I will keep you in touch with progress.

Regards,

Dr R Cooper
Director of Networking

cc Professor H Whitfield
Dr P Bryant
Dr I L Smith
Dr E J Herbert
Dr P Jeffreys