

CONTENTS

Exchange Network Leadership Council	1
Network Operations Board/Virtual Node IPT	3
Network Technology Group	4
Network Partnership and Resources Group	6
Drinking Water Integrated Project Team	7
Phase 2 Task Force	8

This summary details the month's activities of the Exchange Network Governance: Exchange Network Leadership Council (ENLC), Network Operations Board (NOB), Network Technology Group (NTG), and the Network Partnership and Resources Group (NPRG). It also contains information related to other Governance-sponsored activities this month (i.e., Integrated Project Team Meetings, Task Force Meetings, Open Calls, Regional and National Meetings, etc.). For more information on the Exchange Network Governance, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/about/network-management/>.

Exchange Network Leadership Council

The ENLC convenes a call every sixth Thursday from 3:00-4:30pm ET.

August 9, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Karen Bassett (Co-Chair), Robin Stephens, Kurt Rakouskas, Lee Garrigan, Roy Walker, Andy Putnam, Greg Fabian, Connie Dwyer, Deb Quinn, John Dombrowski, Mike Kenyon, Carol O'Tormey, Virginia Thompson, David Meredith, Ron Evans, Steve Schmitt, Lisa Gover, Greg McNelly, Rob Willis, Megan Parker

ACTION ITEMS:

- ENLC members can contact Greg Fabian or Andrew Sawyers if they have questions about SDWIS NextGen.
- John Dombrowski will keep the ENLC and NOB up to date with the AFS modernization process.
- Roy Walker will contact Pam Osnaya regarding the Shared CROMERR Services and Components IPT.
- ENLC members are encouraged to make their hotel and flight reservations for the November 15-16, 2012, ENLC Meeting in Alexandria, VA.

SUMMARY:

Briefing on SDWIS NextGen Project

- This briefing was requested on the last call to inform ENLC members about the modernization efforts for SDWIS.
- Issues with the current version of SDWIS include:
 - The user interface for SDWIS State is not designed in the way that agencies do their work creating inefficiencies. States have built on many add-on systems to help them with the data entry burden.

- Installing and maintaining SDWIS State requires resources. The system does provide a benefit of saving one to three FTE in the drinking water program because of the volume of data that it helps to manage.
- It is expensive for EPA to maintain SDWIS State and changes require specialists for the huge system. In addition, the tool supports two different database management systems.
- Changes to SDWIS with SDWIS NextGen include:
 - It will be hosted in the cloud. The tool will be one application with one database with secure areas within it for each agency. The tool will feature an improved user interface that simplifies data entry and adds data quality checks to the point of entry. It will be more flexible for EPA to implement the new drinking water rules into the tool. There is also plugin rule compliance in the system to allow Partners to be able to use it for their own drinking water rules as well.
 - A system administrator is still required to manage users and allowable values, but this system will be accessible through a standard web browser (including on mobile devices) instead of a particular workstation.
 - SDWIS NextGen will use secure web services to allow data to be entered and retrieved from the system.
- The data in SDWIS NextGen will only be reported to EPA when the States allow it to be and States choose what data to report (not all SDWIS data are sent to EPA).
- EPA is planning to have full delivery of the SDWIS NextGen system in September 2013 with a one-year transition to move to it.

Briefing on AFS Modernization

- This briefing was requested on the last call to inform ENLC members about the modernization efforts for AFS.
- AFS is being modernized to get key information from facilities directly into AFS. This will help to reduce the burden for agencies to report on Clean Air Act stack tests. The modernization will also allow EPA to receive excess emission reports and continuous emissions reports from facilities.
- New features of the modernized AFS will include a newly designed database that will allow for more automated process.
- The requirements analysis will be complete by the end of September 2012. The design will be complete in 2013, assuming the funding is provided and development is projected to be completed in 2014. Based on this timeline, EPA would retire legacy AFS in FY2015.
- There is a governance process in place with Regions and States to help with the design and development stages.

