



# Exchange Network Governance Activity Summary

December 2012

## CONTENTS

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

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, and Regional and National meetings). For more information on 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.

The December 13, 2012, call was cancelled.

*Next Call: January 24, 2013*

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

## Network Operations Board

The NOB continues to focus on development of Virtual Node and Shared CROMERR Services technologies. The Virtual Node IPT convenes calls every other Tuesday from 12:00-1:30pm ET. The Shared CROMERR Services IPT convenes calls every other Wednesday from 1:00-2:30pm ET.

### December 18, 2012 – Virtual Node Call #8

#### ACTION ITEMS:

- IPT members will review the Virtual Node IPT Recommendations Report and provide any comments by January 4, 2013. Comments will be summarized for discussion on the January 8, 2013 call.

## SUMMARY:

### Review of the Draft Virtual Node IPT Recommendations Report

During this call, IPT members began an initial review the Draft Virtual Node IPT Recommendations Report. IPT members will fully review the Report and provide comments by January 4, 2013. Some sections of the report were developed based on the feedback collected via the survey, but were not discussed on calls (e.g., potential file sizes). These sections have been highlighted so that reviewers can ensure that information was captured correctly.

IPT members were also offered the opportunity to get access to the example Virtual Node implementation developed by EPA and CGI. Email Kristen or Will to set up an account.

*Next Call: January 8, 2013*

## December 12, 2012 – Shared CROMERR Services IPT Call #7

### ACTION ITEMS:

- Staff will consolidate comments from this and previous calls into the first draft of the Shared CROMERR Services IPT Recommendations Report. The IPT will review the Report on their January 9, 2013, call.

## SUMMARY:

### General Implementation Approaches

The IPT discussed the three basic approaches for developing services:

1. A set of web services at EPA that Partners invoke (i.e., main approach). This would include a set of loosely coupled services so that Partners can develop a set of shared and local functions.
2. A central web interface where EPA develops the UI screens.
3. EPA distributes code to Partners. This is not a preferred path and not really on the table right now.

Based on the calls so far, the IPT has focused on meeting the CROMERR requirements using a set of web services provided by EPA to trading Partners. These would be loosely coupled and allow Partners some choice on what is performed locally versus what is performed by the shared service.

### Signature Ceremony Review

The IPT discussed the signature ceremony that was laid out during the last call. The following decisions were clarified:

- The signature ceremony was explored primarily as a web service.
- Contractors will explore the types of second factor authentication approaches (e.g., pin) in the Draft Recommendations Report.
- The last step of the signature ceremony involves the creation of two sets of information 1) The Copy of Record (COR), and 2) a set of auditing and forensic evidence documents for Partners' use.

### *Alternative Authentication Approaches*

What are the potential web services that offer second factor or other authentication levels that may be available?

- Examples include challenge questions and unique pin numbers.
- Whatever is implemented needs to be (Americans with Disabilities Act) ADA compliant.
- From a user standpoint, the easiest authentication is whatever they will have handy and is easy to remember. Even though a complex scheme is more secure, it may prevent users from easily using the system.
- There is an option to allow the user to select which challenge format is applied in order to authenticate (e.g., pick a challenge question or use text/email authentication. This will be explored further to see if it is possible from both a technical and CROMERR policy standpoint.

- There is a spectrum of implementations across Partners. Developing web services that they could choose from would be helpful. Requirements range from simple second factor authentication to far more complex steps that may be required by Partner’s security procedures.

### Copy of Record Storage

The IPT discussed the storage needs for CORs and how that will impact shared services. About 46% of the initial survey responses indicated they were interested in a central storage service. Some Partners feel like it is their responsibility to maintain the COR, while others believe that if there was a way to store centrally with appropriate security controls then they would use a central storage mechanism. The following points were highlighted:

- Retention requirements will vary by program and reporting needs.
- Partner retention requirements
  - State, Territory, and Tribal needs are sometimes different from the EPA program needs.
  - Some Partners may want to use the shared services for non-EPA programs, which also have different requirements.
  - The five-year retention requirement is a general rule of thumb
    - EPA’s Superfund Program requires documents to be saved in perpetuity
    - OTEC requires 30 years
- There are some transactions where it may be unclear how long records must be maintained:
  - Incomplete transactions
  - Orphaned submissions
  - Transactions waiting for multiple signatures that do not get applied. In this case, the IPT believed each signature may need to be treated as a separate signature event, but that this will require additional investigation in the IPT Recommendations Report.
- The IPT did not want copies of floating around but instead in an archive where they are signed. Partners can create their own human readable copy to circulate if necessary.

The IPT discussed the option that transaction metadata would include a “type” field connected to a retention policy (so staff know when to delete files). This could be included as a parameter in the signature ceremony process. The desire is that when the service is called that creates the COR, one of the pieces of metadata is some information about the records retention policy associated with that program. This gives the Partner the ability to control retention and will be executed per policy.

