

2019/09/05 Start: 15:34 UTC **End:** 16:20 UTC

Participants: Steve McManus, Filiz Yilmaz, Arnold Nipper, Matt Griswold, Aaron Hughes,

Agenda:

- Selection of 4 issues to go into September Support Contract (Filiz)

Stefan Funke's AC-requested issues list:

Important and probably not minor:

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/293>

- not minor but important since we need to clean up IXP records with bogus network sizes (IPv4 and IPv6)

FY: It is also tagged as a BUG.

→ Needs checking with Stefan to see if it still is an issue. If yes then it can go to Support.

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/371>

- helps cleaning up (something we have to do manually right now)

FY: Already seem to be supported by some PC members

Arnold will shepherd+summarize and then it will move on.

Minor and easy to fix or to fill work queues:

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/374>

- easy minor, and helps AC

FY: +1'ed by 2 PC members already

Ok in the new process. Not a bug, ask PC members if they want to vote or not.

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/288>

- easy minor, and reduces confusion for end users

FY: Really touches usability and has impact on both user's perception as well as support queue tickets imo. Fix will help both users and AC. So I would say this should get priority.

This also relates to <https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/121>

which I believe is very close to be Decided on too. Could we call consensus on 121 and 288 and get them both implemented in next release?

288 can be worked on but 121 needs further discussion.
FY to make a call for votes on both.

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/283>

- cosmetic, very minor

Goes to Support Sept

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/291>

- easy minor

FY to Re-check with Stefan if still valid for AC. Arnold said this was resolved recently.

- Finalization of the [Decision Making Process](#)
 - Next steps: Prioritization and getting Quotes for items with decisions
 -
- Thoughts on Github labels and using them more efficiently

FY created Milestones to note **Decide** and **Consensus** queues that are referred in the new Decision Making Process.

<https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/milestones>

Should we use these to sort issues in order to be able to manage our process better?:

If not, I will delete them (except Next Release of course!)

Having these, an Internal PC process could be like:

- Shepherd picks up the issue and assigns it to themselves.
- Shepherd puts the issue in **Decide**.
- PC members discusses the issue.
- If consensus is reached PM/Shepherd/Chair moves the issue to **Consensus**.

Sounds reasonable. FY will test the idea with 20C too to make sure there are no adverse impact using Milestones.

- Translation Process:
 - Chinese/Chinese Simplified

- Data ownership TF call made within PeeringDB. Further call is pending to be sent out soon. Lists to receive the call: pdb-gov, pdb-announce, pdb-tech and pdb-users mailing lists.
- How can we all work on our 5 issues concluded? How can we help?
- September Release

Those issues from the quote which are not related to IX-F Jason will go into Production. It is decided that we make a Beta announcement on 11 Sept and Production release on 18 September. There is EPF but PC did not see an issue of having a release in this period.

- Vendor selection process: [link](#)
 - Don't need to discuss today - Feedback needed
- AOB?