

NTAC Peering and Routing Working Group

01/21/2020 Call Notes

1. Agenda Bash
 - a. Farmer: add to CII conversation
 - b. Jeff Bartig: Microsoft routes
 - c. E-sports peering
2. Update on peering and I2PX
 - a. Start of semester traffic now evident
 - b. Capacity updates: Apple 100G at STL, NY. Attempted 100G at Ashburn, had interface errors, backed out. Public Equinix exchanges at 100G @ Ashburn, Chicago
 - c. James Deaton: Is there a good visual on I2PX pipes – before, after?
 - i. Jeff will update one and send it out soon and add to NOC pages.
3. Network weather update – trends and coming events
 - a. See above
4. I2 network update
 - a. See above
5. CII conversation
 - a. Farmer: has been looking at where CII is and how it is reachable. Has put together large google spreadsheet that he will share with the group soon.
 - b. There are interesting opportunities from a peering perspective.
 - c. Looking at TLDs for major (and not so major) domains and where their root servers are located network-wise.
 - d. Farmer: once data is out, folks will likely want to chew on it.
 - e. Brock: what other CII? NTP.
 - f. Lambert: NTP: Could I2 run Stratum 1 servers.
 - i. Farmer: yes, but we should coordinate peering amongst the ones we have now.
 - ii. Brock: could look at listing NTP by region.
 - iii. Farmer: could have a working group to coordinate NTP peering.
 - iv. At least several institutions would be open to exposing NTP servers to Internet2 peers.
 - v. Brock: Does this pool domain seem to be a reasonable approach? Could I2 facilitate?
 - vi. I2 would require expensive roof access, so they would likely look to other institutions/colleges to host.
 - vii. Schmiedt: We have agreed that campuses are the best hosts. But, how to coordinate?
 1. Farmer: likely through the regionals.
 - viii. Does anyone care about NTP?
 1. Yes.
 - ix. Internet2 has been running a stratum 1 unit for some time. Not sure how available it is.

- x. Brock: Can Linda Roos discuss with Matt Z. Yes.
 - xi. Farmer: also consider reaching out through the Quilt to find existing infrastructure.
 - xii. Roos: will start with Matt Z.
6. Microsoft routes
- a. Bartig: Have been discussing for some time that Microsoft will need to move out of R&E table as they are not a Net+ member.
 - b. Microsoft also existed in I2PX for some time.
 - c. Jeff has been working to build capacity and now feels comfortable that I2PX peers are satisfactory for this change.
 - d. **Microsoft routes will soon be leaving the R&E table** – Jeff will be working on timing with Microsoft.
 - e. If any concerns, please contact Jeff directly.
 - f. Will other organizations follow?
 - i. Yes, as/if Net+ participation ends. Eg: Oracle and Box.
 - ii. Brock: intent is to get commercial/cloud providers out of R&E table.
7. E-sports peering
- a. Farmer: Jeff had set of peers he was looking at. Timeline for implementation.
 - b. Bartig: have established peering with Gcore and I3d. Waiting on others to get capacity augment with the SIX peering exchange in Seattle (20G to 100G).
 - c. Matt: what specific connectivity is needed? P2P or to servers?
 - i. Both. It is best for the players if latency should be predictable.
 - d. Brock: any “special” peering requirements with these peers.
 - i. Bartig: not really.
 - ii. Farmer: peering is often regionalized; all routes may not be announced at all peers.
 - e. Has anyone had any complaints from Esports players or is this proactive.
 - i. Mostly proactive.
 - f. Many smaller schools fine ESports to be a differentiator and therefore see enabling it as a priority.
 - g. Owens: Updates for gaming computers in arenas can be very bandwidth intensive.
 - i. Farmer: correctly implemented rate-limits can help here.
 - h. Roos: last NTAC call asked for volunteers to be on Esports working group. Would be mostly technical discussion.
 - i. Would be good to have this working group investigate latency impact of ESports peering.
8. Any other business?
- a. Call ended at 5:02 EST