Message

From: Janke, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=25B558A57FBF45E7AAE5ECDE8D4328A0-JANKE, ROBERT]
Sent: 9/26/2019 3:05:06 PM
To: Shang, Feng [shang.feng@epa.gov]
BCC: Robert Janke (Janke.Robert@epa.gov) [Janke.Robert@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: EPANET Beta Test Reviewer Comments [Response from Sam]

FYI

From: Hatchett, Sam - Xylem <sam.hatchett@xyleminc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 11:59 AM
To: Janke, Robert <Janke.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Uber, James - Xylem <james.uber@xyleminc.com>
Subject: Re: EPANET Beta Test Reviewer Comments

Rob, I'm working on harvesting a consensus from Elad, Demetrios, and Lew... but in the meantime, here are my thoughts:

OWA exists as a gathering place for community engagement and development of software related to water systems. All (and I do mean *ALL*) are welcome to participate in a civil and respectful manner. We would love to have more involvement from EPA representatives. Michael seems recalcitrant, but maybe Feng would like to get more involved?

If EPA (In my mind this means Regan, Rob, Michael, and Feng) would like to manage a round of private beta-testers for this updated engine/gui combination, then you've decided to be on your own for that task. There are things that should be sorted - like who manages the communication, where the bugs/issues get tracked, and who eventually will work on fixing the issues. I believe there are some problems preventing all of that happening on the EPA github project site - though maybe that's an outdated understanding. How all of that gets answered depends on your own decisions about what EPA's role is in the development of this software, and whether you see a future in the community-driven development model. I certainly see a future in it, and I'm actively moving toward the OWA 2.2 version being the standard engine for xylem's simulation stack.

In any case, the OWA epanet project site has some momentum here - a good number of forks, stars, watchers, and a backlog of issues/milestones. I would strongly encourage EPA to consider filing the engine-related issues here (or better yet counseling the testers to do so), instead of using spreadsheets, to help build the stronger lines of communication that I think we all desire. This would also stanch the bifurcation of the codebase which has begun in earnest. There is even an OWA repo for the legacy UI, which could easily serve as the home for UI-related issues-tracking and resolutions. I don't think I was ever a fan of the "private Beta" concept, but we can still document these issues and solicit contributions in a way that is transparent and community-building. To do otherwise is to perpetuate the idea that this code belongs to the EPA instead of the people who contributed to it.

I hope that mostly makes sense, and I hope that we can find a way forward!

s

On Sep 25, 2019, at 10:54 AM, Janke, Robert <Janke.Robert@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jim/Sam,

FYI. I am not sure how long it was going to take to get OWA's feedback on the path forward for EPANET and I was feeling pinched to be responsive. Please let me know if you see anything in my email below which you feel is incorrect.

Thanks!

Rob

From: Janke, Robert <Janke.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 9:46 AM
To: Murray, Regan <Murray.Regan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPANET Beta Test Reviewer Comments

Hi Regan,

I am sorry I have been slow to respond. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Again, sorry for the slow response and lack of solutions.

Rob

From: Murray, Regan <Murray.Regan@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2019 10:34 AM
To: Janke, Robert <Janke.Robert@epa.gov>; Tryby, Michael <Tryby.Michael@epa.gov>; Shang, Feng <shang.feng@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPANET Beta Test Reviewer Comments

Hi Rob,

Thanks, this table is really helpful. Let's add another column that tracks how and when we addressed each issue.

Are we moving forward with scheduling a teleconference?

Thanks again,

Regan

From: Janke, Robert <Janke.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2019 4:17 PM
To: Murray, Regan <Murray.Regan@epa.gov>; Tryby, Michael <Tryby.Michael@epa.gov>; Shang, Feng <shang.feng@epa.gov>
Subject: EPANET Beta Test Reviewer Comments

Hi All,

This email is to provide an update on the current status of beta testers' efforts to test the EPANET beta 2.2.0. Below is a table outlining each of the beta testers who volunteered to test EPANET beta v2.2.0 and those that have provided comments (identified by a comment in the "Major Comments/Issues" column associated with each reviewer).

As can be seen from the comments, they span a broad range: (1) does not install or run, (2) problem with a feature, e.g., tank overflow, (3) editorial, or (4) enhancement. Below is a link to the actual comments (i.e., emails and pdf documents) in a one-drive folder.

