

State Networking, the MNT

1. Higher education and State Agencies have been mandated to participate in the State's Multiple-use Network, the MNT
2. Two bills:
 - MNT legislation – build a statewide network among 70 county seats
 - The “Beanpole” bill – plan and fund for rural communities to connect to the MNT
3. Organizational Structure
 - MNT - General Support Services (GSS), Colorado Government Technology Services (CGTS)
 - Beanpole - Dept. of Local Affairs (DOLA), \$4.7 million
4. MNT
 - Restricted to telecommunications “services”
 - \$14 million/yr. of spending authority
 - \$7 million per year of funding
 - Awarded to Qwest in 3 phases, all Qwest ATM based
 - Will be deployed in July-September 01 to almost 40 sites
 - Deployed at ATM, layer-2 (i.e. point to point circuits), not a true “network”
5. MNT Implementation Issues
 - Participation mandated, yet no cost model, no service model, no architecture for Internet services, no support model, no guidance on who can participate
 - Sites that had existing, low-cost fiber transport (e.g. the Front Range) will subsidize deployment of high-speed infrastructure in the rural areas – may be very expensive
6. Higher ed's participation in the MNT
 - Higher ed has built its own network at the Front Range GigaPoP (FRGP)
 - The FRGP is independent of the state network
 - Issues of contention
 - a. higher ed connects to the FRGP using point-to-point circuits, a technology different from that awarded to Qwest; we have asked for permission to maintain our point-to-point circuits
 - b. CGTS wants to interpose an MNT device in our network, so we can be considered to be participating in the MNT
7. Effects upon CSU
 - The MNT's cost model is not yet determined, presenting uncertainty when budgeting for FY 02
 - The cost of our circuit to Denver will increase, as we must order service from Qwest (unknown amount, currently estimated at an additional \$100,000 per year)
 - We in no way want to have an MNT device in our network, as this impairs flexibility, introduces unnecessary complexity, introduces another single point of failure, and currently we have no agreement about who would operate and manage it
 - CGTS may mandate policies about secondaries, affecting our existing secondaries: (NTU, PSD, City of Fort Collins) and impending secondaries (County, PVH, PRPA, City of Loveland)
 - Significant staff time “thrashing” about on this issue