

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

eManifest Stakeholder Meeting

May 19-20, 2004

EPA East Building, Public Hearing Room 1153
1201 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, D.C.

Meeting Objectives

- › Present and receive stakeholder input on the *working-draft* eManifest road map.
- › Understand the lessons learned from other electronic manifesting projects.
- › In small groups, identify and work through issues associated with creating a successful eManifest approach, including balancing consistency with flexibility, ensuring system security and usability, and addressing cost and funding.
- › Describe streamlining and other opportunities that might be created by an eManifest system.

Day One: May 19, 2004

8:30 Registration

9:00 Opening plenary – welcome and orientation (30 minutes)

- › Matt Hale, Deputy Director, Office of Solid Waste, OSWER
- › Renee Wynn, Deputy Director, Office of Information Collection, OEI

9:30 The draft eManifest roadmap (1 hour)

- › Rich LaShier, Office of Solid Waste

10:30 Morning break (15 minutes)

10:45 Group discussion of the draft eManifest roadmap (1½ hours)

- › Develop group understanding about the road map
- › Identification and discussion of alternatives
- › Briefly describe the breakout group process:
 - Business process, opportunities and governance
 - Technology architecture
 - Funding
- › Identify key questions and issues for three breakout groups:
 - Reaction to the overall eManifest approach
 - Pros and cons of alternatives
 - Challenges to eManifest
 - Strategies and partners to overcome these challenges
 - Other options to consider or opportunities that might be realized

12:15 Lunch (on your own) (1¼ hours)

1:30 Lessons learned from other electronic manifesting systems (1 hour)

- › George Rocoski, Ontario Ministry of the Environment
- › Randy Smith, DOD Defense Logistics Agency

2:30 Afternoon break (15 minutes)

- 2:45 Breakout groups – understand issues and questions (1½ hours)
- › Business process, opportunities and governance
 - › Technology architecture
 - › Funding

4:15 Wrap up day 1 and plan for day 2 (45 minutes)

5:00 Adjourn

Day Two: May 20, 2004

- 8:30 Panel: current needs and future visions for electronic manifesting (1¾ hours)
- › Mike Fusco, Safety-Kleen
 - › David Case, Environmental Technology Council
 - › Liz Bols, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
 - › Glenn Miller, Northey-Smith
 - › Dan Munyan, CSC

10:15 Morning break (15 minutes)

- 10:30 Breakout sessions – discuss solutions and path forward (1½ hours)
- › Business process, opportunities, and governance
 - › Technology architecture
 - › Funding

12:00 Lunch (on your own) (1¼ hours)

- 1:15 Report on business process, opportunities and governance group discussion (45 minutes)
- › Reaction to the overall eManifest approach and alternatives
 - › Pros and cons of alternatives
 - › Challenges to eManifest
 - › Strategies and partners to overcome these challenges
 - › Other options to consider or opportunities that might be realized

- 2:00 Report on technology architecture group discussion (1 hour)
- › See topics above

3:00 Afternoon break (15 minutes)

- 3:15 Report on funding group discussion (1 hour)
- › See topics above

4:15 Wrap up and next steps (45 minutes)

5:00 Adjourn

Background Information and Breakout Sessions

Breakout (or small group) sessions will be used so that meeting participations can “drill down” into some of the key issues, questions, and major issues associated with who will design, implement, manage, maintain, modify, certify, and approve eManifest system IT software, hardware, guidance, administrative processes, modifications, upgrades, interfaces, and technical formats.

For purposes of this meeting, EPA has identified a number of potential approaches to developing and implementing an eManifest system, including centralized, distributed, and shared services models.

Under a “*Centralized Services*” approach, all services are hosted on a primary network location. Mission-critical data is located at the primary location.

Under a “*Distributed Services*” approach, private firms would develop eManifest systems that adhere to a set of promulgated standards. Services and data, regardless of type, may be hosted by any network partner.

Under a “*Shared Services*” system, manifest handling services and manifest ‘documents’ would be hosted on a primary network location. All other services and data may be hosted by any network partner wishing to participate.

Of the three, it seems that the *Shared Services* approach best addresses the stakeholder comments received thus far, offers robust security for non-repudiation, and provides an opportunity for value-added development of additional services by network partners.

EPA wishes to thoroughly vet this proposal with stakeholders, both as a group and in focused small group breakouts, as described below:

Business Process, Opportunities, and Governance

EPA anticipates that the business process, opportunities, and governance breakout group will focus on how to use the eManifest to address current information and process requirements, as well as new opportunities (potential roles and functions) that may be created by an eManifest and should, therefore, be factored into thinking about the system design, operation, and funding. For example, an eManifest might be able to:

- › Serve as a mechanism for consolidating a number of functions currently performed by hazardous waste generators, transporters, TSDFs, state regulators, enforcement personnel, and federal regulators.
- › Consolidate reporting requirements for the RCRA Biennial Report and other data collection programs.
- › Allow for integrated reporting and faster data collection and analysis.

This group will also discuss how an eManifest system might be administered and the role of EPA in administering such a system.

Information Technology Architecture

The information technology architecture breakout group will focus on technical aspects of different eManifest system approaches (i.e., software and hardware architectures) and explore the four main IT systems:

- › *Data subsystem:* key assumptions, questions, and issues to be resolved related to manifest data (e.g., input, transfer, output, storage, and archive).
- › *Services subsystem:* key components of the IT application architecture and how they interrelate (i.e., interoperability), as well as defining potential discrete transactions that comprise the entire process.
- › *Data security subsystem:* how manifest data and IT applications will be kept secure.
- › *Infrastructure subsystem:* how data and IT applications will be managed (maintained, updated).

Funding

EPA will not be able to move forward with a “shared services” or other approach that involves the Agency developing and hosting new applications or systems unless a stable source of funding is identified for the entire life cycle of such a system. The funding breakout group will focus on evaluating a number of possible funding mechanisms, such as:

- › User fees
- › Share-in-savings and other cost-recovery contracts
- › New federal appropriations earmarked for system development
- › Reallocation/earmarking of EPA state grants