Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/17/2018 7:24:59 AM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I just wanted to let you know I took a lot of heat from Ed today about letting him know what you wanted. I received a lot of heat and so I wasn't sure how to respond to you earlier today as part of Ed's heat was about me letting Ed know what was needed and your thoughts on things wrt NCC/Security, etc

I love the work that you have here and am very experienced in all the technologies being used. All those companies in Silicon Valley, etc over the years including when I was in Verizon in 95 and was asked to lead NMS for Video which required me to work in California with a leader in distributed computing.

I also agree 100% with you about how the NCC has been burning federal dollars slowing things down. Fortunately, I am on EPA mail and so I can write this to you with ease. Perhaps one day I could work directly with EPA versus in a corp which is dragging things along. I am with you on everything and just as shocked as you are on some of what they are doing to slow it down. Ed is fairly new to software and was formerly working in databases only and so it appears software is something new for Ed.

Anyways, I look forward to these private discussions and will need to keep Ed out of these discussions whenever we do discuss.

Best wishes,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:26 AM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Sounds great.
Thank you. Likewise.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files Ex. 4 CBI, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>

Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no Ex. 4 CBI. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have **root,** Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have Ex. 4 CBI on the dev box? Or Ex. 4 CBI ? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
T: 919-200-7309 |M: 919-260-2750 | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>

Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>

Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: McCarthy, Colleen [Mccarthy.Colleen@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/16/2018 3:37:48 PM
To: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]; Chilivery, Swetha [chilivery.swetha@epa.gov]; Fan, Cindy (Yanqian) [fan.yanqian@epa.gov]; Goods, Lawanna [Goods.Lawanna@epa.gov]; Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]; Madhavan Nair Kamala Devi, Rakhi [madhavan-nair-kamala-devi.rakhi@epa.gov]; McCarthy, Colleen [Mccarthy.Colleen@epa.gov]; Morgan, Jennifer [morgan.jennifer@epa.gov]; Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: EMP Status Meeting: Minutes and Actions from 4/10/2018; Agenda for 4/17/2018
Attachments: EMP_Status_Meeting_2018_April_17.docx; Mod to Oil DB Compliance Module_Informal Compliance Radio Tab.pdf

Flag: Follow up

Hi Folks,

I hope that everyone had a wonderful weekend ☺!

Enclosed are the mintutes from our last status meeting and the screen shot of the SPCC Inspection Record that Troy would like modified (which we will discuss at tomorrow's meeting). I also included in the body of this email the actions from our last meeting and the actions that are pending from previous meetings.

Below is the proposed agenda for tomorrow's meeting. Please let me know if you would like anything added.

We are supposed to receive information today about the Oracle Migration testing *(From the email that Rob forwarded on 4/10/2018 :"On April 16, we will be contacting application owners with instructions for the testing process. Most* Ex. 4 CBI Ex. 4 CBI We may want to discuss the testing at our meeting, also.

<u>Proposed Agenda for 4/17/2018:</u>

1. Review actions from last meetings (see below).
2. Review Troy's request for changes to the SPCC Inspection Record.
3. Rob: Any information to share with team, questions for Team?
4. Ed: Any information to share with team, questions for Team?
5. Team (walk around) information to share, questions

Actions From 4/10/2018:						
No.	**Action Item or Decision**	**Date Identified MD = Meeting Date**	**Owner**	**Description**	**Target Completion Date**	**Actual Completion Date**
		4/10/2018	Colleen	Colleen to upload to Confluence documents (or pointers to documents) that explain why backend access to databases cannot be granted to unauthorized individuals. Colleen will also let Doug Smith know that our customers requested backend access to our databases, and see if he has anything to contribute to our store of information on why backend access must be restricted to the DBA(s) who own the databases.		
		4/10/2018	Rob	Rob to approve OSWER access for Christian.		**4/6/2018**
		4/10/2018	Paula	Paula to do the initial setup of the Ex. 4 CBI servers.	**Pending**	
		4/10/2018	Ed, Rob	Suggestion/Action: Now that we'll all one team, I'd like to see a call with all the players to understand all the costs and to work together to minimize the costs.	**Pending**	
		4/10/2018	Colleen	Review the screen shots of the Expertise and Skill sections of the FR module our PROD Wish List call.	**4/9/2018**	**4/9/2018**

Thanks!

Colleen

Colleen McCarthy, MBA, PMP
Lead Business Analyst
ITS-EPA III – Infrastructure, Support and Application Hosting (TO 2)
CSRA (a GDIT company, contractor to the U.S. EPA
79 TW Alexander Drive, Building 4401, Room 480B
P.O. Box 13668, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
mccarthy.colleen@epa.gov

EMP Discussion Notes / Meeting Minutes

		[FORMCHECKBOX] Revised Meeting Minutes
Subject	EMP Team Meeting Minutes	
Date and Time	4/10/2018 3:00 P.M. – 4:00 p.m. EST	
Meeting Location / Dial in Info	Conference Line - 8007475150 Access Code - 2322895	
Chairperson	Thomas, Rob	
In Person Participants		
Telephone Participants	Thomas, Rob; Campbell, Ed; Goods, Lawanna; McCarthy, Colleen; Leckner, Christian; Madhavan Nair Kamala Devi, Rakhi, Chilivery, Swetha; Fan, Cindy (Yanqian)	
Collaboration		

1	<u>Agenda for 4/10/2018 status call:</u> 1. Review actions from last meeting. 2. Discuss Rakhi's JIRA ticket OEM-6 3. Rob: Any information to share with team, questions for Team? 4. Ed: Any information to share with team, questions for Team? 5. Team (walk around) information to share, questions	Discussion: Rob: 1. In the future we will have customer feedback calls. (We also discussed at another meeting have ticket review calls to ensure that we're working on the highest priority tickets) 2. We need to have a call with Rob's team to review the scenarios for the Contingency Plan Table Top exercise (Call held 4/12/2018). 3. We need to set up a call with Dan Ferko and Kim Edwards after the above call to perform the Table Top exercise (Rob sent email to Dan Ferko, Vicente Cusumano, Kim Edwards, cc Gray Fernandez to schedule this). 4. We need to be sure that we are ready for the Oracle Migration. Below is the email providing information on the migration From: OEI_Oracle_Migration_Notification Sent: Tuesday, April 3, 2018 9:37 AM To: Lee, Stephanie <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Lee.Stephanie@epa.gov"]>;

Mayes, Sya <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Mayes.Sya@epa.gov"]>; Ahad, Sam <[HYPERLINK "mailto:ahad.sam@epa.gov"]>
Cc: Reynolds, Edna <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Reynolds.Edna@epa.gov"]>; Lewis, Matthew <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Lewis.Matthew@epa.gov"]>
Subject: RE: Oracle Migration Update - LINK Correction

LINK Correction – [HYPERLINK Ex. 4 CBI

From: OEI_Oracle_Migration_Notification
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2018 5:00 PM
To: Mayes, Sya <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Mayes.Sya@epa.gov"]>; Ahad, Sam <[HYPERLINK "mailto:ahad.sam@epa.gov"]>
Cc: Reynolds, Edna <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Reynolds.Edna@epa.gov"]>; Lee, Stephanie <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Lee.Stephanie@epa.gov"]>; Lewis, Matthew <[HYPERLINK "mailto:Lewis.Matthew@epa.gov"]>
Subject: Oracle Migration Update

All,

As you may be aware, the Agency is updating its Oracle Ex. 4 CBI infrastructure solution to ensure compliance with federal laws, directives, policies, and mandates (Steven Fine's email dated 03/13/2018). As a result, all users and applications supported by the Ex. 4 CBI, must be migrated by December 21, 2018.

The new environment will not support Ex. 4 CBI Reports based authentication. Also, [HYPERLINK Ex. 4 CBI has been retired and

		replaced by [HYPERLINK Ex. 4 CBI which Ex. 4 CBI authentication services. Therefore, there may be a necessity to do some development work and/or application changes before migration will be possible. On April 16, we will be contacting application owners with instructions for the testing process. Most applications will only need to test Ex. 4 CBI in their STAGE environment and then again in your PRODUCTION environment at go-live. However, there are over 400 applications to be migrated, so we are evaluating the applications fo Ex. 4 CBI For those applications that are more complex, we will meet with you directly to discuss the specific approach for your migration. For additional information, view the [HYPERLINK "Ex. 4 CBI] (Colleen: I copied in the text below from the Oracle Migration Updates link above. This information related to the details of the migration.) *OEI has updated the Oracle Ex. 4 CBI We procured the licenses for the latest release and have completed the build-out of the new Oracle 12c environment. As part of the process for decommissioning the legacy 10g, we must migrate all users (internal and external) and applications to the new 12c environment. Applications not migrated by December 21, will no longer be supported, and will no longer be able to use Ex. 4 CBI uthentication. Please check under the* ***Oracle Migration Updates*** *section for the latest information and schedule.*
Decisions and Actions Items		

EMP Discussion Notes / Meeting Minutes

[FORMCHECKBOX] No, Decisions/Action Items not discussed during this meeting	[FORMCHECKBOX] Yes, Decisions/Action Items discussed during this meeting (info below)
Actions From 4/10/2018:	

No.	Action Item or Decision	Date Identified MD = Meeting Date	Owner	Description	Target Completion Date	Actual Completion Date
		4/10/2018	Colleen	Colleen to upload to Confluence documents (or pointers to documents) that explain why backend access to databases cannot be granted to unauthorized individuals. Colleen will also let Doug Smith know that our customers requested backend access to our databases, and see if he has anything to contribute to our store of information on why backend access must be restricted to the DBA(s) who own the databases.		
		4/10/2018	Rob	Rob to approve OSWER access for Christian.		**4/6/2018**
		4/10/2018	Paula	Paula to do the initial setup of the Tomcat servers.	**Pending**	
		4/10/2018	Ed, Rob	Suggestion/Action: Now that we'll all one team, I'd like to see a call with all the players to understand all the costs and to work together to minimize the costs.	**Pending**	
		4/10/2018	Colleen	Review the screen shots of the Expertise and Skill sections of the FR module our PROD Wish List call.	**4/9/2018**	**4/9/2018**

