2020/06/04 Start: 15:32 UTC **End:** 16:31 UTC
Participants: Arnold Nipper, Steve McManus, Yan Berthier, Filiz Yilmaz, Shane Kerr, Job Snijders, Matt Griswold

Agenda:
- [Add Looking Glass field to the IX object · Issue #672](#)

It was moved to Ready for Implementation but now there is an objection from Job. [It was also put in May Support Contract, depending on the final decision it may need to be removed from there]

Discussion on how the need for the feature reached consensus but how to implement has not reached a common agreement.

Further on, Job noted that the PeeringDB UIX has an impact on how people think and understand routing.

SteveM asked this to be taken outside of the meeting for a separate discussion, regarding specifics about 672. Job will Doodle to find extra time/date to have that.

Discussion on the process: What happens a PC member raises objections on an issue which received Consensus.

Matt: We are a volunteering committee, setting timelines too strictly will hinder my participation.

Job: We should also recognize we have a different set of skills. Fast path and right path as far as the process goes should be managed to keep this in mind when someone with expertise comes up with "delayed" arguments.

If it was deployed, of course, that is a different matter. In such a case, we should open a new issue, reflecting the objection.

Arnold disagrees. If an issue is "Ready for Implementation" it should be considered deployed already.

Yan: We had other issues that moved from "Ready for Implementation" to a previous state. So it should be possible.

Job: rephrased the cut-off point as being "Released".

SteveM: With exception of Arnold it seems everyone else is OK to re-discuss this while ack-ing that it is not ideal.

SteveM: We should try to avoid this from happening again but given that we are a volunteering org, let's try to have the empathy to find a solution.

- Progress on Data Ownership Policy issues
  - We will do a webinar to provide advance notice to users
  - We need to do this at least 2 Weeks (?) prior to the beta announcement, which means at least 3 weeks before any release date

End of July - Early August is a possible date to release the Data Ownership Policy issues implemented. We need to work out the dates of the Webinar back based on that.

Matt will send a mail, confirming the issue resulting from the spec doc.

Filiz will work out the Webinar with Arnold (Admin Com Chair) and SteveM (Product COm Chair). Please also socialize with your network that these changes will be coming once the social media posts are out and we know the dates.

- How to handle notifications of upcoming changes to PeeringDB more gracefully?

We are trying to get attention to upcoming changes in many ways: mailing and social media posts.

Job: Social media, conferences but we also tackled users individually as we deployed RPKI at NTT.

Yan has an issue (719) related to that.

SteveM asked for a volunteer to take this. Noone did, so he took the torch. Arnold is happy to assist.

- Tracking budget

If we want to start tracking budget how do you want this to be handled? Steve will send a follow-up proposal.

- Location normalization proposal:

Some people looked at the document. There is a desire to improve location awareness in PeeringDB. How to do that is the question.

If you haven't gotten the chance of looking at the doc pls do so asap.

If we could reach out to other open-source projects to see what they do about this it would be great.

OpenStreetMap has the same problem and we should talk to them.

Yan found a service (paid, but cheap) that can do that.

ALL: Pls look into the doc and comment.