MINUTES

MEETING
Dol Executive Team Meeting

MEET No.
Meeting no.6/2012

PRESENT
Peter Nikoletatos (Chair), Roxanne Missingham, Samantha Gilbert, David Richardson, Kus Pandey, Anne Kealley

ATTENDING
Sarah-Jane Macri (Secretariat)

GUESTS
David James Brown, Karen Hill

APOLOGIES
Allan Williams, Susan O'Neil, Dominy Evans

DATE/TIME
Monday 16 July 11am – 12:30pm

VENUE
South Oval Meeting Room

Part 1. Agenda

ITEM 1. IT Disaster Recovery Planning Update (David James Brown)

The presentation provided an update of DR project status including:

- Principles of establishment and acknowledgement that the criticality of DoI’s service delivery needs to be driven directly by the businesses perceived priorities;
- A hierarchical Business Impact Analysis (BIA) has been performed, and DoI’s services and supporting technology components have been prioritised for recovery based on their time sensitivity and importance to the university;
- Recovery strategies (high level) are being devised for the most critical supporting technology components and DoI services;
- Recovery actions (low level) will need to be addressed in the coming period. DoI execs have been asked to coordinate and delegate this work between now and mid August as Jo Bryant is no longer working on the project. The task requires input from team leader and operational level staff working in each technical area to complete; and
- A DR Plan outline has been prepared and will be populated directly from the ‘Actions’ worksheet once this is completed (through the step above).

The presentation then went on to discuss the relationship between DR planning and other IT governance and audit activities, particularly regarding:

- Service Delivery;
- Service Catalogue;
- Use of 3rd parties (strategic sourcing);
- New Media; and
- De-duplication of tasks and articulation of DoI core business.
Specific focus was on opportunities that exist to leverage the work done in the DR project for other current activities.

ITEM 2. Change Management Process for DoI Space Services (Karen Hill)

- Briefing about the role of the change manager, a description of the process and plan, a proposed schedule and communication strategy. The process plan, schedule of meetings and communication strategy were uploaded on the Alliance web site. Karen also briefly discussed the Terms of Reference including the desire to examine best practice, clarify roles and responsibilities and potential strategies for improving service delivery efficiency and effectiveness. It was confirmed that there was a mandate from the Executive Director (Administration and Planning) for the change management process, and that this was consistent with the recent university wide administrative reviews and ANU by 2020. The group briefing discussed these issues, and noted that the management and support of staff throughout this process is essential.

ITEM 3. Apologies – as above

ITEM 4. Accept Previous Minutes/Actions

ITEM 5. Action Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action #</th>
<th>Meeting Ref</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Action Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Expected completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22/06/12</td>
<td>SO circulating data relative to sick leave.</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22/06/12</td>
<td>SO: after hours on call. Paper to be forwarded to CIO for comments.</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/06/12</td>
<td>Inviting Marnie Hughes-Warrington, Margaret Harding, Erik Lithander and service division directors (individually) to attend a DoI Exec Team meeting</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. Standing Items

ITEM 6. Portfolio Reports

7.1 Roxanne Missingham

- Library and SIS work proceeding. Project to provide for better workflows for theses and digitisation of retrospective theses in discussion.
Graduation ceremonies were inspiring. Vice Chancellors award winners for teaching to be invited to talk to senior library/SIS/DoI staff to talk about their experience of teaching in the twenty first century.

7.2 Anne Kealley
- ‘O’ Week presentation on behalf of SIS and IS this Wednesday afternoon (18 July).
- Conducting a planning session with the Client Services team leaders this afternoon – ‘Leap frogging for IT’.
- The 1st meeting of the ANU Service Desk Project Steering Committee will be held Friday 20 July.

7.3 Samantha Gilbert
- SG noted that unless anyone had questions she had nothing further to add to the written status report provided in the agenda pack but would like to flag that the ET would need to spend some time in coming weeks agreeing our portfolio planning and project approval processes.

7.4 David Richardson
- Office365 – This has been hampered by the issues we have had with the HP blade SPF issue. The infrastructure is now back to a functional state. The test group kick off meeting is being held Tue 17 Jul 12. An issue in terms of IIS permissions is the last piece of the jigsaw before we can migrate the first live Exchange user and we hope to have this solved this week with the help of Microsoft.
- SGI Storage/OnStor issues – We have over the last week and half experienced issues with the OnStor part of the SGI Storage solution which servers the NAS component out to clients. This started with a fatal memory issue in the Huxley blade resulting in the blade having to be swapped out, although this was done by an SGI engineer it caused Crisp to reboot due to a remaining config issue from the last firmware upgrade performed by SGI. A second issue arose which was identified through the migration to Crisp in which SGI had configured the data paths from volumes to disk to 16 and LSI have confirmed 8 is the tested and supported config, this issue is the part that caused actual client impact in that the volumes went offline, this happened twice during hr investigations. Work continues to fully restore to BAU, however additional issues are being thrown up as we go. I have requested a meeting with the
SGI Director, Services to discuss the state of this environment and the reasons as support around these incidents.

- Incident Communications – The Exec team were asked if the current emails sent out by DR were useful, and the resounding answer was yes, it was conceded that they were not yet as good as they could be but a step in the right direction, the long term home for this communication and incident management is a conversation that has commenced between Anne, myself and the PM for the Sevice Desk.

7.5 OMG Chair’s Report

- The group requested that a representative from F&S be invited to join the OMG, given their responsibilities regarding the Security Cardax and Parking systems, and since they have now made a formal request that the Security Cardax system be made an Enterprise System. Delia Ritherdon has accepted this invitation on behalf of F&S.
- The group requested that the team reshuffles resulting from the changed portfolio structure be communicated as soon as possible.
- We need a document to outline the process for information transfer between the OMG and the Exec, and vice versa. DR had mentioned doing this, along with guidelines for the OMG report.
- Following on from SG’s presentation to the group about a month ago, the OMG have asked for formal advice from the Exec for the approvals process for minor projects. When Sam addressed the group, James Blanden asked her this question, and she replied that if it’s a small matter and the area involved judges that they have room both in their recurrent budget and their schedule of work, that they were able to make the decision to go ahead with that job themselves. However, it was raised this week (by Dominy) that they would like a way of rating requests, given that it is not uncommon for areas to receive many requests for work which may only need a week’s worth of work, the total of such requests would take far more resources than the area has on offer, and so areas would like stronger guidance from the Exec as to how to determine a prioritisation method for determining whose request should be actioned. Although we have the five step process:
  [http://projects.anu.edu.au/management/5steps.php](http://projects.anu.edu.au/management/5steps.php) and the Small project documentation requirements (attached) as provided by the Project Office, there is a strong disinclination to have to document projects as small as these. It seems to me that the ranking methodology (hyperlink to the spreadsheet is under Step 4 in the 5 step process) might be the most
pragmatic approach if people are too pushed for time to document anything more relating to a request. Further, given we are attempting to provide a more holistic decision making process, is there the chance of setting up a database of this kind of request, to give visibility of trends in the nature of these requests (i.e. as a work request tool within the Service Desk?).

Meeting closed 12:30pm

Next Meeting held:
Peter Nikoletatos (Chair)
Tuesday 31st July 2012
South Oval Meeting Room
3:30 – 5pm