EMP Discussion Notes / Meeting Minutes

Old Actions:

No.	Action Item or Decision	Date Identified MD = Meeting Date	Owner	Description	Target Completion Date	Actual Completion Date
1.	**Search Oil Db for Army facilities**	**03/26/18**	Rob & Troy	Get information from Troy Swackhammer for Amit on whether or not we track Ex. 4 CBI acilities in the OIL DB. Amit needs to do a response plan for Ex. 4 CBI acilities. Follow up: Troy follow took the action. Update 4/3/2018: Rob has not heard from Troy. Update 4/10/2018: Troy is much more familiar with the Oil DB than Rob is and the best person to answer this question.	**Still Pending**	
2.	**OSC class & certification report for Board Review**	**03/17/18**	Rob and Swetha:	Although we verified that Rob Fox has the rights to see OSC data, Rob Fox may ask to have an EMBI report created that shows the OSC's Name, Region, all required classes for OSC's and the required classes that each OSC has taken. An example of all classes taken by OSC's was sent to Rob Fox. Update 4/3/2018: Swetha created reports for Rob Fox to review. Rob Thomas found a dashboard with 100-200 OSC's and sent the location of the dashboard to Rob Fox for Rob Fox to review. Waiting on response from Rob Fox. Update 4/10/2018: Still waiting on response from Rob Fox.	**Still Pending**	
3.	**Privacy Act items**	**3/15/18**	Rob	Update the SORN including edit the five questions from Judy Hutt.	**Still Pending**	

				Update the Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) with the new immunization and medical clearance information. Update 4/3/2018: Pending. Update 4/10/2018: Rob to follow up with NCC 7 DEV team for a date.		
4.	**Email Raj of Reg 6 on Fac IDs**	**3/10/18**	Rob	Tell Raj the time to work on this request would be timely; it is best he contact Susan Smiley, PM for FRS as FRS is the SOR (system of record) for the facility data that he needs. The FRS data is accurate, up-to-date and includes the geocodes. 4/3/2018: Pending. Update 4/10/2018: Still pending.	**Still Pending**	
5.	**Auto Email template for FR SHEM customers**	**3/25/18**	Rob & Cindy	Rob converted the email template into a Word template. Sent it to Cindy & Team for review. Next it goes to SHEM workgroup for review and approval. 4/3/2018: Pending. Update 4/10/2018: Template was send to SHEM group (Skip, David, David and Josh) and waiting for response from May 1, 2018, SHEM monthly meeting.	**Pending May 1, 2018, SHEM monthly meeting.**	
6.	**Auto Email template for FR SHEM customers**	**3/30/18**	Rob, Ed, & Cindy:	Find out how many emails the users want and when the users want the emails sent for both the reminder emails (before the class) and the "missed class" emails (after the class is over). Then Cindy will generate a LOE & timeline for Rob & Ed to review then explain to the SHEM team. 4/3/2018: In progress. Update 4/10/2018: Pending May 1, 2018, SHEM monthly meeting	**Pending May 1, 2018, SHEM monthly meeting.**	

Deliverable Status

No.	Deliverable Name	Date Received	Date Accepted	Comments

EMP Discussion Notes / Meeting Minutes

Risks and Issues				
[FORMCHECKBOX] No, Risks/Issues not discussed during the meeting				[FORMCHECKBOX] Yes, Risks/Issues discussed during this meeting (info below)

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:40:28 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺

The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files Ex. 4 CBI etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer

ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group Ex. 4 CBI That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI roup access if no j Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT

949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have Ex. 4 CBI on the dev box? Or Ex. 4 CBI ? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under tomcat. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
T: 919-200-7309 |M: 919-260-2750 | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer

ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files, Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** Ex. 4 CBI membership on Ex. 4 CBI ? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:39:42 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Shall do.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.
Great.
Let him know.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I will speak to Ed about this on Monday so something changes.

I'm still waiting on my RAM upgrade for 2 months too for local machine.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:29 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Good to know.. sometimes new ppl shack things up. This is something you all should bring up to Ed to champion it up the CSRA command
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. IAM/WAM team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).

At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)

At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)

…

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a Ex. 4 CBI linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo Ex. 4 CBI then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI was added to group Ex. 4 CBI.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *deployments/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their Ex. 4 CBI were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new Ex. 4 CBI server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the Ex. 4 CBI group on Ex. 4 CBI and she changed the permissions so we have Ex. 4 CBI access now by my request.

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI *similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the* Ex. 4 CBI *environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be Ex. 4 CBI so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to Ex. 4 CBI regardless of where they were on Ex. 4 CBI). Later focus on what's on Ex. 4 CBI although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with Ex. 4 CBI since it never made it over to Ex. 4 CBI

What Salient provided us was one local Ex. 4 CBI base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future Ex. 4 CBI where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need Ex. 4 CBI for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on Ex. 4 CBI:

a) the code provided was Ex. 4 CBI most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was Ex. 4 CBI most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on Ex. 4 CBI we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us Ex. 4 CBI access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI.

For Ex. 4 CBI we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to Ex. 4 CBI under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on Ex. 4 CBI. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for Ex. 4 CBI access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous Ex. 4 CBI team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Ex. 4 CBI?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on Ex. 4 CBI? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/17/2018 4:51:07 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob,

Anytime. My number is always on my signature too ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Christian.

Let's have a talk soon. For the record I try to be transparent as a team…because some things happened on the previous contract were others didn't know. When I ask to inform Ed, it's not from an authoritative standpoint is to make sure he is in the loop as a PM. I don't want to step on anyone's duties or authority. I need everyone on the team to make these things work.
TTYS.

Rob Thomas

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 3:25 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I just wanted to let you know I took a lot of heat from Ed today about letting him know what you wanted. I received a lot of heat and so I wasn't sure how to respond to you earlier today as part of Ed's heat was about me letting Ed know what was needed and your thoughts on things wrt NCC/Security, etc

I love the work that you have here and am very experienced in all the technologies being used. All those companies in Silicon Valley, etc over the years including when I was in Verizon in 95 and was asked to lead NMS for Video which required me to work in California with a leader in distributed computing.

I also agree 100% with you about how the NCC has been burning federal dollars slowing things down. Fortunately, I am on EPA mail and so I can write this to you with ease. Perhaps one day I could work directly with EPA versus in a corp which is dragging things along. I am with you on everything and just as shocked as you are on some of what they are

doing to slow it down. Ed is fairly new to software and was formerly working in databases only and so it appears software is something new for Ed.

Anyways, I look forward to these private discussions and will need to keep Ed out of these discussions whenever we do discuss.

Best wishes,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:26 AM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Sounds great.
Thank you. Likewise.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM

To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half... I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files Ex. 4 CBI etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Apache and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
T: 919-200-7309 |M: 919-260-2750 | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have root on the dev box? Or Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP

CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested emp/jdaemon access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/17/2018 3:37:36 PM
To: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Ed.

Sounds like they are making good progress, finally. I hope it happens today.

Yes, we talked from two old emails I meant to reply to him on. Most of the convo was basically what he is doing or wants to do with the application code and how Salient-CRGT still have not provided a repository of the data.

In regards, to the WAM/Middleware I have the same conclusion as you stated in the above paragraph. I figured by the emails I've seen they didn't give him the full picture, yet NCC is still behind schedule on getting the Ex. 4 CBI server online ready for us to move forward with our work. The guy is hungry/anxious to show his skills for the Agency and transparent which is way more then what was done previously. I inform to make sure he keeps you in the loop, if he is then I won't keep telling him that… cause it irritate you. I've informed me how govt bureaucracy can be slow and at time work against your best efforts. Thanks for the update.

Rob

From: Campbell, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:34 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Rob,

I wanted to give you a brief update on the Dev server status this morning. Since Friday, Paula has been working to configure the Ex. 4 CBI and coordinating with the Ex. 4 CBI team to put into place the appropriate security certificates, and enable traffic to occur to and from the server on the appropriate ports. As of this morning, they appear to be nearing completion / complete hand-off of the server to Rakhi and Christian. I am pressing them for this to happen today, ideally before the meeting this afternoon. Paula has not used or exceeded her estimated 20 hours of initial setup at this point.

As a related note, did you happen to have correspondence with Christian on Friday? He sent me a few snippets of conversation with you on Friday, but did not send me a full email, so I am not sure what status he might have communicated to you. Christian does not usually have the full picture from Ex. 4 CBI as they try to allow him to focus on development while they do their configuration.

Talk with you soon,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III GDIT

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Message

From: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/17/2018 1:34:13 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Rob,

I wanted to give you a brief update on the Ex. 4 CBI server status this morning. Since Friday, Paula has been working to configure the Ex. 4 CBI and coordinating with the Ex. 4 CBI team to put into place the appropriate security certificates, and enable traffic to occur to and from the server on the appropriate ports. As of this morning, they appear to be nearing completion / complete hand-off of the server to Rakhi and Christian. I am pressing them for this to happen today, ideally before the meeting this afternoon. Paula has not used or exceeded her estimated 20 hours of initial setup at this point.

As a related note, did you happen to have correspondence with Christian on Friday? He sent me a few snippets of conversation with you on Friday, but did not send me a full email, so I am not sure what status he might have communicated to you. Christian does not usually have the full picture from Ex. 4 CBI as they try to allow him to focus on development while they do their configuration.

Talk with you soon,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III GDIT

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:36:22 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two

weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to Ex. 4 CBI as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (Ex. 4 CBI machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a Ex. 4 CBI for anything that touches the Ex. 4 CBI and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a Ex. 4 CBI file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of Ex. 4 CBI files (Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local Ex. 4 CBI working version) matches with what's currently on Ex. 4 CBI, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group "Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no Ex. 4 CBI sudo access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, Ex. 4 CBI files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to Ex. 4 CBI.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI"

You have Ex. 4 CBI on the Ex. 4 CBI box? Or sudo to Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to Ex. 4 CBI logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For Ex. 4 CBI we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to Ex. 4 CBI under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous Ex. 4 CBI team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Ex. 4 CBI?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on Ex. 4 CBI? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:35:34 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.
Great.
Let him know.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I will speak to Ed about this on Monday so something changes.

