



## CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2019

### 1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Acknowledged that the committee was meeting on Noongar land and respects were paid for Elders past, present and emerging.

**1.1 Attendance:** Mutya Maragiot Joseph (MMJ), Jack Spagnuolo (JS), Kelvin Lee (KL), Clarice Antero (CA), Chan (JC), Raaghav Raj (RR), Nitin Narula (NNA), Conrad Hogg (CH),

**1.2 Apologies:** Nicola Norris (NN)

**1.3 Absent:** Melissa Hetherington (MH)

**1.4 Proxies:** N/A

**1.5 Invitee:** N/A

### 2.0 Committee Business

#### 2.1 Business Case for Task Backup

KL outlined the business case for adding backup for TASK. This would involve working with TASK and adding another server on site. This change will ensure our TASK data is protected on both financial and compliance terms.

All agree and the Business case is passed.

#### 2.2 Business Case for DR – Offsite Replication

KL outlined the business case. Currently we have backup here on site. But we need to push data to an outside location to ensure we have reliable backup.

KL has reviewed several options. Our options are restricted by the UWA requirements hence we cannot use platforms that store data overseas such as Amazon.

Probox is an option that is possible with their storage facility located in Malaga WA.

Monthly costs depend on the data volume. The business case is based on current use broken down into (1) Quick Access (2) Archiving – stored on cheaper discs 1 tenth of cost. All costs per terabyte are based on current monthly and Quarterly archive calculations for data in the last 7 years.

RR asked if there is a system currently in place. KL indicated there is no backup in place offsite and we are exposed if something was to occur at our current on-site location.

CH asks if there are any essential systems which are currently backed up. MMJ indicated that TASK and Netsuite are currently backed up.

RR asks if this expenditure is really required. MMJ indicates that it is essential because of the potential risk to our organisation if we do not have data backed up off-site.

CH asked What is the most significant area of data loss between monthly and quarterly backups. MMJ short term backup no difference but our Archiving backups would be at highest risk.

CH asks if we are backing up monthly what is the advantage of archiving. KL indicates we would lose archiving data between backups.

CH What is your recommendation due to costs? Potentially not monthly updates. Full backups then deltas for the month to ensure data is protected.



## CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2019

JS asks if we are keeping data we don't require? KL will review the data currently in use.

RR asks what the most likely cause of damage to our onsite data storage is. KL indicates that physical damage ie fire, water damage, etc would be the most obvious.

NNA suggests that it needs to be done and all agree to proceed in endorsing this.

CH will ask the university about their data centre and what their future are. Including their management and/or third-party arrangements.

Costs will be borne by IT expense – unbudgeted.

CH suggested this to endorsed and passed on to SRC for final approval. All agree

### **2.3 Photocopier Contract renewal**

KL provided a background on the photocopier situation. Current photocopier contract set to expire in July 2019. There are 4 options (1) Replace current machine with new machine, new 5 year contract (2) Upgrade existing machine with a colour machine, new 5 year contract (3) No upgrade but pay as you go on a cost per page printed basis, under contract. (4) Do not upgrade machine do not extend contract. Pay for running costs and repairs per callout.

From the options KL proposes we go with option 4 because it will give us flexibility and least costly.

JC asked how much we are spending at Uniprint. KL pointed out that we use the other colour printer and will still to use uniprint service.

CH asked if the costs will still be split up between department. MMJ suggests this is still possible on a user basis but the cost will be significantly less to each user. JS indicated that we should still monitor heavy users to ensure that there is no abuse of the service.

Option 4 agreed and passed by the committee.

### **2.4 Guild Website update**

JC indicated that the website skeleton will be completed by July with the content to be determined by the 1<sup>st</sup> September

KL Data as been sent to begin setting up database. Pub crawls and camps included at this stage.

Going forward we will be able to vary the EMP size and scope which was not previously possible.

### **2.5 Update on Refectory 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**

JS requested this be removed from the agenda. The project is completed, and the rooms are in operation and available.

All agree to remove from the agenda.

### **2.6 Oak Lawn seating**

CH indicated that the Student council has tasked him to explore the viability of improving the seating options on Oak Lawn. Suggestions such as Hammocks which provide us a challenge in regard to OHS and storage issues, to bean bags which will need to be managed and have their own storage solution.

JS pointed out that we need to engage CM to find out their overall plan for seating on campus. With this we could decide on placing additional seating.

CH will pursue the university through his channels. JS will make contact through the CM directors to get a clearer idea on their timelines and plans for the space.

Report back to this committee with additional information and options.



## CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2019

### **2.7 Finances**

MMJ suggested things are going well. But currently short ne staff member which is making things a little tight. Auditing completed so this has taken pressure off he team overall.

MMJ pointed out that a student could be engaged in a quasi-internship to help in accounting finance area. CH indicated that there was a lot of interest for this with students.

RR said he would be interested in providing assistance to finance in relation to the role for the experience. MMJ to follow up.

### **2.8 Other - Wi-Fi**

MMJ indicated that we will be getting a site survey from a Telstra subcontractor to look at potential solution to our poor mobile phone reception within the Guild precinct. This is mainly due to the poor reception and the need for our students, tenants, and staff to have better reception in this part of the campus.

JS pointed out that it is commercially important to make the guild location the best area for mobile reception on campus. It will ensure that it gets increased visitation and engagement.

KL will provide further details in the next committee meeting.

## **3.0 CLOSE**

**3.1** Meeting closed at 1.56pm.