```
PC Todo list
```

2023-03-06 Start: 15:30 UTC End: 16:30 UTC Participants: Steve, Grizz, Martin, Leo

## Main agenda

- Carrier object approval process: take this discussion to e-mail
  - Auto-approval under which circumstances?
  - Notification messages implementation is urgent?
  - Should we approve requests from organizations without a website, or whose website does not list carrier services?
- Search improvements Grizz described the improvement steps
- <u>RIPE NCC Community Projects Fund</u> Leo to prepare a draft
  - hackathon project?
  - make that a proper open source tool
  - Apply before 31 May 2023
- Budget one renewal didn't come through this year, potential for us needing to be more judicious with our spending in 2023
- PeeringDB is seen as slow by some people (see <u>https://github.com/peeringdb/peeringdb/issues/367</u>), especially outside North America. Couple of options we could explore - we should discuss and see which ones are going to have the highest ROI
  - CDN (as called out in that issue) might speed up object delivery but could still be constrained by database loads
  - Responsive design make the base page load and then pull in data fetching calls in the background
  - Optimize the database calls to make them faster

Number	Title	Summary	Consent Finalized?
<u>1099</u>	Expose authentication methods on outbound federation	In the scenario where PeeringDB is the authorization server used by third parties to signin PeeringDB users automatically, it is useful to know the successful authentication processes the user has met upon signin towards establishing a level of assurance of the identity.	Yes - but make sure we add a scope on disclosure
		The OIDC specification defines the acr and amr claims as two complementing elements to expose the identity assurance level and authentication methods that the user has met	

		respectively upon signing in.	
<u>1321</u>	Organization Network Type - Access technology agnostic	Can we agree on a set of terms that are technology agnostic and widely used in a consistent way? Should we retain this field at all?	More discussion in the issue
<u>1328</u>	Create mechanism for updating PeeringDB from a configuration management system	Do we want to make it easier for configuration management tools to identify deltas and propose updates to PeeringDB?	ОК
<u>1331</u>	BFD support field in Global and IX specific views	As title	ОК
<u>1333</u>	Calling /api/carrier with parameters is broken	As title	ОК

## **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?
<u>1322</u>	Give API writes high priority and limits	Prioritize API writes while retaining service resilience	OK
<u>1327</u>	Improve visibility of contact data settings	Add an icon to show admins when contact data is visible when not editing the list of contacts	OK
<u>1334</u>	IX-F Importer: Cosmetic issue with "resolved" emails and double-slashes in URLs after the FQDN	As title	ОК
<u>1336</u>	Clearly show when a facility is part of a campus	As title	OK

## Informational

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

Number	Title	Summary
<u>1332</u>	Available voltages are USA-centric	As title. Consensus reached already

AOB

None