1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

1.1 Attendance

Megan welcomes everyone to the SGM and acknowledges that this meeting is taking place on traditional Whadjuk-Noongar land whom are the spiritual and cultural custodians of this land and continue to practice and their values, beliefs and customs.

Megan opens by saying that Guild Council has passed a motion stating that Ordinary General Meetings and Special General Meetings will be filmed. Megan says that it won't be live streamed, but the footage will be put online within seven days. Megan says that the camera will be directed at the speakers' chair and will not be panning around the room. Megan adds that if people in the room wish to live stream the event to be mindful of other people in the room that may not want to be filmed.

1.2 Purpose of the Special General Meeting: '*The purpose of the Special General Meeting will be to discuss the recent security vulnerability discovered in the UWA Student Guild website which exposed the personal details of over a thousand Guild Members, how the UWA Student Guild responded to this vulnerability and how the UWA Student Guild can improve in the future'*

Megan says that the Guild staff have been working with the submitter of the SGM request on the information provided, and this will be discussed more today.

2.0 DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None.

3.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

3.1 The UWA Student Guild will immediately take down the website hosted at http://www.uwastudentguild.com/ and conduct a security audit on that website and will not repost the website until this audit is complete.
Moved: Ryan Oakley; Seconded: Chris Scherini.

Ryan moves an amendment to his motion. 'The UWA Student Guild will conduct a security audit of the website hosted at http://www.uwastudentguild.com/ and present a report detailing the findings at an Ordinary General Meeting of the UWA Student Guild.'

Ryan says that on the 24th of February it was discovered that the UWA Student Guild website had the information of over a 1000 student name, phone number and emails. The data was embedded in the website which means that the information is downloaded whether you wanted to save it or not. This mistake is an example of gross negligence by the developer. Considering the gross negligence of the developer, Ryan believes it is appropriate to conduct a security audit of the website. Ryan says that it is also important that members of the Guild are alerted of this issue. Ryan says that he has purposefully made it the case that the Guild can decide about how to handle this issue, for example speaking to computer science students that understand the issue or hiring a third party consultancy. Ryan acknowledges that he believes the Guild hasn't acted in a malicious manner and that the purpose of these motions that he has moved today is to improve the Guild and focus on dealing with security vulnerabilities. Ryan doesn't hold any single person in the Guild accountable for these vulnerabilities, but it was a failing of the organisation as a whole. Ryan says this is an opportunity today, to rectify these issues.

Chris says that he has not much more to add. Chris says that it is simply a security audit and then a presentation of the findings at an Ordinary General Meeting so that students can learn about improvements made to the Guild.

Jack Looby asks how much the security audit will cost, as it might not be worth having an audit if an audit is going cost a lot of money?

Ryan says that the costs vary. Ryan says that if the Guild asks computer science students very nicely it could be free, or it could be very expensive if the Guild wanted to get a third party consultancy to be involved. Ryan says that his suggestion would be to talk to computer science students about what can be done.

Tony Goodman (UWA Student Guild Managing Directory) says that just for clarification the Guild would have to go through an external third party organisation if this audit was to occur. Tony says that it wouldn't be appropriate to have other students deal with a security issue of the Guild which is a student organisation. Tony says that he appreciates the sentiment of what Ryan says, but the Guild can't have a security breach and then having other students access the information from the breach. Tony says that the intent of this is good, and that it is important to have students involved in these processes. Tony says that the Guild Council have a section in the budget to improve the website and student input could definitely be part of the process. Tony says that he isn't convinced there has been

a security breach, but if there are concerns about that then an external third party should be brought in. Tony finishes by saying to Jack Looby that the Guild would most likely have to pay some money for this process.

Megan says that Guild is currently conducting a user experience review of the website and that the Guild would love to have as much student input as possible for that, because the students are the ones that use the websites. Megan believes that Guild Council would feel more comfortable with an external body conducting the audit, and that as a professional organisation, the Guild needs professionals to deal with this situation.

Ryan says that he believes it is part of the regulations to ensure that the Guild looks to hire students first for any potential jobs.

Tony says that when it has been alleged that there has been a security breach, the Guild needs to bring in the best people possible to deal with the potential breach. Tony says that there isn't anything wrong with bringing students into the process but if a third party is brought in like the developer this is the best option. If an audit is held then this means the auditor's credibility is put behind the action. The responsibility of the audit isn't on a few students but has been transferred to an external organisation.

Ryan says that first of all he shouldn't be interrupted because that isn't really appropriate. Ryan says that there are many students on campus that run successful businesses and know how to be professional.

Student asks when the 'leak' was first discovered?

Ryan says that this is a complicated answer, Ryan first discovered on the 24th of February 2018 that there were phone numbers on the website.

Student asks because on the 27th of February, when Ryan made a post to Facebook, this post was shared a fair bit and when the student saw this post, he immediately went to check to see if his phone number was on the website. Student says that he couldn't find his own phone number and that only students from late 2013 to 2014 were affected.

