

e-Manifest Advisory Board Charges

1. How can e-Manifest better engage our user community with the goal of maximizing electronic manifest submission?

For background information, please reference the e-Manifest System Summary section of the e-Manifest advisory board white paper.

- A. What hurdles do you foresee in getting user buy-in?
- B. What outreach efforts have we overlooked? What can we do better?

2. Corrections Process for Manifest Data Already Entered in System

For background information, please reference the e-Manifest System Summary section of the e-Manifest advisory board white paper.

- A. Can the Board opine on how much prescriptive detail is necessary to prescribe a structured and orderly process for executing data corrections, while affording interested parties (waste handlers on manifest and regulators) the opportunity to participate adequately?
- B. Can the Board advise on how the process, notices to parties, and response deadlines should be structured if EPA determines to eliminate the 90-day window for finalizing all data corrections?
- C. Does the Board agree with EPA's conclusion that only one party – the receiving facilities who submit final manifests to the system – should have the responsibility to access the system to enter or submit data corrections?

3. What level of IT support for the help desk is appropriate for launching the e-Manifest system? What could EPA do to make the help desk/IT support more efficient?

For background information, please reference the e-Manifest System Summary section of the e-Manifest advisory board white paper.

- A. What level of service is needed for Day 1?
- B. What level of personal vs. automated support is ideal?
- C. For states/programs with similar applications, what are best practices for standing up a help desk?
- D. A primary driver for this help desk is moving all of our users towards a fully electronic system. How best can the help desk assist in this effort?

e-Manifest Advisory Board Charges

4. OLEM's User Fee Payment Methods Proposal and Commenters' Suggestions for Payment Approaches

For background information, please reference the User Fee Proposed Rule section of the e-Manifest advisory board white paper.

- A. What features or incentives could be included in the advanced, fixed payment approach to make it more appealing to receiving facilities and reduce the risk from variability in use of manifests?
- B. If the initial year's appropriations are not adequate to seed several months of system operating costs, does the Board consider it reasonable for EPA to require the advanced fixed payment approach during the initial year of operations, and then allow facilities to opt out if they so choose? What other means are available within the proposed rule options to mitigate EPA's revenue stability risk during the initial period of system operations?

5. OLEM's Hybrid Manifest Proposal and Commenters' Suggestions for a Phase-in of Electronic Manifesting

For background information, please reference the User Fee Proposed Rule section of the e-Manifest advisory board white paper.

- A. Can the Board suggest alternatives to the industry commenters' approach that would provide a workable and credible path to widespread use of electronic manifests?
- B. Can the Board recommend features or requirements (e.g., a cap on its availability) that should be included in the hybrid approach that would mitigate the risk that the hybrid might actually thwart the adoption and use of electronic manifests?
- C. Commenters raised concerns that waste-tracking disconnects and data-integrity issues may occur since the hybrid option severs the manifest paper copy from the electronic version. Can the board recommend measures to EPA that will address these concerns?