I'm still waiting on my RAM upgrade for 2 months too for local machine.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:29 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Good to know.. sometimes new ppl shack things up. This is something you all should bring up to Ed to champion it up the CSRA command
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. Ex. 4 CBI team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
...

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a Ex. 4 CBI linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new Ex. 4 CBI wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo Ex. 4 CBI then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the Ex. 4 CBI, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new Ex. 4 CBI. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on Ex. 4 CBI and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with Ex. 4 CBI since it never made it over to Ex. 4 CBI

What Salient provided us was one local Ex. 4 CBI code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI ervices (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on Ex. 4 CBI:

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have root and jdaemon on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI

For Ex. 4 CBI we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to Ex. 4 CBI under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on Ex. 4 CBI If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous Ex. 4 CBI team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Ex. 4 CBI?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on Ex. 4 CBI Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:34:47 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Sure thing.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey.

Wow. All ppl have to do is do the job asked of them. Thanks for that update.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:30 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I know Maury had gone to Paula and Paula had probably gone to LeAnn and leAnn had gone to Ed and then I got It (full circle back). In any case, Ex. 4 CBI needs to be aware of it all as it is Java code in the first place that references the keys – see below highlighted in Ex. 4 CBI tool in blue:

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Makes sense. Keep Ed and I posted on the progress. Ed will loop me in when it gets tooo hot. I'm sure they did as well. It has to happen.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I had wanted to add/set the new keys for dev, but it became a security issue for some odd reason – I believe that Paula will be working on it because I had written to both Maury and Paula to do this (it's a simple but advanced Java command to update /create the keys. Keystore is a storage for credentials and private key. Private key is where Maury said Paula will work on that. I am pretty sure that Salient created the keys in the first place (using approved certificates and private keys from Ex. 4 CBI team).

Great about the Salient additional request on source code to have all of EPA's eggs in one basket.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding time…Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal…what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) Ex. 4 CBI matched staging
b) I requested production files (deployed Ex. 4 CBI files) and received it. That is what I put up on Ex. 4 CBI along with Ex. 4 CBI from Ex. 4 CBI What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to Ex. 4 CBI etc). She is currently working on it.

c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI server, Ex. 4 CBI and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Subversion (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the dev server to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official Ex. 4 CBI repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the Ex. 4 CBI teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on Ex. 4 CBI from previous Ex. 4 CBI team at Salient – their Ex. 4 CBI were still part of the Ex. 4 CBI group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new Ex. 4 CBI server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the Ex. 4 CBI group on Ex. 4 CBI and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be Ex. 4 CBI so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to Ex. 4 CBI regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to Ex. 4 CBI

What Salient provided us was one local Ex. 4 CBI code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future Ex. 4 CBI where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on Ex. 4 CBI:

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have root and Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI roup access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on Ex. 4 CBI. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>

Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI cess for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Ex. 4 CBI?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:33:29 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey.

Wow. All ppl have to do is do the job asked of them. Thanks for that update.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:30 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I know Maury had gone to Paula and Paula had probably gone to LeAnn and leAnn had gone to Ed and then I got It (full circle back). In any case, Ex. 4 CBI needs to be aware of it all as it is Ex. 4 CBI code in the first place that references the keys – see below highlighted in Eclipse Java tool in blue:

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Makes sense. Keep Ed and I posted on the progress. Ed will loop me in when it gets tooo hot. I'm sure they did as well. It has to happen.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I had wanted to add/set the new keys for Ex. 4 CBI but it became a security issue for some odd reason – I believe that Paula will be working on it because I had written to both Maury and Paula to do this (it's a simple but advanced Java command to update /create the keys. Keystore is a storage for credentials and private key. Private key is where Maury said Paula will work on that. I am pretty sure that Salient created the keys in the first place (using approved certificates and private keys from Ex. 4 CBI team).

Great about the Salient additional request on source code to have all of EPA's eggs in one basket.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding time…Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal…what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) empadmin and fr matched staging
b) I requested Ex. 4 CBI files (deployed Ex. 4 CBI files) and received it. That is what I put up on empdev along with Ex. 4 CBI from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running tomcat instances, Ex. 4 CBI and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Subversion (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the Ex. 4 CBI to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the Ex. 4 CBI group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new Ex. 4 CBI Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in** Ex. 4 CBI **similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one Ex. 4 CBI code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need Ex. 4 CBI for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on Ex. 4 CBI):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or

g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on Ex. 4 CBI we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik

<Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:33:24 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to Ex. 4 CBI as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA

San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (Ex. 4 CBI machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA

San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a Ex. 4 CBI for anything that touches the Ex. 4 CBI server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of Ex. 4 CBI files (Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one Ex. 4 CBI working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Thanks,

LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, Ex. 4 CBI files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI"

You have root on the Ex. 4 CBI box? Or sudo to Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under tomcat. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15

Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 4 CBI
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on Ex. 4 CBI If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on Ex. 4 CBI? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:31:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I will speak to Ed about this on Monday so something changes.

I'm still waiting on my RAM upgrade for 2 months too for local machine.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:29 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Good to know.. sometimes new ppl shack things up. This is something you all should bring up to Ed to champion it up the CSRA command
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. Ex. 4 CBI team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
…

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

I think when you say ***"comprehensive forensic analysis"*** *it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *deployments/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "****thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer****" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the* Ex. 4 CBI *environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev Ex. 4 CBI then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:30:47 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal Ex. 4 CBI), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a Ex. 4 CBI for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an apache is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of Ex. 4 CBI files Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one Ex. 4 CBI working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 4 CBI
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, Ex. 4 CBI files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have root on the dev box? Or sudo to Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under tomcat. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 4 CBI
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for Ex. 4 CBI access to Ex. 4 CBI This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik

<Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:30:07 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I know Maury had gone to Paula and Paula had probably gone to LeAnn and leAnn had gone to Ed and then I got It (full circle back). In any case, dev needs to be aware of it all as it is Java code in the first place that references the keys – see below highlighted in Eclipse Java tool in blue:

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Makes sense. Keep Ed and I posted on the progress. Ed will loop me in when it gets tooo hot. I'm sure they did as well. It has to happen.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I had wanted to add/set the new keys for Ex. 4 CBI but it became a security issue for some odd reason – I believe that Paula will be working on it because I had written to both Maury and Paula to do this (it's a simple but advanced Java command to update /create the keys. Keystore is a storage for credentials and private key. Private key is where Maury said Paula will work on that. I am pretty sure that Salient created the keys in the first place (using approved certificates and private keys from Ex. 4 CBI team).

Great about the Salient additional request on source code to have all of EPA's eggs in one basket.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding time…Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal…what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) Ex. 4 CBI matched staging
b) I requested production files Ex. 4 CBI files) and received it. That is what I put up on empdev along with sma from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI Ex. 4 CBI and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Subversion (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the Ex. 4 CBI to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the Ex. 4 CBI teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their Ex. 4 CBI were still part of the Ex. 4 CBI group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new Ex. 4 CBI server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the Ex. 4 CBI group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the* Ex. 4 CBI *environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one Ex. 4 CBI code base (Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on Ex. 4 CBI:

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files, Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on Ex. 4 CBI. If you grant me/Rakhi jdaemon access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM

To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:28:57 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Good to know.. sometimes new ppl shack things up. This is something you all should bring up to Ed to champion it up the CSRA command
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. Ex. 4 CBI team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way... there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others ...

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
...

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM

To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo Ex. 4 CBI, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM

To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group Ex. 4 CBI

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the Ex. 4 CBI group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the Ex. 4 CBI group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one Ex. 4 CBI code base (Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The jdaemon thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on Ex. 4 CBI we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for Ex. 4 CBI access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT

949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA

San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:26:53 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal Ex. 4 CBI machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a Ex. 4 CBI for anything that touches the Ex. 4 CBI and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a Ex. 4 CBI is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one Ex. 4 CBI working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group "Ex. 4 CBI". That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 4 CBI
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no jdaemon sudo access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have jdaemon. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Apache files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI"

You have root on the Ex. 4 CBI box? Or sudo to Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you Ex. 4 CBI access to conf, logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 4 CBI
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 4 CBI spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT

949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:23:08 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Makes sense. Keep Ed and I posted on the progress. Ed will loop me in when it gets tooo hot. I'm sure they did as well. It has to happen.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I had wanted to add/set the new keys for dev, but it became a security issue for some odd reason – I believe that Paula will be working on it because I had written to both Maury and Paula to do this (it's a simple but advanced Java command to update /create the keys. Keystore is a storage for credentials and private key. Private key is where Maury said Paula will work on that. I am pretty sure that Salient created the keys in the first place (using approved certificates and private keys from Ex. 4 CBI team).

Great about the Salient additional request on source code to have all of EPA's eggs in one basket.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding

time… Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal… what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) empadmin and fr matched staging
b) I requested production files (deployed Ex. 4 CBI files) and received it. That is what I put up on Ex. 4 CBI along with sma from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Subversion (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the Ex. 4 CBI to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *deployments/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the Ex. 4 CBI group on Ex. 4 CBI and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local sandbox from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI - as it requires integration with Ex. 4 CBI that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of Ex. 4 CBI which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);

f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with Ex. 4 CBI, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi jdaemon access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik

<Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:22:30 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. IAM/WAM team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).