Ryan says that he is quite glad that this was brought up, as he was notified twice by the Guild on that day. Ryan says that the first time it was clear that no change had occurred, but the second time the Guild had deleted almost all the data but not all of it. Ryan says that when he had posted, most of the data had been removed and that he had sufficient evidence of the information that was at one point available.

Vinuri asks that in the process of this audit, how long will the website be out of operation and what impact will this have on clubs and students that want to use the website.

Ryan says that the reason the motion was amended so that the website didn't have to be taken down during the audit. Ryan explains that the coding of the website can be copied and pasted to another location and could potentially be examined there.

A student asks if the Guild should be confident that none of the leaked information is still on the website and if there is any other potential information on the site?

Ryan says that none of the personal information is still on the website, but there still might be some meta-information.

Michael Barblett explains that the personal details such as names, phone numbers and emails are not any different from data that is sold by companies on a regular basis. Michael says that he doesn't believe these are private details.

Ryan says that the issue is that the data that was on the website was public. Ryan adds that the Guild has a privacy policy about not selling personal data. Ryan says that it is still possible that the data is being sold by another body that isn't the Guild.

Michael says that the selling of data isn't the right analogy and adds that your personal email is something that is very public. Michael says that anyone can use your first and last name with the @student.uwa.edu.au for an email and that your mobile phone number is similar to your home number.

Ryan says that there is other contextual information that needs to be considered. Ryan discusses how if someone searches for a 'gay' event, they could be offended by this and send the organiser of the

event an angry email. Ryan talks about how some people also use their personal or work email for the EMPs. Ryan explains that it isn't about the information itself but the content of the information.

Student asks about the White Pages system and how you an opt-out of being part of the White Pages.Whereas for the Guild website there was no way of opting out or preventing the information being up.

Megan Lee says that this is a good point about EMPs, and that Guild staff are working hard to make sure the system is being fixed. However an EMP is a public document, and anyone is able to see an EMP upon the request from the Guild. When someone is hosting a public event, they are making themselves a public contact person and leader for that event. This information for the event leader is used before the event, during the event and after the event. If something goes wrong the Guild is able to ask the event leader what had gone wrong so that in the future mistakes and risks can be avoided. This information can then be accessed after the event. Megan adds that an EMP is a different kind of thing to a special consideration form, where you sign a declaration that the University cannot contact anyone that you are providing documented information about. Megan asks if there are any more questions.

Student asks how long a security audit would take?
Ryan says that this depends on the implementation, and that is why it isn't mentioned in the motion.

Taylor Home asks that when an EMP is submitted, why the fact that the event leaders information will be made public isn't made clear to those submitting an EMP. Taylor says that she wasn't concerned about her own information as it is already on club websites that she is involved in, but she went back to check through the EMP process and there is no point where it is stated that this information can be made public.

Tony Goodman says that this situation has arisen because when someone signs up to run an event, they become the public face of the event. Tony says that the Guild wouldn't put this information out there, but it is if for example a local community member has an issue with a big event which has resulted in a noise complaint there needs to be access to the EMP and the organisation. Tony says that most clubs are affiliated to the Guild, but they are still a separate body. Tony adds that when someone becomes an Office Bearer, they are taking on a legal position within the organisation which then gives you legal responsibility. Tony explains that the Guild doesn't take responsibility for the

event, but instead acts as overseer. Tony adds that this is what makes UWA so good, because we have multiple clubs and societies that have their own events. The responsibility of these events belongs to the clubs and societies and not the Guild. The Guild plays a role in training for events.

Taylor Home says that to clarify, not everyone who submits an EMP is an office bearer for a club and haven't signed an Executive Registration Form.

Megan Lee says that the discussion is moving into substantive debate, but that if someone is running a public event and therefore becomes the public contact for the event, it doesn't matter if they are an office bearer or if they are part of the executive. Megan says that if people are uncomfortable with this, they need to look at the internal system within their club for EMPs. Megan asks if there are any more questions?

Student asks what is the likelihood that there was a data breach?

Ryan Oakley says that this is almost certain and explains that the data is automatically downloaded to your computer. Ryan says that when there are vulnerabilities like this, any person that goes onto the website is a potential attacker, while other exploits require more sophisticated attacks.

Megan Lee moves the discussion into substantive debate.

Ryan Oakley says that when an event is ran it is true that you take responsibility for the event. However, there is a difference between your information becoming available for the public and there being a procedure which makes your information public. Ryan says that it is true that anyone can request information, but that the is different to there being a website data issue. Ryan says that it is all to do with the reasonableness of accessibility.

Megan moves to a vote on this motion.

MOTION PASSES.

Jacob Fowler says that in the interest of time and there only being 19 minutes left, he would like to move a procedural motion to vote on the final three motions on block.

MOTION CARRIES.

3.2 The UWA Student Guild will establish a process to promptly deal with security vulnerabilities. Moved: Ryan Oakley; Seconded: Chris Scherini.

Ryan Oakley says that he wants to keep this short but the way that the security vulnerability was handled and that there was misinformation provided. The Guild didn't take the website down and that it should be part of the ordinary operation of the Guild to check the website is secure. There are other vulnerabilities such as the apache web server used by the Guild is out of date. Ryan adds that it is also important to contact students to let them know that their data was breached and that this is something that everyone major company does. This is because when you breach your privacy policy, you must inform the people about the Breach.