No.	Name	Email	Major Comments/Issues
1	Hyoungmin Woo	hyoungmin.Woo@cincinnati-oh.gov	Correction Setup screen - License term didn't align properly. Graph Options - The GUI has default values, but one option. Graph label needs to set a default value. Copy-paste option - Copy to Meta file captures larger screen than the actual plot window size. Copy to Bitmap is fine. Windows display scale compatibility - Conflict to windows scale option Recommendations Change to new organization name in the About EPANET dialogue box Addition of a section "What's New in 2.2" in the Help file Set to default High DPI Scaling Option - With the High DPI scaling override option Manual - addition of PDA simulation example (e.g. a simple NET1 example with PDA simulation option)
2	Sudhir K (Global Quality Corporation)	sudhir@gqc.com	Questions about licensing with the official EPA release of v2.2 from the website. Also, noted that "maximum trials are exceeded several times and the system flow balance numbers can't be trusted. It is not a large network (10K pipes) but there are quite few PRV's."
3	Tom Walski	tom.Walski@bentley.com	
4	Kobus van Zyl	**Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**	
5	Juneseok Lee	juneseok.Lee@manhattan.edu	EPANET header should be 2.2 rather than 2.0. Regarding near-zero flows, I ran a simple network with a base demand of 0.005 GPM, and it turns out that the actual demand (flow) is rounding up to 0.01 GPM. The same for 0.004 GPM, and it rounds down to 0 GPM. I was wondering whether it is possible to increase the significant figure by one more decimal place.
6	Kate Klise	kaklise@sandia.gov	
7	Sri Kamojjala	sri.kamojjala@lvvwd.com	

No.	Name	Email	Major Comments/Issues
8	Jorge Pesantez	jpesant@ncsu.edu	
9	Fatemeh Hatam	fatemeh.hatam@polymtl.ca	Compile the PDA features into epanetmsx.exe. This will allow us to perform multi-species water quality analysis based on pressure-driven hydraulic analysis. In the current version, Wagner's equation is used to perform PDA. Now that the EPANET hydraulic engine includes the pressure dependent demand model, I think it would be beneficial if users could also integrate other types of pressure-demand relationships in the model as well as various minimum/required pressures at the nodes.
10	Gabrielle Ebacher	g.ebacher@laval.ca	Installation issues with ".msi" file. Also, access violation errors occur with using the stand-alone executable. These problems do not occur with v2.00.12
11	Ruoxi Wu	wur@hnu.edu.cn	
12	Martin Lambert (Class)	martin.lambert@adelaide.edu.au	
13	Ehsan Shafiee	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)	
14	Jarai Sanneh	jsanneh01@manhattan.edu	
15	Miah Cohall	mcohall01@manhattan.edu	
16	Zheng Wu	Zheng.Wu@bentley.com	
17	Juarl Saldarriaga	jsaldarr@uniandes.edu.co	
18	Morris Maslia	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)	
19	Ahmed Abokifa	Ahmed.abokifa@utexas.edu	
20	David Watkins	dwatkins@mtu.edu	
21	Paulo Oliveira	oliveipa@mail.uc.edu	
22	Jonathan Keck	jkeck@calwater.com	
23	Arnold Strasser	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)	See attached comments. Generally, no problems but does note some minor differences between v2.00.12 and the beta release of v2.2.0
24	Pedro L. Iglesias Rey	piglesia@upv.es	
25	Jim Cooper (Arcadis)	Jim.Cooper@arcadis.com	See attached comments from Arcadis. Evidence of one model running in 2.00.12 but not in v2.2. Differences were observed between v2.2 and v2.00.12. Tank overflow feature did not run with model selected for testing. Error received, "Error 206: undefined curve -16s in (TANKS) section: ..."
26	Nestor Vicencio Ortiz Salazar	nv.ortiz@uniandes.edu.co	

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Thanks!

Rob

Robert Janke
Water Infrastructure Protection Division
U.S. EPA/NHSRC
Mail Stop NG-16/NB21F
26 West Martin Luther King Dr.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268
Office Phone: 513-569-7160
Fax: 513-487-2559
Cell Phone: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
http://www.epa.gov/nhsrc/index.html
http://openwateranalytics.github.com/epanet-rtx/
janke.robert@epa.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail, including any attachments and/or linked documents, is intended for the sole use of the intended addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, proprietary, or otherwise protected by law. Any unauthorized review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please contact the original sender immediately by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this e-mail are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Xylem Inc.