At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)

At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)

…

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo Ex. 4 CBI, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *deployments/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the* Ex. 4 CBI *Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one Ex. 4 CBI code base (Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the Ex. 4 CBI repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's Ex. 4 CBI services (Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to Ex. 4 CBI ;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Ex. 4 CBI environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The jdaemon thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have root and jdaemon on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now Ex. 4 CBI will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on Ex. 4 CBI. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us Ex. 4 CBI access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI

For staging, we need at the very least Ex. 4 CBI group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:20:43 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal Ex. 4 CBI, I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA

San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a Ex. 4 CBI for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an apache is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Ex. 4 CBI for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files (Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one Ex. 4 CBI working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its Ex. 4 CBI Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group 'Ex. 4 CBI. That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Thanks,

LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need Ex. 4 CBI group access if no jdaemon sudo access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have jdaemon. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Apache files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI"

You have root on the Ex. 4 CBI? Or sudo to Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under tomcat. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15

Contact Stephen Rushing at Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi jdaemon access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just Ex. 4 CBI group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to Ex. 4 CBI. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their Ex. 4 CBI are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/Ex. 4 CBI deployments/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in Ex. 4 CBI similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Ex. 4 CBI?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:18:12 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I had wanted to add/set the new keys for dev, but it became a security issue for some odd reason – I believe that Paula will be working on it because I had written to both Maury and Paula to do this (it's a simple but advanced Java command to update /create the keys. Ex. 4 CBI is a storage for credentials and Ex. 4 CBI. Ex. 4 CBI is where Maury said Paula will work on that. I am pretty sure that Salient created the keys in the first place (using approved certificates and private keys from WAM/IAM team).

Great about the Salient additional request on source code to have all of EPA's eggs in one basket.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:09 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding time…Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal…what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) Ex. 4 CBI and matched staging
b) I requested production files (deployed war files) and received it. That is what I put up on Ex. 4 CBI along with Ex. 4 CBI from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI web server, Ex. 4 CBI, and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Ex. 4 CBI I installed it, configured it, and once I have the dev server to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with

Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local sandbox from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what tomcat instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:14:06 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
…

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

I think when you say ***"comprehensive forensic analysis"*** *it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "****thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer****" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only jdaemon has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:09:00 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

You'd be surprised why they wouldn't. Glad to read progress is being made finally. SMH. So we still have keys to be reset?

It should not have taken 2 months to get access to those accts.

That's good to know. That's correct. I figured as much for the repository. But they didn't. they were hoping for a Sub-Contracting option to come through. It didn't happen obviously. That's the Government's code. We are owed that code. Ed wrote Elliot again…so I'm waiting for Ed to make another move. Also this contract bidding time…Salient could be hoping the review I do won't hurt their chances to win a new contract. Just my thoughts on it.

Its like the game show lets make a deal…what door does the code hide behind.

a) Glad the match
b) Good. We'll see
c) This has to be noted on their lack luster approach to support EMP.
d) Sounds good. We'll try again with Elliot.

Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:18 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) Ex. 4 CBI and matched staging
b) I requested production files (deployed war files) and received it. That is what I put up on Ex. 4 CBI along with sma from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI, and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Ex. 4 CBI (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the dev server to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used,

albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer"** Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed

made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/[Ex. 4 CBI] in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The jdaemon thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 10:02:13 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others …

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Eclipse with Websphere)
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
…

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have root and jdaemon on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested emp/jdaemon access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/13/2018 9:50:18 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

I think when you say ***"comprehensive forensic analysis"*** *it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "****thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer****" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only jdaemon has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested emp/jdaemon access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 9:39:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT

949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

*I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local sandbox from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested emp/jdaemon access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 9:18:00 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Note several things:

a) Ex. 4 CBI and Ex. 4 CBI staging
b) I requested production files (deployed war files) and received it. That is what I put up on Ex. 4 CBI along with Ex. 4 CBI from staging. What Paula does I shall soon see (if she switched it all to staging, etc). She is currently working on it.
c) Maury is granting me the community access - I requested that two weeks ago. Once Paula and Maury finishes their work, I can work off running Ex. 4 CBI instances, Ex. 4 CBI, and have community access which I applied for weeks ago.
d) Rest assured, I will provide all findings to you before I freeze the code into Ex. 4 CBI (I installed it, configured it, and once I have the dev server to work with, I can do the analysis which determines what should be used, albeit we should really have the official source code repository with the proper tags/branches, or trunk version of what was deployed where.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

I think when you say ***"comprehensive forensic analysis"*** *it may cause some discomfort… you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in

Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "**thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer**" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that… after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on empdev it should be prod so then I build and deploy on empdev we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although sma by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our Ex. 4 CBI finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto Ex. 4 CBI and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, webgate).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and fr which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;
b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have Ex. 4 CBI on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested emp/jdaemon access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 5:52:53 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Hi Rob

Shall do.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 1:52 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Hey Christian. Please do. That will be great…make sure to inform Ed so it's on the agenda for the team meeting.

The code the mobile app was developed in wasn't Oracle or Java. As I've spoked to Ed, I want us to use Oracle's ADF and MAF strategies… We'll most likely have a developer meeting with Ed, you, Rakhi, Swetha, and Cindy to see our path forward on how we develop.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 1:36 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Hello Rob

I'll be watching out for this one. We can discuss code options before or during the meeting.

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 11:07 AM
To: EMP_Internal_Team <EMP_Internal_Team@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Request for Modification to Oil DB
Importance: High

Hello Team.
We just received a request for modification to Oil Db. Plus a meeting to discuss new plans for Oil Db and the Mobile App.

Please understand the Mobile Oil Db app was developed in a non-Oracle or Java language, so we are going to have to discuss internally what to do about it... even it means the Mobile Oil Db has to be redeveloped with Oracle/Java code to be accessible via mobile phones/tablets. Something Ed and I discussed several weeks if not months ago.

I will reply to Troy's email to get the people he wants at the meeting. Yes, we may need to have a Skype meeting. TTYS.

Rob

From: Swackhammer, J-Troy
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 10:28 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Cc: Roache, Brendan <Roache.Brendan@epa.gov>; Hyman Moore, Julie <Hyman.Julie@epa.gov>; Jennings, Kim <Jennings.Kim@epa.gov>; Gioffre, Patricia <Gioffre.Patricia@epa.gov>; Howard, MarkW <Howard.MarkW@epa.gov>
Subject: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Rob,

Please see attached mock-up of the requested modification to the inspection record in the Compliance Module of Oil DB. This modification would apply to both SPCC and FRP inspections.

I would like to meet with you to discuss this modification and other changes that have been made recently to Oil DB. Would also like to meet with you to discuss next steps in deployment of the Oil Mobile Apps to the Regions. Regional SPCC and FRP Coordinators are requesting an update as to when they will be made available.

Please advise on your availability to meet with you and the new development team at CSRA.

Thx,
Troy

Message

From: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: 4/13/2018 5:36:22 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Hello Rob

I'll be watching out for this one. We can discuss code options before or during the meeting.

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 11:07 AM
To: EMP_Internal_Team <EMP_Internal_Team@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Request for Modification to Oil DB
Importance: High

Hello Team.
We just received a request for modification to Oil Db. Plus a meeting to discuss new plans for Oil Db and the Mobile App.

Please understand the Mobile Oil Db app was developed in a non-Oracle or Java language, so we are going to have to discuss internally what to do about it... even it means the Mobile Oil Db has to be redeveloped with Oracle/Java code to be accessible via mobile phones/tablets. Something Ed and I discussed several weeks if not months ago.

I will reply to Troy's email to get the people he wants at the meeting. Yes, we may need to have a Skype meeting. TTYS.

Rob

From: Swackhammer, J-Troy
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 10:28 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Cc: Roache, Brendan <Roache.Brendan@epa.gov>; Hyman Moore, Julie <Hyman.Julie@epa.gov>; Jennings, Kim <Jennings.Kim@epa.gov>; Gioffre, Patricia <Gioffre.Patricia@epa.gov>; Howard, MarkW <Howard.MarkW@epa.gov>
Subject: Request for Modification to Oil DB

Rob,

Please see attached mock-up of the requested modification to the inspection record in the Compliance Module of Oil DB. This modification would apply to both SPCC and FRP inspections.

I would like to meet with you to discuss this modification and other changes that have been made recently to Oil DB. Would also like to meet with you to discuss next steps in deployment of the Oil Mobile Apps to the Regions. Regional SPCC and FRP Coordinators are requesting an update as to when they will be made available.

Please advise on your availability to meet with you and the new development team at CSRA.

Thx,
Troy

Message

From: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/17/2018 7:19:16 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy

Hey Rob,

Nothing from Elliot unfortunately. I had assumed we were not going to hear back. Christian has another version of the code he can baseline, if needed. His opinion is that we should continue to press them on this. My opinion is that we should baseline what we have and begin to move on with our lives, as soon as Dev is ready. Obviously it's your call, though. Feel free to reply again to Elliot on that chain, or I can if you like. I think it may have more weight coming from you, if I'm being honest. He sees me as a competitor, but sees you as a previous – and maybe future – customer.

Talk soon,
Ed Campbell
Web Development Team Project Manager
GDIT Supporting ITS-EPA III Contract
79 TW Alexander Dr, Bld 4401, NC 27713
campbell.ed@epa.gov (o) 919.200.7243
http://intranet.epa.gov/webdev

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 3:13 PM
To: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy
Importance: High

Hi Ed.
Has Elliot wrote you back about what the other developer can provide us? This in regards to the following:

> "identified a discrepancy in the version of the Oil db module that was delivered to us via GoAnywhere on the FTP – it is different than what is on Staging and Production. With that said, we were wondering if it was possible to deliver us the current deployment of the Oil db module on EPA Staging and Production. We would love to see/have the entire source code repository/tree for this module"

If you like, for the next email I can add my input. They should have it on their servers, it's Federally funded/paid for property. Do you want to speak on it at today's EMP Status meeting? You may need to CC: RYAN.FERRARIO@salientcrgt.com the Division Director. Thanks.

Rob Thomas

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 4:26 PM
To: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy

Hi Ed.
I'm good with the plan. By tomorrow, green light to go forward with what we have. Any information coming from salient afterwards we'll adjust accordingly. Thanks for the update.

Rob

From: Campbell, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 4:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy

Hey Rob,

Wanted to ping you on this topic; Christian had asked me today if we had heard any update from Salient. How long would you like to wait on this before we assume we are not going to hear back? The decision on this item will become a blocker for Christian in the next 24-48 hrs, as he establishes a baseline of application versions on the Dev server. If we do not hear back from Salient RE: Oil DB discrepancy, we will use what we received and handle any functionality differences if they arise.