### *COR Stored Centrally at EPA*

- Partners discussed how they would view the human readable part of the COR if it was stored centrally by EPA.
  - There are services like GetCORbyUser that would allow users (both those submitting and some Partner staff) to view and download the COR.
  - Partners could build a UI locally that calls on that service. They would query EPA and receive all the CORs EPA has for the related to X submission type. If they select a file then another service would query EPA and bring that back to the Partner staff. The IPT decided that upload/retrieval of CORs would not be implemented as a plugin but as web services given the variety of platforms used by Partners.
- Some of these files will be very large. A package that is more than 100MB will take a long time to get to and from a central service.
  - The shared service may need to apply asynchronous
  - A download of the package or COR may need to be asynchronous
- The file size issue is universal as the file will need to be uploaded for the signature ceremony even if a local storage of the COR is implemented.
  - A hash can be used to ensure accurate transmission
- Storing the COR centrally will require a detailed MOU with procedures outlined for retrieval and deletion of files as necessary that meet both EPA and Partner requirements.

- Some States noted that for enforcement actions, they need ready access to all files and may need to store a local copy (not the “official” copy) that can easily be retrieved.
  - For most part, generation of human readable copy would be handled locally.
- For retrieval of a centrally stored CORs, there needs to be a way to verify the signature (including the signature agreement would solve this issue).
- For records retention purposes, Partner staff will need the ability to change the status of the COR (similar to how a document management system handles files). They would include:
  - Repudiated (e.g., due to an error in the file)
  - Hold for Enforcement
  - Expired (i.e., ready for removal)
- Records purging could then be done by request based on an agreed upon workflow between Partners and EPA.

#### *Partner Staff Access to Central COR*

The IPT discussed the need for both Partner and EPA program staff to access the COR:

- Staff members will need access to the human readable COR (e.g., a PDF).
  - If the COR is stored centrally this could be requested and include a PDF of the submission with information on how to request the rest of the file if necessary.
- The data collected to fill in the form would be available on local systems prior to the package being sent to the local database and then on to central storage.
- The COR transaction will include a transaction ID that could be stored locally for easy identification/search.

#### **Next Steps**

The information gathered over the last few months will be assembled into a draft IPT Recommendations Report for the IPT to review. The review will likely generate additional topics that may require one or two calls to discuss in detail. The draft Report will be presented during the January 9, 2013 call.

*Next Call: January 9, 2013*

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

## Network Technology Group

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

### December 13, 2012

#### **PARTICIPANTS:**

Chuck Freeman (Co-Chair), Glen Carr (Co-Chair), Roy Walker, Kurt Rakouskas, Bill Rensmith, Chris Clark, Dennis Murphy, Dennis Burling, Yunhao Zhang, Joe Carioti, Lico Galindo, Bob Simpson, Tony Jeng, Daniel Jeng, Tony Hartrich, Greg McNelly

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

- Kurt Rakouskas, Chuck Freeman, Glen Carr, Connie Dwyer, and Roy Walker will discuss when it makes sense for the Co-Chairs to transition.
- Once the Governance transition occurs, Kurt Rakouskas, Ross, and ECOS will change any references to specific EN Governance groups in EN documentation and on the EN website.

- Yunhao Zhang will send Kurt Rakouskas the REST Services Center URL for inclusion in the REST services documentation.
- Kurt Rakouskas will work with Connie Dwyer and Roy Walker to obtain NOB approval of the REST services documentation and post it to the EN website.
- Bill Rensmith will introduce the integrated REST endpoint functionality of OpenNode2 (.NET version) on a future call (potentially an Open Call for the REST services standards).
- Kurt Rakouskas will follow up with Dwane Young to determine if there is any support that the EN, or NTG in particular, can provide to test the REST services documentation with WaDE.
- Kurt Rakouskas will post the revised version of the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network to the EN website.

## SUMMARY:

### Changes to EN Governance

- The Phase 2 Task Force suggested changes to EN Governance as part of their tasking. These suggestions were reviewed by the ENLC at their November 2012 Meeting.
- The recommendations included sunsetting the NPRG and to recast the NTG into a new group with a similar set of responsibilities to the current NTG, but with additional authority and stewardship that is currently held by the NOB. This group would be known as the Network Technology Board (NTB).
- The NTG was in favor of the new EN Governance proposal.
- The ENLC will be reviewing draft charters for the NTB and others groups on their January 24, 2013, call, so the NTG will review the NTB's charter and discuss what work will need to get done when the transition happens on their February 13, 2013, call.
- NTG members are invited to participate in the Network Technology Board (NTB). Connie Dwyer and Roy Walker will be Co-Chairs of the NTB. Kurt Rakouskas, Chuck Freeman, Glen Carr, Connie Dwyer, and Roy Walker will discuss when it makes sense for the Co-Chairs to transition.
- The EN Governance transition is anticipated to take place after endorsement at the ECOS Spring Meeting on March 4, 2013.
- Once the Governance transition occurs, Kurt Rakouskas, Ross, and ECOS will change any references to specific EN Governance groups in EN documentation and on the EN website.