Check-in on Virtual Node and Virtual CROMERR

- There are two IPTs that have recently formed under the NOB to work through the Virtual Node and Shared CROMERR Services solutions. The IPTs will determine the feasibility, technical and functional requirements, and considerations for how the tools (if they are to be built) would be governed and managed. Kurt Rakouskas has been working with the ENLC and NOB Co-Chairs to draft charters, recruit volunteers, and secure contractor support.
- The NOB reviewed the charter for the Virtual Node IPT and has sent it to the IPT for review on its first call. Roy Walker and Connie Dwyer will Co-Chair the IPT. The kickoff call will be held August 28, 2012. Calls are scheduled every two weeks after. Given that the funding opportunity for implementing virtual node solutions is advertised in the FY2013 Grant Solicitation, the IPT is working to answer key questions and make information available to potential grant applicants as soon as possible. The final Guidance and Recommendations Document will be produced in January 2013.
- There is a similar plan for the Shared CROMERR Services and Components IPT. A charter is being drafted. Chuck Freeman will be the IPT EPA Co-Chair. A State Co-Chair has not yet been identified. No calls have been scheduled.

Phase 2 Task Force Update

- The Phase 2 Task Force is holding bi-weekly conference calls. Thus far, the Task Force has reviewed two of the four goals in the Phase 2 Implementation Plan. The Task Force is on track to provide a revised draft

Implementation Plan to the ENLC and NOB Co-Chairs in late September. The Phase 2 Task Force will also discuss suggestions for potential governance structures and responsibilities to support Phase 2 goals and activities.

ENLC Meeting Logistics

- Lee Garrigan emailed logistics for the November 15-16, 2012, ENLC Meeting in Alexandria, Virginia.

Next Call: September 20, 2012

For more information on the ENLC, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/about/network-management/exchange-network-leadership-council>.

Network Operations Board/Virtual Node IPT

Starting September 18, 2012, and continuing through the end of the year, the Virtual Node IPT convenes calls every other Tuesday from 12:00-1:30pm ET. NOB calls will resume in 2013.

August 28th, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Connie Dwyer (Co-Chair), Roy Walker (Co-Chair), Mike Beaulac, Harry Boswell, Chris Clark, Eric Cleckler, Kristen Durance, Phani Eturu, Charles Freeman, Brian Gregory, Frank Harjo, Bruce Jones, William LaBar, Greg McNelly, Amy Miguel, Ted Morris, Dennis Murphy, Eileen O'Grady, Guy Outred, Mary Beth Parisi, Jason Payne, Kurt Rakouskas, Lucy Reed, Rene Roy, Chris Simmers, Louis Sweeny, Mike VanMatre, Bryanna Vaughan, Angela Westin, Dave Wilcox, Yunhao Zhang

ACTION ITEMS:

- Virtual Node IPT members will complete a questionnaire and submit it to kdurance [at] rosstrategic.com by September 11, 2012.

SUMMARY:

Virtual Node Demonstration

CGI's Jason Payne provided an overview of the virtual node prototype as a starting point for discussions on how to develop a virtual node. The prototype was a proof on concept. The IPT is charged with starting from scratch to ensure that the virtual node will meet the needs of Partners and will have users once completed. The cost to develop the virtual node will be covered by EPA and grant dollars. Partners will be able to apply for funding via the FY2013 grant solicitation to transition to a virtual node. The centralized infrastructure will be funded by EPA.

The IPT discussed the prototype and highlighted the following questions that will require in depth discussions during future calls:

- What are the connection requirements to access a virtual node, VPN connection, TCP/IP request, etc.?
- What are security options? Point-to-point firewall rules, VPN tunnels, leveraging SSH forwarding, potentially different ways to consume the data (i.e., not always a database that is accessed).
- Will the hosting be in the United States? This is required by some States.
- What about the requirements for source data? For Node 2 there are staging tables that require a lot of formatting. Where would those staging tables be located?
- Can the virtual node exist in a mixed environment where some Partners use the virtual node and others maintain local nodes?

- If a Partner wants to publish a REST service that is non-standard, is that possible? If there is a standard set of REST services, can Partners publish a Partner-specific service as well?

The Co-chairs noted that the goal of the IPT is to come up with a list of requirements that would allow a virtual node to work for all Partners, not to develop the finished product. The questions collected during the call will be added to the information collected from participants via the Feedback Questionnaire to help define what discussions are held on future calls.