Talk Soon,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III CSRA
79 TW Alexander Dr, Bld 4401, NC 27713
campbell.ed@epa.gov | (o) 919.200.7243
http://intranet.epa.gov/webdev

From: Norman, Elliot (US) [mailto:ELLIOT.NORMAN@salientcrgt.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 4:31 PM
To: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Cc: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy

One of our developers left but I will reach out to the remaining one to see what she can provide and get back to you.

Regards

Elliot Norman
Program Manager | Civilian Services Group – Information Management

SalientCRGT

198 Van Buren Street, Suite 120, Herndon, Virginia 20170
703-429-4449 (o) | SalientCRGT.com
Elliot.Norman@SalientCRGT.com

From: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2018 15:53
To: Norman, Elliot (US) <ELLIOT.NORMAN@salientcrgt.com>
Cc: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA EMP - Oil DB Module Discrepancy

Hello Elliot,

I wanted to reach out to you because we have identified a discrepancy in the version of the oildb module that was delivered to us via GoAnywhere on the FTP – it is different than what is on Staging and Production. With that said, we

were wondering if it was possible to deliver us the current deployment of the oildb module on EPA Staging and Production. We would love to see the entire source code repository / tree for this module, so we could easily identify the difference between what was delivered to us and what is deployed – but failing that, we would settle for the version of the code that is currently deployed. I expect it is something harmless, such as minor tweaks / updates that your developers had made which were not deployed to production yet. We would prefer not to lose these, if possible – and to be sure the difference isn't something more critical. In addition, we want to insure Salient-CRGT has a positive legacy of their latest code on EPA Staging and Production environments.

Thanks,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III CSRA
79 TW Alexander Dr, Bld 4401, NC 27713
campbell.ed@epa.gov | (o) 919.200.7243
http://intranet.epa.gov/webdev

Message

From: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/17/2018 4:30:42 PM
To: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

Thanks, Rob. Between you and I, Christian has really rubbed some of my colleagues the wrong way thus far; being overly aggressive and accusatory of folks "causing" delays when trying to get what he wants. I have been working to mitigate the damage to the relationships with these other teams, as we will need them again and often in the future. Because of this though, most of his communication to them is occurring through me now. That is why I wanted to emphasize that his picture is not necessarily 100% accurate.

Talk with you soon,

Ed

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:38 AM
To: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Ed.

Sounds like they are making good progress, finally. I hope it happens today.

Yes, we talked from two old emails I meant to reply to him on. Most of the convo was basically what he is doing or wants to do with the application code and how Salient-CRGT still have not provided a repository of the data.

In regards, to the WAM/Middleware I have the same conclusion as you stated in the above paragraph. I figured by the emails I've seen they didn't give him the full picture, yet NCC is still behind schedule on getting the Dev server online ready for us to move forward with our work. The guy is hungry/anxious to show his skills for the Agency and transparent which is way more then what was done previously. I inform to make sure he keeps you in the loop, if he is then I won't keep telling him that… cause it irritate you. I've informed me how govt bureaucracy can be slow and at time work against your best efforts. Thanks for the update.

Rob

From: Campbell, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:34 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Rob,

I wanted to give you a brief update on the Dev server status this morning. Since Friday, Paula has been working to configure the Ex. 4 CBI and coordinating with the IAM / WAM team to put into place the appropriate security certificates, and enable traffic to occur to and from the server on the appropriate ports. As of this morning, they appear to be nearing completion / complete hand-off of the server to Rakhi and Christian. I am pressing them for this to happen today, ideally before the meeting this afternoon. Paula has not used or exceeded her estimated 20 hours of initial setup at this point.

As a related note, did you happen to have correspondence with Christian on Friday? He sent me a few snippets of conversation with you on Friday, but did not send me a full email, so I am not sure what status he might have communicated to you. Christian does not usually have the full picture from WAM / Middleware, as they try to allow him to focus on development while they do their configuration.

Talk with you soon,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III GDIT
79 TW Alexander Dr, Bld 4401, NC 27713
campbell.ed@epa.gov | (o) 919.200.7243
http://intranet.epa.gov/webdev

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/17/2018 2:21:26 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Christian.

Let's have a talk soon. For the record I try to be transparent as a team…because some things happened on the previous contract were others didn't know. When I ask to inform Ed, it's not from an authoritative standpoint is to make sure he is in the loop as a PM. I don't want to step on anyone's duties or authority. I need everyone on the team to make these things work.
TTYS.

Rob Thomas

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 3:25 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I just wanted to let you know I took a lot of heat from Ed today about letting him know what you wanted. I received a lot of heat and so I wasn't sure how to respond to you earlier today as part of Ed's heat was about me letting Ed know what was needed and your thoughts on things wrt NCC/Security, etc

I love the work that you have here and am very experienced in all the technologies being used. All those companies in Silicon Valley, etc over the years including when I was in Verizon in 95 and was asked to lead NMS for Video which required me to work in California with a leader in distributed computing.

I also agree 100% with you about how the NCC has been burning federal dollars slowing things down. Fortunately, I am on EPA mail and so I can write this to you with ease. Perhaps one day I could work directly with EPA versus in a corp which is dragging things along. I am with you on everything and just as shocked as you are on some of what they are doing to slow it down. Ed is fairly new to software and was formerly working in databases only and so it appears software is something new for Ed.

Anyways, I look forward to these private discussions and will need to keep Ed out of these discussions whenever we do discuss.

Best wishes,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:26 AM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Sounds great.
Thank you. Likewise.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT

949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM

To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard de facto Linux README for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares

bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Apache and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group "emp". That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
T: 919-200-7309 |M: 919-260-2750 | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need **emp** group access if no jdaemon sudo access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have jdaemon. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Apache files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have root on the dev box? Or sudo to jdaemon? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik

<Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/16/2018 12:25:40 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Sounds great.
Thank you. Likewise.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an apache is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard Ex. 4 CBI README for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files (Ex. 4 CBI applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Apache and all its configs, and Tomcat and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group "emp". That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need **emp** group access if no Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Apache files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have root on the dev box? Or Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under Ex. 4 CBI. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only jdaemon has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [Thomas.Rob@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/16/2018 12:24:16 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Great.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:39:42 PM
To: Thomas, Rob
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Shall do.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.
Great.
Let him know.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes, I will speak to Ed about this on Monday so something changes.

I'm still waiting on my RAM upgrade for 2 months too for local machine.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:29 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

Good to know.. sometimes new ppl shack things up. This is something you all should bring up to Ed to champion it up the CSRA command
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:23 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

- *Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.*

Yes, you can imagine the frustration that I have been going thru with NCC. IAM/WAM team seems to be more efficient as Maury is newer on their team and has a different outlook. Greg from IT support/servers/networks, is very efficient. I can't say the same for NCC.

- I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

Yes, NCC definitely needs to improve their processes and never leave us hanging. I once needed nighttime support for Ericsson back in 1996 as Senior Engineering Technical Lead on Christmas week and got a fast turn around that same day.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Awesome! After 2 or 3 times with a hour or so gap in between them… you level up to the chain of command that you speak of via Ed. I want those names gone like yesterday… this is unacceptable.

I picked that up when I spoke to you. I'm the same way… there are milestones, protocols, and procedures to almost everything. This NCC group has broken them and it showed on the survey I completed. I'm pushing for SLA on inside technical support. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I shall do ASAP (next email out now). I mentioned this several times to them in emails. As you can see names are still there. I would think at least their access was revoked to the machines so being in a group isn't as bad as if they still had access. But that will go into the email as well that I send out.

My recommendation between you and I is this:

Someone from CSRA is appointed high up that can make sure NCC/WAM perform things that are required much faster. This way they can coordinate with EMP CSRA team and get things done fast (like I am accustomed to in the F500 world and the tech startup world. My background is with Verizon, Boeing, NASA, NRL, Google Digital Marketing Partner, Nissan/Infiniti, ATT/iPass, Tango.me (mobile app similar to skype) with 400M+ in funding, TIBCO, Seagate Technology, Ericsson, Fujitsu, ADP, United Health, Capital Group Companies (managing $3T in assets for mutual funds), and others ...

Between you and I, never seen anything this slow.

At United Health, for example, 1 hour to get up and running but diff situation. We were writing code the first day (all experienced engineers).
At ADP, 1 day (because we had to integrate Ex. 4 CBI
At Capital Group, no time (since it was setup prior to me starting)
...

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:50 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Make sure you inform Ed of this behavior from NCC. So he can have those names removed. Their contract was cancelled and some of those 5 user name need to removed, yesterday. This violates FISMA NIST 800-53 Rev 4 Security Controls on proper user access. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

One other thing to note – if you look at the bottom right of the **BEFORE** image inserted here, you will see that prior to the change, I ran a group info linux command and saw that salient development team was still on the group (but new dev wasn't). That was one of the issues. So if you recall, you, I, and Ed all requested to the NCC that we needed access. Initially it was sudo jdaemon priv, then it was an alternative user, and also group access. Paula finally changed the permissions so I had read access and added me to the group:

BEFORE

Ex. 4 CBI

AFTER

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 5:06 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi
Importance: High

Hello Rob,

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I am not sure why they would not want us to know – after all, we are picking up where they had left off. Meanwhile progress from NCC/Paula/LeAnn is being made, just not yet finalized. Permissions were reset to read except for keys and dev was added to group emp on staging.

I think when you say ***"comprehensive forensic analysis"*** *it may cause some discomfort... you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/* Ex. 4 CBI *in the first place".*

I did analysis on what groups the dev teams were part of, etc. – even though I know already what groups, permissions which we need to have regardless (which match for some things on staging from previous dev team at Salient – their lanids were still part of the emp group, for example). Those permissions were requested early on in Feb, March, etc and finally we just had to get it once we got the new dev server. Recently, upon a discussion with Ed/Ali and LeAnn based on my request once again, NCC/Paula/Dan finally added me to the emp group on staging and she changed the permissions so we have read access now by my request.

*Lastly, Dan's comment "****thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer****" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that... after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.*

Yes, you are correct – that is NOT what we will do (on Ex. 4 CBI it should be prod so then I build and deploy on Ex. 4 CBI we can compare to prod, regardless of where they were on staging). Later focus on what's on staging although Ex. 4 CBI by default will be compared with staging since it never made it over to prod.

