2019/11/14 Start: 16:33 UTC **End:** 17:35 UTC
Participants: Steve McManus, Matt Griswold, Filiz Yilmaz, Arnold Nipper, Shane Kerr

Agenda:

1. Staffing updates
2. Quick recap of our Processes (Steve):
   a. What is Hot Seat duty and what is expected of it? How does it link to Decision Making Process as Hot Seaters mark issues as bug or feature requests?
      It is only about initial tagging. Bug, feature, hotfix kind of tagging….
   b. Are we **all** still performing **Hot Seat duty** in accordance to the [roster]?
      Steve will update the roster with Shane added and Florian and Eric out.
   c. How is shepherding going for the following issues?
      People love it. Shepherding is good.
   d. Do the Shepherds need help in generating interest and feedback for the issues they are looking after?
      Arnold: Still the hardest part, getting people engaged or having them make their minds up.
      Steve: Summarizing is hard but it is good for voters to be actively doing their bit.
      Matt: It may help getting quality people on PC too in the long run.

3. How to use Github in accordance to the new Decision Making Process? (Filiz)
   a. Zenhub is an overkill - Default Github seems to do the job.
   b. The new Milestones Decide and Consensus

   New Issue => Decide => Consensus Reached => Consensus Finalized => Ready for Implementation => Next Release => [$release_number will be added as the issue gets closed after release]

   Also Steve to send a mail to PC ML about this

   c. How one can mark issues, search the queue of Open issues during Hot Seat or Shepherding?
      Matt: One good side of Zenhub is that it can pull multiple repositories. We can solve the issues with Github projects but that will also bring overhead.

   d. Efficient Commenting on Github to lay out decisions: Who does this? Chair or the Shepherd?
      Steve: I believe Shepherd should do this.
      Matt: Works for me.
      Arnold: Yes

4. Status of new Quote requested for:

    a. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/168

    b. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/21

    c. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/193

    d. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/50

    e. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/492

    f. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/411

    g. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/228

    h. https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/394

5. Do we need a seperate VOTE to be run to have the Quote accepted for the issues
    above in agenda point 3.
    a. If yes, what are the mechanics of it?

        Historically PC was also voting on the money spent on the issues. Do we still
        need this? If so, should we keep it at the same percentage for the previous
        threshold (85%).

        Set a threshold per month?
        Set a cap per issue?
        Is this a Board thing?

        Steve will talk to Board

6. Next meeting topic will be looking forward into 2020

7. AOB:
    a. Next Release:
        Steve: lets have a freeze
        Matt: We may need a new one before the end of the year

        TBD on the ml.