Charter and Virtual Node Feedback Questionnaire

Kurt Rakouskas reviewed the Charter. The IPT made no changes and adopted the Charter. The Charter is available at <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/virtual-node-ipt/>

William LaBar, CGI, reviewed the draft Virtual Node Feedback Questionnaire and the process for submitting responses. IPT members should submit their responses by September 11, 2012 to allow time for the technical staff to summarize prior to the September 18 call. All responses should be sent to [kdurance \[at\] rossstrategic.com](mailto:kdurance@rossstrategic.com). Thorough responses from as many different Partners as possible will ensure that the IPT has enough data to make informed decisions about technical requirements.

Next Call: September 18, 2012

For more information on the NOB, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/about/network-management/network-operations-board>.

For more information on the Virtual Node IPT, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/virtual-node-ipt>.

Network Technology Group

The NTG convenes a call on the second Thursday of each month from 12:00-1:00pm ET.

August 9, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Glen Carr (Co-Chair), Chuck Freeman (Co-Chair), Mike Beaulac, Eric Cleckler, Dennis Murphy, Jason Payne, Kurt Rakouskas, Greg McNelly, Phani Eturu, Bob Simpson, Bill Rensmith, Chris Clark, Tony Hartrich, Tony Jeng, Rob Willis, Megan Parker

ACTION ITEMS:

- Greg McNelly will send the ER3 schema package review to enfoTech and Mike Beaulac for review and consideration of what changes to address.
- enfoTech will make additional clarifications and incorporate information as recommended by the NTG to the ER3 schema.
- enfoTech will review the full batch v3.2 ICIS-NPDES schema.
- Megan Parker will send the ICIS-NPDES schema package to the NTG and request additional volunteers to review.
- If any NTG members have certain topics that they would like the Virtual Node IPT to discuss, please send those to Kurt Rakouskas and Rob Willis.
- Megan Parker will send the Virtual Node IPT Charter to the NTG.

SUMMARY:

Schema Reviews

The NTG reviewed three schema packages prior to the call and discussed findings and recommendations on the call. ER3:

- The reviewers noted no critical issues with the schema, but did note some deviations from the rules.
- The reviewers noted some missing information in the FCD and places where clarifications could be made.

GLENDIA:

- The reviewers noted some issues in the schema package. The NTG decided to request the flow developer to make changes and resubmit the package prior to publishing it.
- Multiple reviewers noted that the flow uses a majority of the data elements from WQX, so it would be useful for the flow developers to describe the business reasons for creating the different flow so future implementers can understand which one to utilize.

SWQA:

- This FCD submitted by Iowa Department of Natural Resources defined an additional query service to embellish the existing ATTAINS data flow, which only contains Submit. It is a good addition to an existing flow.
- The NTG recommended to publish the service as an addendum to the ATTAINS flow.

REST

- The REST Subgroup has been meeting to discuss ways to incorporate RESTful web services into the Network. The NTG and NOB have seen a copy of a draft document that provides background on REST and recommendations for how to do so. The Subgroup is currently using that previous material to create two final updated deliverables: 1) a short and direct technical document that outlines recommendations on how to build RESTful interface that includes a simple set of guidelines with a standard URL structure and guidelines on minimum documentation for RESTful web services to encourage consistent and adequate instructions; and 2) a narrative document that draws on much of the information in the previous document with the background information explaining what REST is, the differences between REST and SOAP, best practices for when to consider using REST versus EN SOAP services, and available tools (i.e., CDX REST proxy). The NTG will then review these documents.
- After the REST Subgroup completes this work, the next topic of discussion will be a broader look at discovery. There are many services in existence (i.e., STORET, RCRA, EnviroFacts, AQS) that are not documented in a coordinated way to allow data consumers to find them and utilize them. There is an opportunity for the Network to provide value here. The first part of this discussion relating to what types of functionality would be desired and what is important for discovery is less technical and could be handled by the full NTG. The second part of the discussion would focus on existing resources and how these match up with the identified needs. The discovery discussion will happen at the NTG level and then can be moved to a smaller technical subgroup to work out details, if needed.