What Salient provided us was one local dev code base (local Ex. 4 CBI from a developer's laptop) without the master repository. A repository has all the branches, tags, and the main trunk. Each brank/tagged release is what one deploys off of (or they deploy off whatever's current on the trunk). So Salient should have provided us with their repository.

According to Cindy, Salient had an internal meeting after being cut out for future dev, where the Salient dev team/mgt team had wondered when EPA/CSRA would request the repository. No one inquired about it from CSRA/EPA, and so they didn't go the extra step in providing it. Also, Cindy said that they would keep the repo around for 6 months. Ed made that request recently. I requested this early on in Feb in all team meetings (Tues, Wed, and Thurs mtgs) and in email. We're still within the 6 months, so I think if you escalate this over to them, we could potentially get it.

I requested the repository once I had access to what they had provided in Feb – and I was told in our meetings/emails that Salient might not be giving us the repository upon request. I requested the repository several times on different occasions.

So once we have our empdev finished from NCC/Paula/LeAnn, then I could run what I build locally/deploy onto empdev and test - as it requires integration with IAM that can only be done on a server or we would need static ip addresses for laptops for Oracle's IAM services (server, proxy, Ex. 4 CBI).

So the code provided could be one of the following (outside of empadmin and which match after being built locally and compared with already compiled code on staging):

a) the code provided was staging's most recent deployment;

b) the code provided was was production's most recent deployment;
c) the code was neither (a) or (b) in its entirety and had additional features/code that was developed after the most recent deployment to staging and prod;
d) a combination of (a) and (b);
e) a combination of (a), (b) and (c);
f) a combination of (a) and (c); or
g) a combination of (b) and (c)

Best,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.

Glad you kept Ed in the loop. I believe they don't want you and Ed to find out what Salient-CRGT were doing. Understand we are billed by NCC, the extra stuff S-CRGT created the extra stuff OEM paid for, that's unnecessary to do.

I think when you say **"comprehensive forensic analysis"** it may cause some discomfort…you could be picking them apart. I concur with you and Ed that you all should have the same rights if not more as the previous contractor i.e. "they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place".

Lastly, Dan's comment "thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer" Is NOT what we will do. I think Ed and you understand that…after we get all we need from NCC will re-platform the Dev, Staging, & Production environments. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:17 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Absolutely. This has gone off board. I had to circle with Ed at least a dozen times to get Paula to do anything for us.

Recall the logs.

The other day, Paula thought you didn't know what Ex. 4 CBI instances were and I had to correct her.

The Ex. 4 CBI thing the past.

Paula has a habit of circumventing the issues altogether and reposing questions to others. I can't even fathom who would want to look at Java logs than Java developers.

Fortunately, I now have root and jdaemon on dev so for full control on dev we will be OK.

Now IAM will be finishing soon with dev IAM, then Paula's team will at the very least be involved with the first install to match precisely what's on stage/prod. Some of the files/directories are hidden, so I have been working on getting that in the past several days.

Never used LOL in an email – here goes my first one. LOL. ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Keep me posted for any actions I need to approve of. I agree we need to have the same rights, access, permissions at the previous contractor. Even as they developed offsite. LOL.
Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:04 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I put you on bcc for this thread, since it has been very difficult getting Dan/Paula to properly grant us staging access to see the files there. We're working on it steadfast here, just wanted to keep you in the loop (in bcc).

BCC is sufficient, now that Dan is going to act on it.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only jdaemon has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/17/2018 5:47:30 PM
To: Leckner, Erik [Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com]
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

About to give you a quick call.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 12:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob,

Anytime. My number is always on my signature too ☺

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Christian.

Let's have a talk soon. For the record I try to be transparent as a team…because some things happened on the previous contract were others didn't know. When I ask to inform Ed, it's not from an authoritative standpoint is to make sure he is in the loop as a PM. I don't want to step on anyone's duties or authority. I need everyone on the team to make these things work.
TTYS.

Rob Thomas

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 3:25 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Rob

I just wanted to let you know I took a lot of heat from Ed today about letting him know what you wanted. I received a lot of heat and so I wasn't sure how to respond to you earlier today as part of Ed's heat was about me letting Ed know what was needed and your thoughts on things wrt NCC/Security, etc

I love the work that you have here and am very experienced in all the technologies being used. All those companies in Silicon Valley, etc over the years including when I was in Verizon in 95 and was asked to lead NMS for Video which required me to work in California with a leader in distributed computing.

I also agree 100% with you about how the NCC has been burning federal dollars slowing things down. Fortunately, I am on EPA mail and so I can write this to you with ease. Perhaps one day I could work directly with EPA versus in a corp which is dragging things along. I am with you on everything and just as shocked as you are on some of what they are doing to slow it down. Ed is fairly new to software and was formerly working in databases only and so it appears software is something new for Ed.

Anyways, I look forward to these private discussions and will need to keep Ed out of these discussions whenever we do discuss.

Best wishes,

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 8:26 AM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Christian.
Sounds great.
Thank you. Likewise.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:40 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

I will discuss with Ed when he returns on Monday.

Have a great weekend if I don't hear from you today more.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:36 PM

To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Good job.
Yes this is true.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

I had added Ali onto the emails when I saw things weren't getting done. The two then went to LeAnn and there were still issues with NCC and then I re-emphased to Ed/Ali that it must be all or best effort, not partial and no effort.

But given we are still left hanging from NCC as to where they are on things but they are working on it – there should be an escalation of command that can get NCC and WAN to work on things in an ASAP fashion.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:31 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hah. And I don't want to see the half… I'll hit the roof and start writing Paul, Ali, Jerry myself.

Glad Ed spoke to Ali. Good. Thanks.

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob,

Yes and you're only seeing the half of it. One time when Paula updated the passwords, there were stale server process that was left unchecked/unfixed. That went on for 7 days on staging in the past several weeks.

Thank you for working on the chain of command going forward – too many delays and unnecessary responses/emails for simple stuff. You should see emails that you weren't part of – it was beginning to get fairly off the wall in the past two weeks until I told Ed something has to be done about it. Ali/Ed spoke to LeAnn recently about this to get the group access, etc.

Soon we will have our machine and I can start setting it up based on the steps we need to do prior to dev as outlined in several previous emails. They will be less in the picture going forward.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2018 6:21 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hey Christian.

I read the email thread, it's unacceptable of the responses you and Ed received. People are in these Federal Contract positions and you have to see responses like you're in high school. There should be set procedures and communication templates with a hard line stance on usage. They make difficult for themselves. This is something I need to speak to Ed about and then go up their chain of command. This makes EPA looks more than bad… they're burning federal resources and what is the result. Thanks.

Rob

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:51 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Rob

Now that LeAnn is getting the message, things will happen. The silos are coming down altogether – especially here ☺ The fact that we now have metal (dev machine), I am making sure we get all what we need now so I can and Rakhi can do our work. Push has come to shove and the time is right.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:47 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group emp on staging access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn

The other additional items were requested by Ed earlier today (outside of this email thread). I included in my previous email.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:46 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Leann

Thank you. About the two list items, thank you – yes I need both and Rakhi.

I need a **README** for anything that touches the dev server and I mean anything (if a file is put there, an Ex. 4 CBI is built, an install is made, a config file is added, a file is touched), I would love to see a normal standard Ex. 4 CBI README for it.

I also would like to see the entire set of prod files (Ex. 4 CBI) applications, etc) put in their original raw form on development as they are versus in pieces/fragments/portions. I need to do diff compares bytewise to ensure what Salient left us (only one local dev working version) matches with what's currently on production, byte for byte.

Thank you very much.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Let's see if I have it.

- You need read access for Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs, and Ex. 4 CBI and all its configs. Paula would you be so kind as to implement that, as we just discussed, and reply back.
- You and Rakhi need to be a member of the group "emp". That's fine too. I will open a ticket for you.

Anything I missed?

Upcoming out of office times:

March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi LeAnn,

I thought it was fairly clear and unambiguous in my emails as to what I need. Thank you for your inquiry.

I need **emp** group access if no Ex. 4 CBI access. This would not complicate builds, etc if we have Ex. 4 CBI. Been in tech as CTO even at F500, Google, NASA, Verizon, ATT, Ericsson, iPass, etc., for 23+ years with 20+ years additional contracts currently so 43-50 years of experience. Earlier today, I saw an email asking if I knew how subversion worked.

Then I need the Ex. 4 CBI files, conf files, etc to be set to read access for **everything** related to EMP.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Spradling, LeAnn
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

I spoke to Ed about something which I think is realted to this, earlier today but have not yet had a chance to write you a reply.
Can you expand upon this however:
"I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev."

You have root on the dev box? Or Ex. 4 CBI? And you can create groups on the box? Perhaps I am confused.

We cannot give you access to Ex. 4 CBI user as this will complicate middleware builds and maintenance.

We can give you read access to conf, logs and other directories under tomcat. This is what I understand the need was.

Upcoming out of office times:
March 30 afternoon
April 12-15
Contact Stephen Rushing at 919-200-7294
Thanks,
LeAnn Spradling, RHCSA, CSM, PMP
CSRA
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) | spradling.leann@epa.gov

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan

I have Ex. 4 CBI on dev and I created a group Ex. 4 CBI on dev.

For staging, we need at the very least emp group access. Rob and I both requested to Paula group access to all the files related to EMP under Rob's ownership several times.

There are additional directories/files which only Ex. 4 CBI has access to on staging. If you grant me/Rakhi Ex. 4 CBI access we can see all of it. If it needs to be just emp group access, then Paula needs to restore the proper permissions for read access to emp. This restrictions had caused great hardships for both Rakhi and I.

Thank you.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Need to know the way to arrange that for you and Rakhi. Is it done by adding you to a WAM group? If so, which group? That request would need to get to the WAM team.

Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>; Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hello Dan

Thanks. I requested Ex. 4 CBI access in early February 2018.

As you can see the previous dev team had access as their lanids are in the group in my comprehensive forensic analysis.

After all, they were the ones to decide/develop/create the files/ Ex. 4 CBI in the first place.

We should see what they saw/created.

