2019/08/08 Start: 15:32 UTC End: 16:30 UTC

Participants: Filiz Yilmaz, Arnold Nipper, Eric Loos, Steve McManus, Matt Griswold, Job

Snijders, Florian Hibler, Shane Kerr

## Agenda:

• Decision-making process: <u>link</u> - still need feedback from a few

We are pretty close to agreeing on this version. Florian just made a new comment. Steve explained his intention of having minimum of 3PC Members for the stakeholder group to work on an issue. Then it would require 75% of stakeholders agreeing with the proposal before it can move forward.

Job suggested having a process that deals with objections quickly rather than doing a quick vote which may fail.

Job noted having a new Decision Making process will trigger a Charter change and this needs to be sent to Stewards for Board approval.

**Action on Steve:** Update the Decision making process and pass it along to Board as it reaches consensus.

- Translation process is now documented: <u>link</u> looks good to everyone?
   No comments
- Decision on <u>Quote 21001</u>
   All those that have not voted yet, pls vote and we can move forward.
- Selection of 4 issues to go into August Support Contract (see mail from Filiz)
   Candidate issues are:

```
#161, Old issue, easy to fix, will reduce work of AC volunteers - Minor
```

#289, Old issue, easy to fix, will reduce work of AC volunteers - Minor

#221, Old issue, external comments with agreement - Minor

#496, Translations related, volunteers involved, fix will shows correct data - Minor (Might be Major)

#500, Data accuracy related, fix will shows correct data - Minor (?)

#354, Fix for AC to help mailbox clutter control - Minor (?)

#507, Fix for AC to cut down time spent for approving users - Minor (?)

```
#508, Fix for AC to cut down time spent for approving users (part II) - Minor (?)
#295, Stylistic typo fix, suggested by Arnold for AC - Super Minor
```

For August Support Contract it is decided that we will ask 20C to work on:

#161, Old issue, easy to fix, will reduce work of AC volunteers - Minor

#289, Old issue, easy to fix, will reduce work of AC volunteers - Minor

#221, Old issue, external comments with agreement - Minor

#496, Translations related, volunteers involved, fix will shows correct data - Minor (?) (Might be Major)

Action on Filiz: Send above to 20C.

Regarding the process on how to deal with Support Contract items moving forward, Job suggested to review the Zenhub and replace it with something more practical. Filiz, Eric and Job will have a meeting to come up with a recommendation.

- Backlog progress any movement on people's 5 issues?
  - Can we do a round to report on issues shepherded?
     <a href="https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues?utf8=%E2%9C%93&q=is%3Aopen+is%3Aissue">https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues?utf8=%E2%9C%93&q=is%3Aopen+is%3Aissue</a>
  - There are OPEN issues assigned to vegu (Stefan Pratter) who is not a PC member. So following issues are also technically Shepherdless and can be for grabs?:

https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/368 https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/306 https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/174

 We have an issues file now for tracking at: <a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rLtrLl6DH1ixUullyr559T6klEdSJISU5">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rLtrLl6DH1ixUullyr559T6klEdSJISU5</a>
 <a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rLtrLl6DH1ixUullyr559T6klEdSJISU5">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/10rLtrLl6DH1

Action on all: Go through your 5 issues and then move them to the next stage if there is consensus on them.

- Vendor selection process: <u>link</u>
  - o Don't need to discuss today Feedback needed
- Data ownership:
  - Who "owns" data when >1 party is involved (netix, ixfac, netfac, etc)?
  - Should we make up a policy doc?
  - Is this entirely PC's domain? AC's? Board's?

This seems to be a wider issue that external community and board feedback should be seeked.

PC could take the leadership in creating a discussion for aaround this in trying to crafting out a Peering DB proposal.

Suggestion to set up a Task Force (TF) to work on such a proposal. Reach out to all PeeringDB Committee volunteers and Board and ask for participation to the TF. Then start the work.

Filiz, Job and Arnold showed interest in the TF during the mtg.

AOB?