2020/05/07 Start: 15:33 UTC **End:** 16:05 UTC
Participants: Steve McManus, Matt Griswold, Arnold Nipper, Yan Berthier, Filiz Yilmaz, Shane Kerr

Agenda:

- Discussion on Issues
    - Where should it happen? GH only, GH, slack and email? Other?
    - Issuing a BCP

  SM: It is OK for conversations to happen elsewhere but we need to summarize these conversations on GH publicly so that our audience can then be informed about them.

  Yann: Some conversations can be taken to ml.

  Arnold: Issues that are being discussed on GH should be kept on GH maybe just with a summary at the least.

  BCP: for non-contentious issues use GH already.
  If there are lengthy discussions or we do not want to expose some parts of the discussion, have it on ml but eventually, it should be summarised on GH. But be conservative in ml discussion for the sake of transparency when we can.

- Product Committee 101 doc now in a good state (big thanks Arnold!)
    - Can everyone please give it a read through and make sure they think it's accurate?
    - Can always add to it later on, doesn't have to be static.

  Yann: Maybe we are missing the actual workflow:
  When a consensus is reached when we move an issue from one Milestone to another…

  Arnold: There is a workflow document, there is supporting documentation to that and then there is 101 document.

  Yann: To me, the workflow document is not clear.

  SM: I will look into the workflow document and try to clean it up/align with reality.

  Arnold: Happy to set up a conf call to go through the document and the workflow if needed.

- Data Ownership TF
    - Are all issues at consensus? Anything needed from PC for now?

Matt: I have not finished creating the issues. Still in progress.

- Next release status

    - Was going to cherry-pick a ~month worth of effort from these issues: https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues?q=is%3Aopen+is%3Aissue+milestone%3A%224+Ready+for+Implementation%22
    - Worth waiting on all Data Ownership TF stuff to finalize first or just go for what we have now?

Matt: Majority of DTF issues are going to be IXF importer so we could cherry-pick some others and do them.

Arnold: We could do the locking of deletion. That should happen soon.

Matt is working on a specs document. Once this is out we can start making announcements to the Community accordingly. A release to address these may be in June or July.

Yann: Could we have a pop-up on the UI to inform people about the upcoming changes?

Steve: I like the idea but we need to balance it out. Let's talk about it.
Action on Yann: To create an issue about it.

- Need someone to post notes. Any volunteers?
  Arnold will do it.

- Board meeting Friday - any feedback for the board?

All good. Releases are a bit bigger but it is OK.
Bug fixes are done quicker.
We could do a grab all “minors” and do all of them in one single release.
Now the bottleneck is the releases not the decision making process.

AOB:
Matt:
Reopening of CLOSED issues. If the original requester has not responded for more than a certain amount of time, shall we CLOSE them?

Steve: If we have asked for clarification and received nothing we can CLOSE the issues.

Yan: Location thing. How do we go about this one? There is the city, old address… They are documented in PeeringDB folder. I would like to see some movement here.
Steve: Pls send the link to the doc to the ml and we can add this to the next meeting agenda to have a dedicated discussion on it.

Action on Yan: Send the link to the doc