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

From: Ferko, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Childers, Paula <Childers.Paula@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>; Leckner, Erik <Leckner.Erik@usepa.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: RE: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Paula,

I'm thinking we want things set up in EMP staging similar to how it was when Salient was the developer.

Is there a particular WAM group to which Rahki and Christian should be added, to give them privs that are approved for developers in Staging?

Thanks,
Dan

From: Leckner, Erik
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Ferko, Dan <Ferko.Daniel@epa.gov>
Cc: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>; Spradling, LeAnn <Spradling.LeAnn@epa.gov>
Subject: Group Ex. 4 CBI on Ex. 4 CBI access for eleckner, Rakhi

Hi Dan,

Could you please provide eleckner and Rakhi **emp** group membership on staging? Currently, we are not part of the group.

Thanks in advance.

Ex. 4 CBI

Christian Leckner
Principal Engineer
ITS-EPA | CSRA
San Diego, CA 92028 | PDT
949-244-6501 | leckner.erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Thomas, Rob [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FA5671F147D3470E9F2630FC4C941375-THOMAS, ROB]
Sent: 4/17/2018 4:57:37 PM
To: Campbell, Ed [Campbell.Ed@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

You're welcome Ed. I can understand, I once did that in my early days. Because I didn't the speed and priority that other work, yet they will rush you for something to be done.

Yeah I can see how his frustration came out in that way. Well that would be the plan to push those issues through you and just relax and take notes on their slow turn around. I do. Trust me.

I have phone calls with NCC on different things that they are slow on or are not in communication with the other side of OEI, yet will bark at me for something that I depend on them for.

I'm aware that it's not 100%, but I also have years of history with NCC and what they do or don't in time or what they know are don't about EPA's network. Hopefully, we can patch up our Team with clear lanes of protocol and procedures…then move forward on our projects. Thanks Ed. TTYS.

Rob

From: Campbell, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 12:31 PM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

Thanks, Rob. Between you and I, Christian has really rubbed some of my colleagues the wrong way thus far; being overly aggressive and accusatory of folks "causing" delays when trying to get what he wants. I have been working to mitigate the damage to the relationships with these other teams, as we will need them again and often in the future. Because of this though, most of his communication to them is occurring through me now. That is why I wanted to emphasize that his picture is not necessarily 100% accurate.

Talk with you soon,

Ed

From: Thomas, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:38 AM
To: Campbell, Ed <Campbell.Ed@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Ed.

Sounds like they are making good progress, finally. I hope it happens today.

Yes, we talked from two old emails I meant to reply to him on. Most of the convo was basically what he is doing or wants to do with the application code and how Salient-CRGT still have not provided a repository of the data.

In regards, to the WAM/Middleware I have the same conclusion as you stated in the above paragraph. I figured by the emails I've seen they didn't give him the full picture, yet NCC is still behind schedule on getting the Dev server

online ready for us to move forward with our work. The guy is hungry/anxious to show his skills for the Agency and transparent which is way more then what was done previously. I inform to make sure he keeps you in the loop, if he is then I won't keep telling him that… cause it irritate you. I've informed me how govt bureaucracy can be slow and at time work against your best efforts. Thanks for the update.

Rob

From: Campbell, Ed
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:34 AM
To: Thomas, Rob <Thomas.Rob@epa.gov>
Subject: EMP Dev Server Status

Hi Rob,

I wanted to give you a brief update on the Dev server status this morning. Since Friday, Paula has been working to configure the Ex. 4 CBI and coordinating with the IAM / WAM team to put into place the appropriate security certificates, and enable traffic to occur to and from the server on the appropriate ports. As of this morning, they appear to be nearing completion / complete hand-off of the server to Rakhi and Christian. I am pressing them for this to happen today, ideally before the meeting this afternoon. Paula has not used or exceeded her estimated 20 hours of initial setup at this point.

As a related note, did you happen to have correspondence with Christian on Friday? He sent me a few snippets of conversation with you on Friday, but did not send me a full email, so I am not sure what status he might have communicated to you. Christian does not usually have the full picture from WAM / Middleware, as they try to allow him to focus on development while they do their configuration.

Talk with you soon,

Ed Campbell
ITS-EPA III GDIT
79 TW Alexander Dr, Bld 4401, NC 27713
campbell.ed@epa.gov | (o) 919.200.7243
http://intranet.epa.gov/webdev

FTE Costs - EMP Project Costs

Guident BPA Contract Years: 2007 - 2018

[data as of March 2020]

Employee Name	FTE Annual Cost/Years													Comments
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total	
Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)	**$143,471**	**$149,000**	**$153,200**	**$155,500**	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$601,171	This is an estimate based on grade/step by year.
	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$132,009**	**$136,134**	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$268,143	This is an estimate based on grade/step by year.
	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$115,742**	**$116,901**	$0	$0	$0	$0	$232,643	This is an estimate based on grade/step by year.
	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$105,960**	**$107,505**	**$113,755**	**$116,365**	$443,585	This is an estimate based on grade/step by year.
GRAND TOTAL FTE Costs													**$1,545,542**	

Document Review

IFMS Document: MO EP07D000620 03/17/20

Document Summary: General Ledger Entries
Doc Type: MO
Doc No: EP07D000620
Order Date: 08/17/07
Effective Date: 11/19/09
Closed Date: 09/07/10
Servicing Finance Office: AP22
Order Amount: $4,257,521.04
Paid Amount: $4,257,521.04
Available Amount: $0.00
Vendor Code: MISC **Vendor:** GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC

Document Details: Expand

Line#	Line Amt	Paid Amt	Available Amt	BFY	Fund	Org	Program	Job	BOC	CostOrg	Comments
001	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$0.00	2007	T	D3E	302D72CPA	LEXDSC00	2505		07D3E7E068
002	$268,922.04	$268,922.04	$0.00	2007	T	D3E	302D72CPA	LEXD0000	2505		07D3E7E068
003	$70,000.00	$70,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		08D3T8T004
004	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		08D3T8T004
005	$145,000.00	$145,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSLM0000	2505		08D3T8T008
006	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		08D3T8T008
007	$200,000.00	$200,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		08D3T8T008
008	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		08D3T8T012
009	$180,000.00	$180,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		08D3T8T012
010	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3N	302DC6C	LSMDSC00	2505		08D3N8N059
011	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3N	302DC6C	LSMD0000	2505		08D3N8N059
012	$24,000.00	$24,000.00	$0.00	2008	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSLM0000	2505		08D3N8N059

013	$252,000.00	$252,000.00	$0.00	2008	TC	D3E	302DC6C	LSLM0000	2505		08D3E8E022
014	$28,000.00	$28,000.00	$0.00	2008	TC	D3E	302DC6C	LSCM0000	2505		08D3E8E022
015	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		09D3T9T006
016	$225,000.00	$225,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		09D3T9T006
017	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$0.00	2009	H	D3T	302D91C	LSMD0000	2510		09D3T9T013
018	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2510		09D3T9T013
019	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSMD0000	2510		09D3T9T013
020	$155,000.00	$155,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2510		09D3T9T013
021	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMDSC00	2505		09D3T9T019
022	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEUD0000	2505		09D3T9T019
023	$54,000.00	$54,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		09D3T9T019
024	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSMDSC00	2505		09D3T9T019
025	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEUDSC00	2505		09D3T9T019
026	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSMD0000	2505		09D3T9T019
027	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LSMD0000	2505		09D3T9T021
028	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		09D3T9T023
029	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		09D3T9T023
030	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2009	HC	D3T	302D91C	ZQ00	2509		09D3T9T037
031	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2009	HC	D3T	302D91C	ZQ00	2509		09D3T9T037
032	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXDSC00	2509		09D3T9T037
033	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXD0000	2509		09D3T9T037
034	$4,999.00	$4,999.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	ZZZD73	LSMDSC00	2509		09D3T9T037
035	$70,000.00	$70,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	ZZZD73	LSMD0000	2509		09D3T9T037
036	$115,000.00	$115,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXD0000	2509		09D3T9T038
037	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2009	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXDSC00	2509		09D3T9T038
038	$9,600.00	$9,600.00	$0.00	2009	TC	D3T	ZZZD73C	LEXD0000	2509		09D3T9T038

039	$225,000.00	$225,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2510		10D3T0T003
040	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2510		10D3T0T003
041	$270,000.00	$270,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		10D3T0T005
042	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		10D3T0T005
043	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		10D3T0T006
044	$70,000.00	$70,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		10D3T0T006
045	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		10D3T0T006
046	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		10D3T0T006
047	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		10D3T0T006
048	$540,000.00	$540,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3L	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		10D3T0T009
049	$60,000.00	$60,000.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3L	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		10D3T0T009

Date	Ref Amount	Related Document	Direction	Date	Ref Amount	Related Document	Date	Ref Amount	Related Document
09/07/10	$3,543.42	PV B0091928078	Forward						
07/16/10	$23,620.96	PV B0091817921	Forward						
06/29/10	$45,393.72	PV B0091732613	Forward						
06/15/10	$238,879.30	PV B0091658098	Forward						
04/21/10	$296,143.60	PV B0091527011	Forward						
03/25/10	$258,434.26	PV B0091440198	Forward						
03/04/10	$600,000.00	RQ 10D3T0T009	Back						
02/25/10	$260,452.38	PV B0091337924	Forward						
02/10/10	$206,944.16	PV B0091244475	Forward						
02/09/10	$275,000.00	RQ 10D3T0T006	Back						
12/21/09	$300,000.00	RQ 10D3T0T005	Back						

