PeeringDB Issues board [Google Meet] [PC Todo list] [Product Roadmap]

2025-04-03 Start: 16:30 UTC **End:** 17:30 UTC
Participants: Grizz, Jeff, Leo, Jack, Steve, Arnold, Yolandi
Apologies: Paul, Martin,

Main agenda

- Survey: we ran a user survey for three years with similar results and declining participation. But there's been significant change since the last survey:
    - Data normalization
    - .KMZ download
    - v2 search

  Should we run another survey in October or early in 2026? If so, are there specific feature ideas
  we should ask about? e.g. new policy values.
  JC: are there features or changes we've discussed but not yet decided to move forward on we should ask surveyees about?
    - Leo to prepare and share draft
- Website: do we want to let users opt-in to trial web UI designs? If so, we could create a profile switch for interested users.
    - *JC: similar to the darkmode switch, should we have an "early adopter" opt-in switch in user settings? Can also use it to let PDB people opt out if we have autoadded them*
    - Leo to draft an issue
- A user is requesting access to contacts set to "users" without an org or other child objects. Should we create a new kind of user accreditation for AUP compliant service providers and accredited researchers, that gives them access to private contact data?
    - Use case seems like a "no" / prolly AUP violation? / use oauth correctly
    - Leo to reach out and schedule a conversation with the requester

Number	Title	Summary	Consent Finalized?
#1735	Linked or "also known as" facilities functionality	Add support for well known synonyms for facilities with a different formal name. If we support this in principle, how should we implement it?	Defer discussion
#1742	Add additional status values to operational attribute on netixlan	Allow networks to indicate whether they are joining or leaving an exchange. Possibly add expiry dates for values?	Not yet

Number	Title	Summary	Consent Finalized?
#1717	Prevent IXPs from deleting last remaining prefix	As title	
#1697	IPv6 addresses are overlapping with the new IX-Port location information	As title	YES
#1662	Suggest a Carrier/Facility Presence Control	User request for a “Suggest a Carrier” similar to the “Suggest a Facility” feature we already have	Defer discussion
#1750	Geographic maps embedded on PeeringDB website	Embed maps in website where relevant, so users don’t need to download the KMZ and open a separate app	Getting a viability/cost analysis
#1751	Add RFC8950 marker for IX memberships (similar to RS marker)	An indicator that IPv6 addresses on an IX support extended-nexthop/RFC8950 and traffic exchange with IPv4-with-IPv6 next-hop	Get a design developed

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?
#1686	Deleted ix lans causing validation error when ixlan field is not the same	Bug?	YES
#1644	New Facility Object Website Scheme Entry Failure	Bug?	Defer discussion
#1640	Add carrier_count to fac object	We know why. Do we want to change it?	YES
#1639	IX-F Importer: Enhance error message	Help users with more informative error messages	YES

#1749	CP: Highlight when facility is a SUGGESTION	For the AC, provide a visual clue when a facility is a SUGGESTED facility.	YES

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

Number	Title	Bug?	Summary

AOB

- Discussed the communications for the MFA Mandate on 1 July 2025. Noted:
  - The MFA configuration controls have been redesigned to be easier to use
  - We have published blog posts and written to mailing lists
  - We will be writing to OAuth application owners, so they can choose to communicate about it, too
  - We will be putting a message on the website for users who don't have MFA configured ahead of the deadline
  - We will check the number of users with MFA configured in mid-May