

**2023-04-06 Start:** 15:30 UTC **End:** 16:30 UTC

**Participants:** Matt, Pete, Steve, Leo, Arnold, Martin

**Apologies:** Laurent

### Main agenda

- Introduce Laurent Jarbinet
- Report on “Evaluate ways to reduce operational costs [#1225](#)” and priorities for effective deployment of “Improve Search Functionality [#1204](#)” (Grizz)
- Clarifications on “[Support web updates from a source of truth #1328](#)” - see if we can get alignment on this issue
  - Discussion led to agreement, with some concerns on keeping the budget low.
- [Report on Google Analytics](#): initial findings, potential areas for future analysis (Leo)
- Campus “break up” problem. Some facility operators have previously chosen to list interconnected sites as a single facility. If they now want to take advantage of the new campus object, they’ll need to break these up into separate objects. How can we manage the change to help them do this in a way that minimizes user surprise?
  - Can we move networks, exchanges, and carriers to new facility objects at the facility operator’s request for this one time event? (see: [DOTF](#)) If not, how can we manage the quality of user data as some users will never make updates? Will facilities even know which networks are at which facility?
  - What notifications are required?
  - What tooling is needed?
  - What else?

This work would require action by the AC as ordinary users do not have the appropriate permissions. No tool is needed to support this.

ACTIONS: 0) Facility operator would need to provide a mapping for networks or IXs between old facility ID and new facility ID 1) Send an announcement 2) Write a blog post 3) Document elsewhere on the website 4) Include in conference talks

Number	Title	Summary	Consent Finalized?
<a href="#">1344</a>	Auto approval of new carrierfac objects	Decide on approval policy for carriers in a facility. Do they need the facility operator to approve the listing or can it be the same policy as we use for networks?	YES

<a href="#">1341</a>	Only indicate availability of DC voltage for facilities	Should we show all power options or the non-standard options that distinguish a facility?	Discuss on list
<a href="#">1353</a>	Updating voltage services options	See 1341	Discuss on list
<a href="#">1357</a>	Clarifying or Deprecating the Network Type field	Follow up on RossIreland's <a href="#">#1321</a>	Discuss on list
<a href="#">1364</a>	IX Object Creation Per Policy	Automate the current (manual) process	YES - need to look at corner cases

### Consent Agenda

Non-contentious issues that can be agreed in a single vote. Members can ask for an issue to be placed on the main agenda if they want it to have more discussion.

Number	Title	Summary	Consent Finalized?
<a href="#">1337</a>	List of "Peers at this Exchange Point" shows IPv4 addresses in the IPv6 column and vice versa	As title	YES
<a href="#">1338</a>	API /org/\$ID?depth=4 omits carrier and campus	See 1352	YES
<a href="#">1352</a>	Include carrier and campus objects in the API	As title	YES
<a href="#">1339</a>	Tie TOTP devices and Webauthn Security Keys to the user account	As title	YES
<a href="#">1340</a>	Clearly show in the API when a facility is part of a campus	See 1352	YES
<a href="#">1341</a>	Inconsistent return results when querying facilities by state (Datafill)	Jayhanke reported some data quality issues for states. Looks like a bug that needs fixing.	YES
<a href="#">1360</a>	IX-F Importer: IX-F Member Data not being nullified after IX stops/changes import	Bug where mails are being sent based on a removed IX-F import	Defer to next month

<a href="#">1361</a>	Add Campus and Carrier Tooltips	Summarize our definition of these terms to users in a tooltip to help them understand what they are seeing	Defer to next month
<a href="#">1362</a>	Show connected networks, exchanges, and carriers on campus results pages	These tables exist for each facility that is part of a campus. Show tables for the whole campus on the campus page.	Defer to next month
<a href="#">1363</a>	Google Analytics for docs.peeringdb.com	As title	Defer to next month

**Informational**

No action required. Members should be aware that these new issues have been agreed since the last meeting.

Number	Title	Summary

**AOB**

None