Virtual Node IPT and Shared CROMERR Services IPT

- Governance formed a Virtual Node IPT under the NOB to determine what types of functionality a virtual node would need to provide in order to be a viable and attractive solution for Partners. Several NTG members are participants in the IPT. The IPT's Charter outlines the objectives of the group including expected deliverables, including final recommendations to the NOB by January 2013.
- The Shared CROMERR Services and Components IPT will be co-chaired by EPA's Chuck Freeman and a yet-to-be determined State representative. CGI, EPA, and the ENLC and NOB Co-Chairs are currently drafting the IPT's Charter. This IPT will follow a similar path to the Virtual Node IPT.

Next Call: September 13, 2012

For more information on the NTG, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/about/network-management/network-technology-group>.

Network Partnership and Resources Group

The NPRG convenes a call on the first Thursday of each month from 2:30-4:00pm ET.

August 2, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Jonathan Jacobson (Co-Chair), Chris Simmers (Co-Chair), Lauren Banks, Tom Beierle, April Hathcoat, Michael Kaufman, Jurgen Koch, Greg McNelly, Jackie Moore, Darcy Peth, Kurt Rakouskas, Salena Reynolds, Virginia Thompson

ACTION ITEMS:

- Creative Marketing Resources will distribute a final version of the communications audit to the NPRG.
- NPRG members who have not yet communicated with their assigned performance measures survey respondents will do so before the September 6 call.

SUMMARY:

Communications Audit Path Forward

- Creative Marketing Resources (CMR) provided a brief presentation on their Communications Audit of the Exchange Network, including recommendations for the path forward for the Network.
- The communications plan is in the process of nearing completion.
- The CMR team gathered data on how communication is accomplished with target audiences. A future document will present a visual audit of the Exchange Network.
- The team presented a strategic communications matrix, which showed that the Network is currently doing well in setting goals and outcomes, defining target audiences, and making communications materials available on the website. Materials, such as success stories, carry the same theme and style.
- Areas for communications to improve include:
 - Lack of a clear brand message
 - Lack of an elevator pitch
 - No recognizable tagline
 - No engaging use of social media
 - No analysis of competition versus industry peers
 - Communication materials are very technical in nature and not accessible by a lay-audience
 - User feedback surveys are not performed often enough (should be once per quarter)
 - Integration of communications and branding across the organization
 - No ongoing communications with target audiences; EN Alerts do not keep users up to date with what's going on, and Governance summaries are not easily accessible on the website
 - Success stories are too lengthy
- The CMR team presented the following recommendations:
 - Create a brand (one centralized message about the Exchange Network, from a potentially new logo and tagline to a new elevator pitch)
 - Simplify communications materials for a non-technical audience
 - Target testing among users
 - Establish consistent communications (e.g., distribute a monthly newsletter)
 - Build communications between Governance and stakeholders (e.g., make Governance summaries prominent on the website)
 - Leverage social media
 - Create excitement around success stories (e.g., video testimonials)

- Monitor and evaluate new brand as it rolls out
- The team said that their next steps are to finalize the communications audit and roadmap, communicate with non-technical audience to get their input, and develop an Exchange Network brand, including umbrella message and tagline.

Performance Measures: Dissatisfied Users

- NPRG members reported on their contacts with dissatisfied users from the 2012 Performance Measures Survey.
- April Hathcoat spoke with Alex Cabillo, with Hualapai Tribe, whose complaint was that the RFP did not emphasize Tribal needs. Not enough funds are available for Tribes who are trying to get started with the Network. April agreed to carry these comments forward to the Tribal Governance Group.
- Virginia Thompson spoke with Won Kim, whose concern is that the program managers in the State of Oregon are not hearing consistently from programs at EPA Region 10 and Oregon DEQ that they should use the Network for exchanging data. Virginia commented that this feedback underscores that Phase 1 activities are still needed in Oregon; Jurgen Koch agreed that that is the case across the country.
- Other NPRG members had yet to contact their assigned dissatisfied users.

Next Call: September 6, 2012

For more information on the NPRG, please visit: <http://www.exchangenetwork.net/about/network-management/network-partnership-and-resources-group>.

Drinking Water Integrated Project Team

The DW IPT convenes a call once a month on the first Thursday of the month from 1:00-2:30pm ET.