### REST Services Documentation

- Kurt Rakouskas reviewed the final draft of the REST Services documentation, which was approved by the REST Services Subgroup on their last call.
- The NTG approved the REST Services Documentation.
- Yunhao Zhang will send Kurt Rakouskas the REST Services Center URL for inclusion in the REST services documentation.
- Kurt Rakouskas will work with Connie Dwyer and Roy Walker to obtain NOB approval of the REST services documentation and post it to the EN website.
- Bill Rensmith will introduce the integrated REST endpoint functionality of OpenNode2 (.NET version) on a future call (potentially an Open Call for the REST services standards).
- Kurt Rakouskas will follow up with Dwane Young to determine if there is any support that the EN, or NTG in particular, can provide to test the REST services documentation with WaDE.
- Kurt Rakouskas will post the revised version of the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network to the EN website.

### Updates to the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network

- The NTG previously revised the internal review process for exchange documentation packages. Kurt Rakouskas modified the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network document. This document mainly discusses the process for those who want to submit a package and thus did

not require many changes based on the internal process changes, but Kurt did make other minor changes to update the document (e.g., update to the new EN website URL).

- The NTG approved the revised version of the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network.
- Kurt Rakouskas will post the revised version of the Exchange Documentation Package Preparation and Review Process for the Exchange Network to the EN website.

*Next Call: February 14, 2013.*

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

## Network Partnership and Resources Group

December 10, 2012

### **PARTICIPANTS:**

Chris Simmers (Co-Chair), Jonathan Jacobson (Co-Chair), Tom Beierle, Ken Blumberg, April Hathcoat, Martin Husk, Michael Kaufman, Jurgen Koch, Darcy Peth, Kurt Rakouskas, Salena Reynolds, Virginia Thompson

### **SUMMARY:**

#### **EN Governance Restructuring**

- Kurt Rakouskas reviewed the upcoming changes to EN Governance. The ENLC reviewed the changes and recommended sunsetting several governance groups, including the NPRG. The sunsetting is a realignment to keep the Governance relevant to the changing needs of the EN.
- The responsibilities of the NPRG will in part be taken on by a new Communications IPT, with day-to-day communications tasks assigned to staff members among EPA, ECOS, the EN Coordinator, and contractors. The IPT will with develop a comprehensive communications and marketing strategy for the EN. That plan will be implemented by staff. NPRG members are encouraged to volunteer for the Communications IPT and to submit ideas for reaching new audiences.
- NPRG members responded that the new structure seemed well thought-out and makes sense.
- The EN Governance transition is anticipated to take place after endorsement at the ECOS Spring Meeting on March 4, 2013.

#### **NPRG Farewell**

- The Co-Chairs clarified that this will be the last NPRG call. They thanked each member of the NPRG for their contributions, and welcomed their future input into new Governance groups and IPTs going forward.

## Drinking Water Integrated Project Team

The DW IPT is on hiatus until late January or early February 2013.

## Phase 2 Task Force

Future calls to be determined.

December 20, 2012

### PARTICIPANTS:

Andy Putnam (Co-Chair), Jonathan Jacobson (Co-Chair), Lee Garrigan, Greg McNelly, Ken Blumberg, Kurt Rakouskas, Dwane Young, Chuck Freeman, Mike Beaulac, Dennis Murphy, Chris Simmers, Rob Willis, Megan Parker

### ACTION ITEMS:

- Kurt Rakouskas will make final changes to the Phase 2 Plan and will send to Ken Blumberg for a final edit.
- Kurt Rakouskas will draft an Executive Summary.

### SUMMARY:

- Kurt Rakouskas shared feedback from the ENLC on the Phase 2 Plan. In general, they were pleased and had no major changes. Kurt is making final changes to the Plan based on the ENLC's comments and will send to Ken Blumberg for a final edit. Kurt will also develop a two-page Executive Summary.
- The final draft Phase 2 Plan will be released via EN Alert in January 2013 for review and comment by the entire EN community. This will be followed by an Open Call.
- The goal is to send the Phase 2 Plan to ECOS for review and approval at their March 4, 2013 Spring Meeting.
- The Phase 2 Task Force will not need to meet prior to releasing the final draft Plan. The Task Force may need to meet to decide how to address comments from the EN community.
- The charters for the new EN Governance groups will be drafted for ENLC review on their January 24, 2013, call. Kurt will send the draft charters to the Phase 2 Task Force and to the ENLC.

*Next Call: TBD*