Chris Scherini says that he agrees with everything Ryan says.

Student asks who will be writing the security policy of the Guild.

Megan Lee says that the policy will be written by professional staff in consultation with students and then to be passed by Guild Council. Megan says that none of the Guild student representatives are professionals. Megan adds that there is $50000 in the budget to improve the website, but in summary it has to be approved by Guild Council at some point.

Tony Goodman says that the as Megan has stated there is money in the budget to improve the website and that there is already a plan in place. Tony says that the website was created about 4 or 5 years ago. Tony says that the Guild was aware of the beach on the 24th of February being a Saturday and that the legislation relating to this topic was changed on Thursday the 22nd of February. Tony says that the Guild began to take action on Monday in consultation with Ryan Oakley and by the 28th the Guild brought the developer in to fix the problem. Tony believes that a lot of these motions need to be debated within an operational context and that he is unsure why having a Special General Meeting is necessary. Tony says that the Guild has had an open door and that we have gone through the process of fixing some of these issues. Tony adds that there are always going to be problems with websites in relation to data. The Privacy Act was changed on the 22nd, which was something the Guild wasn't aware of and now the idea of a breach falls into three different categories for what is considered a serious harm such as financial information or health records. Tony says that other

potential breaches comes under a judgement, and that you should go through this legal process to determine if there has been a serious breach. This is in conjunction with the context of the internal organisation to see if there has been a 'serious harm' before an apology or statement is made. Tony reiterates that the Guild has an open door policy for generally all staff but in particular himself. Tony says that anyone can come and talk to the Guild about issues which can then be fixed and that the Guild has taken good straight strides to fix this issue. Tony is uncertain if there has been a full breach of information. Tony believes the Guild has done the right thing and has now taken the information down and that this issue should be dealt with by Guild Council and the operations. For an apology to happen, the Guild will need to go through the commission to determine if there has been a breach or not.

Michael Barblett asks if we have to vote on these motions on block?

Megan Lee says yes.

Michael Bartlett moves a procedural motion to split 3.2 and 3.3 from 3.4 because the final motion is different to the other two.

MOTION CARRIES

Jack Looby says that although he disagrees with how this situation has been handled, he might disagree with how the student handled the situation. Jack says that creating a policy on cybersecurity is a sensible thing.

Megan asks for anymore speakers for or against the motions 3.2 and 3.3.

MOTION PASSED ON BLOCK WITH 3.3

3.3 The UWA Student Guild will establish a cyber security policy such that:
   a) The security of all Internet Services hosted by the UWA Student Guild is reviewed on a regular basis and,
   b) The UWA Student Guild ensures it is in compliance with the Privacy Act of 1988 and other relevant regulations and laws.
   Moved: Ryan Oakley; Seconded: Chris Scherini.

MOTION PASSED ON BLOCK WITH 3.2

3.4 The UWA Student Guild will where possible contact affected members to inform them that their personal information may be compromised when a data breach or security vulnerability is discovered.
Moved: Ryan Oakley; Seconded: Chris Scherini

Ryan Oakley says that the Guild needs to fulfil it's legal and ethical requirements. Ryan says that this isn't about providing an apology but it is about letting students know if they have had their phone numbers leaked. A student might have an abusive ex on campus that is now able to find their phone number or if they are a female that feels unsafe they will now be able to change their number.

Chris Scherini says that he doesn't have much more to add.

Fraser asks if this is something that would normally be part of cyber security policy or if this is a 'computer science policy'?

Megan asks Ryan Oakley if this would apply to this situation or future situations?

Ryan Oakley says that this would apply to future situations and this situation.

Taylor Home says that she doesn't think it is very clear by the Guild website that this information will become public. Taylor Home says that it is entirely fair that this information is something that can be requested and then accessed but until then all necessary precautions should be taken to make it private.

Jacob Colangelo says that he doesn't think there is an issue here. Jacob C says that it is like a professional sports player being mad about being filmed. Jacob C says that this information being publicly available, is something that you sign up for and that you should know that when you sign up that your phone number and email become public.

Student says that regardless of this information being on the website, it is still an issue that this information is visible to anyone with no requirements. Student says that people have the right to know.

Tony Goodman says that there isa lot of danger around this information being free and that we are not debating this right now. Tony says that it is dangerous for any organisation to make a blanket decision. Tony says that he does agree with Ryan Oakley in that the Guild needs to go above expectations but at the same time it still has legal responsibilities. Tony says that the Guild shouldn't be having an SGM for this and that there is still a lot more technicality around just saying 'there was a breach' or 'we should contact everyone and let them know'.

Megan Lee says that she is going to close debate and that the Guild is welcoming student feedback. Megan says that there have been some very good points made today about the EMP system in regards to event managers' information becoming public. Megan says that it is good to see all the students who want to be engaged with the Guild. Megan thanks everyone for coming down today.

MOTION PASSES WITH MEGAN LEE USING HER CASTING VOTE AS CHAIR

6.0 CLOSE OF MEETING