August 2, 2012

ACTION ITEMS:

- Pravin will circulate the final mapping tool evaluation report in two weeks for the IPT to review.

SUMMARY:

Mapping Tool Evaluation Report

Pravin provided a brief overview of the initial findings from the Altova MapForce® evaluation pilot. In general, the pilot participants found the tool helpful and provided features that make data mapping more efficient. Key findings include:

- The tool required assistance and some robust technical support will be required when the tool is distributed to other Partners (all participants noted that it did get easier to use with time).
- The ideal person to conduct mapping should be staff with expertise with the source data and technical proficiency.
- The level of effort varies widely depending on how much initial work has been done with the data.
- Staging tables were very helpful in getting the data mapped.
- MapForce has utility for other programs, which will be taken into account when the discussion is brought to OEI for review.
- There were some security issues when participants attempted to submit the data via their node – most were related to available resources. Working with local node administrators was very helpful and should be included in the information provided to Partners as the tool is rolled out.

A full report on the findings from the evaluation pilot (including cost scenarios) will be circulated to the IPT in two weeks for review prior to the next call.

EPA Data Warehouse

Pravin also provided an update on the timing for the EPA Data Warehouse development, which has occurred in parallel to the mapping pilot. The inventory, compliance samples, and violation modules have been deployed and Version 1 of the complete system should be complete by September 1, 2012. Testing will occur in August and September with Version 2 slated for availability by October. Once Version 2 is deployed, the warehouse will be ready to accept data.

Kansas EN Multi-Party Grant

Jonathan Haynes is soliciting additional interested parties for a multi-partner Exchange Network grant to develop tools for migrating compliance monitoring data directly to a cloud-based database, as well as creating a reporting portal where data owners can choose to share the data with interested parties. Any interested IPT members should contact Jonathan directly at [jhaynes \[at\] kdheks.gov](mailto:jhaynes@kdheks.gov) if they are interested.

Next Call: Sept 26, 2012

Phase 2 Task Force

The Phase 2 Task Force convenes a call every other Thursday from 2:00-3:30pm ET. The Task Force held two calls in August.

August 14, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Andy Putnam (Co-Chair), Kurt Rakouskas, Greg McNelly, Dwane Young, Joe Wilson, Mike Beaulac, Ken Blumberg, Lee Garrigan, Dennis Murphy, Rob Willis, Megan Parker

ACTION ITEMS:

- Phase 2 Task Force members will review Goal 4 and its strategies to see if they are the right ones and if there are any additions needed and provide written comments prior to the next call.
- Rob Willis and Kurt Rakouskas will incorporate the written comments and comments from the call into the draft Phase 2 Implementation Plan.

SUMMARY:

Detailed Review of Goal 3

- The Phase 2 Task Force reviewed written comments submitted by Task Force members and discussed changes and additional information to include in the new Goal 3.

August 28, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Andy Putnam (Co-Chair), Jonathan Jacobson (Co-Chair), Kurt Rakouskas, Dwane Young, Chris Simmers, Chuck Freeman, Mike Beaulac, Greg McNelly, Megan Parker

ACTION ITEMS:

- Rob Willis and Kurt Rakouskas will incorporate written comments and comments from the call into the Plan.
- Kurt Rakouskas will share the E-Enterprise PowerPoint presentation with the Phase 2 Task Force.
- Kurt Rakouskas will draft a white paper discussing EN Governance and potential changes and send to the Phase 2 Task Force in preparation for the September 11 call.
- Kurt Rakouskas and Rob Willis will produce a revised draft of the Phase 2 Implementation Plan to review prior to the September 25 call.

SUMMARY:

Detailed Review of Goal 4

- The Task Force reviewed written comments submitted by Task Force members and discussed changes and additional information to include in the new Goal 4.

Next Steps

- Now that the Task Force has completed its goal-by-goal review of the draft Phase 2 Implementation Plan, they will discuss potential changes to Governance on its September 11 call and review a revised draft on the September 25 call. This timeline keeps the Task Force on track to deliver a revised Phase 2 Implementation Plan to the ENLC and NOB Co-Chairs by the end of September.

Next Call: September 11, 2012