12/17/09	$211,507.76	PV B0091133700	Forward						
11/30/09	$212,049.71	PV B0091071798	Forward						
11/19/09	$250,000.00	RQ 10D3T0T003	Back						
10/21/09	$194,821.24	PV B0090977435	Forward						
10/01/09	$134,600.00	RQ 09D3T9T038	Back						
09/29/09	$274,999.00	RQ 09D3T9T037	Back						
09/28/09	$100,769.78	PV A9090878414	Forward						
09/28/09	$102,842.34	PV A9090878421	Forward						
09/11/09	$9,554.64	PV A9090878407	Forward						
08/28/09	$150,000.00	RQ 09D3T9T023	Back						
08/24/09	$50,000.00	RQ 09D3T9T021	Back						
08/18/09	$188,514.90	PV A9090795599	Forward						
07/28/09	$260,000.00	RQ 09D3T9T019	Back						
07/16/09	$172,873.76	PV A9090717225	Forward						
06/12/09	$147,302.20	PV A9090622215	Forward						
05/27/09	$151,858.05	PV A9090555209	Forward						
05/07/09	$365,000.00	RQ 09D3T9T013	Back						
04/22/09	$125,889.50	PV A9090482093	Forward						
04/16/09	$113,712.58	PV A9090423836	Forward						
02/26/09	$102,505.18	PV A9001484048	Forward						
02/24/09	$250,000.00	RQ 09D3T9T006	Back						
01/27/09	$93,627.65	PV A9000365904	Forward						
12/17/08	$82,133.20	PV A9000362736	Forward						
11/24/08	$97,545.93	PV A9001611116	Forward						
10/27/08	$94,359.73	PV A9000357008	Forward						
09/29/08	$280,000.00	RQ 08D3E8E022	Back						

09/22/08	$97,235.13	PV A8000163088	Forward						
09/16/08	$124,000.00	RQ 08D3N8N059	Back						
08/18/08	$80,875.66	PV A8000180545	Forward						
08/13/08	$103,505.02	DD A8050035895	Forward						
08/13/08	-$103,505.02	DD A8050035895	Forward						
08/13/08	$0.00	RQ 08D3T8T008	Back						
08/04/08	$200,000.00	RQ 08D3T8T012	Back						
07/24/08	$86,259.67	PV A8000167122	Forward						
07/02/08	$84,227.09	PV A8000009724	Forward						
05/29/08	$74,735.86	PV A8000160745	Forward						
05/20/08	$370,000.00	RQ 08D3T8T008	Back						
04/25/08	$25,000.00	RQ 08D3T8T004	Back						
04/18/08	$18,199.98	PV A8000009263	Forward						
04/10/08	$50,000.00	RQ 08D3T8T004	Back						
02/19/08	$67,007.37	PV A8000005023	Forward						
02/06/08	$71,090.70	PV A8000006082	Forward						
01/16/08	$15,741.64	PV A8000011708	Forward						
01/10/08	$65,328.72	PV A8000029502	Forward						
12/13/07	$61,539.27	PV A8000027697	Forward						
10/01/07	$268,922.04	RQ 07D3E7E068	Back						
08/17/07	$30,000.00	RQ 07D3E7E068	Back						

Compass Data Warehouse Document Review **Compass Document: MO EP10D000265**

Document Summary: General Ledger Entries
Doc Type: MO
Doc No: EP10D000265
Order Date: 03/16/10
Closed Date:
Servicing Finance Office: RTPFC
Order Amount: $8,439,559.01
Net Paid Amount: $8,439,550.48
Closed Amount: $8,439,550.48
Available Amount: $8.53
Vendor Code: MISC * **Vendor:** GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
Vendor Legal Name: GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
Description: CONVERSION
Extended Description:
Guident Call

Document Details: Expand

Line #	Line Amt	Expended Amt	Closed Amt	Refunded Amt	Available Amt	BFY	Fund	Org	Program	Project	FOC	Cost Org	Comments	Extended Description
1	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3L	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T008	
2	$90,00	$90,000.00	$90,00	$0.00	$0.00	20	T	D3L	302D	LEXD0000	25		RQ|10D3T	

	0.00		0.00			10			72C		05		0T008	
3	$531,000.00	$531,000.00	$531,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXD0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T011	
4	$130,000.00	$130,000.00	$130,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T011	
5	$162,000.00	$162,000.00	$162,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T011	
6	$59,000.00	$59,000.00	$59,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T011	
7	$18,000.00	$18,000.00	$18,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXMSC00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T011	
8	$180,000.00	$180,000.00	$180,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQDWH001	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
9	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQDWH001	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	

10	$23,000.00	$23,000.00	$23,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302DC6C	LEXDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
11	$207,000.00	$207,000.00	$207,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302DC6C	LEXD0000	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
12	$35,000.00	$35,000.00	$35,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
13	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302D72C	LEXMSC00	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
14	$90,844.29	$90,844.29	$90,844.29	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
15	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RQ|10D3B0B052	
16	$208,338.37	$208,338.37	$208,338.37	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQ00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T012	
17	$30,00	$30,000.00	$30,00	$0.00	$0.00	20	HR	D3EXD	302D	ZQDW	25		RQ|10D3T	

	0.00		0.00			10		WH	91C	H001	05		0T012	
18	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEUD0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T013	
19	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T013	
20	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3E	302DC6C	LSMD0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T013	
21	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3T	302D72C	LSMD0000	2505		RQ|10D3T0T013	
22	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3E	302DC6C	LSMDSC00	2505		RQ|10D3T0T013	
23	$225,000.00	$225,000.00	$225,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	H	07WH	302D91C	LEXD0000	2505		RQ|1007W80025	
24	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	H	07WH	302D91C	LEXDSC00	2505		RQ|1007W80025	

26	$538,000.00	$538,000.00	$538,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2010	T	D3B	302D72C	LSMM0000	2505		RQ|10D3B0B086	
27	$840,688.44	$840,688.44	$840,688.44	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQDWH001	2505		RQ|10D3B0B085	
28	$291,661.63	$291,661.63	$291,661.63	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQDWH001	2505		RQ|10D3T0T012	
29	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|11D3T15002	
30	$450,000.00	$450,000.00	$450,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXD0000	2505		RE|11D3T15002	
31	$591,789.00	$591,789.00	$591,789.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TCD	D3T	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15003	
32	$81,499.00	$81,499.00	$81,499.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TCD	D3T	302DC6C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15003	

313	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$150,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15003	
314	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TCD	D3T	302D72C	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|11D3T15003	
315	$504,000.00	$504,000.00	$504,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15004	
316	$56,000.00	$56,000.00	$56,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|11D3T15004	
317	$230,000.00	$230,000.00	$230,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302DC6C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15005	
318	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	H	D3T	302D91C	LSMDSC00	2505		RE|11D3T15008	
319	$351,235.00	$351,235.00	$351,235.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15010	
410	$127,169.00	$127,169.00	$127,169.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TCD	D3T	302D72C	LEXM0000	2505		RE|11D3T15010	

41	$53,196.00	$53,196.00	$53,196.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	302D72C	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|11D3T15010	
42	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	H	D3T	302D91C	LSMD0000	2505		RE|11D3T15008	
43	$172,500.00	$172,500.00	$172,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	T	D3T	ZZZD73C	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|11D3T15017	
44	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TCD	D3T	302D72C	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|11D3T15017	
45	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$135,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T15001	EMP Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M-Incremental funding. $135,000 of this money is for EMP maintenance (LEXM0000) and $15,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
46	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T15001	EMP Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M-Incremental funding. $135,000 of this money is for EMP maintenance (LEXM0000) and $15,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
47	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51001	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. $45,000 (LEXD0000) and $5,000 is for EMP security (LEXDSC00).
48	$80,000.00	$80,000.00	$80,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51002	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $64,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $16,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $16,000 (LEXD0000) and $4,000 (LEXDSC00).

49	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51002	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $64,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $16,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $16,000 (LEXD0000) and $4,000 (LEXDSC00).
50	$306,000.00	$306,000.00	$306,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51003	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $306,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $34,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $9,000 (LEXD0000) and $1,000 (LEXDSC00).
51	$34,000.00	$34,000.00	$34,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T51003	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $306,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $34,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $9,000 (LEXD0000) and $1,000 (LEXDSC00).
52	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51003	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $306,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $34,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $9,000 (LEXD0000) and $1,000 (LEXDSC00).
53	$1,000.00	$991.47	$991.47	$0.00	$8.53	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T51003	Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $306,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $34,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $9,000 (LEXD0000) and $1,000 (LEXDSC00).
54	$247,982.57	$247,982.57	$247,982.57	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51005	RE12D3T51005
55	$33,000.00	$33,000.00	$33,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T51005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $297,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance; $33,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00); and $10,000 is for the Oil Database (LEXD000).
56	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T51005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies GS-35F-0799M. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $297,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance; $33,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00); and $10,000 is for the Oil Database (LEXD000).

57	$224,155.71	$224,155.71	$224,155.71	$0.00	$0.00	2010	HR	D3EXDWH	302D91C	ZQDWH001	2505		RE|13D3T51001	Additional funding of $224,155.71 for Guident Technologies GS 35F-0799 to be added to Orgn: D3EXDWH PRC: 302D91C Site: ZQDWH001.

Document Activity:

Date	Ref Amount	Related Document	Direction	Date	Ref Amount	Related Document	Date	Ref Amount	Related Document
07/25/2013	-$224,155.71	Decrease							
07/22/2013	-$49,017.43	RE 12D3T51005	Back						
05/01/2013	$224,155.71	RE 13D3T51001	Back						
05/01/2013	$0.00	SPV B3000601178	Forward						
05/09/2012	$271,236.41	SPV B2094620294	Forward						
05/04/2012	$126,562.40	SPV B2094674846	Forward						
03/22/2012	$257,317.08	SPV B2094474538	Forward						
03/13/2012	$263,473.75	SPV B2094371905	Forward						
03/01/2012	$340,000.00	RE 12D3T51005	Back						
02/02/2012	$319,785.89	SPV B2094203893	Forward						
01/26/2012	$350,000.00	RE 12D3T51003	Back						
12/29/2011	$100,000.00	RE 12D3T51002	Back						
12/27/2011	$354,138.89	SPV B2094112911	Forward						
12/14/2011	$8,756.60	SPV B2000290062	Forward						
12/09/2011	$330,741.44	SPV B2094006067	Forward						
12/02/2011	$150,000.00	RE 12D3T15001	Back						
12/02/2011	$50,000.00	RE 12D3T51001	Back						

11/16/2011	$301,176.92	SPV B2093892647	Forward						
10/10/2011	$6,206,361.10	PVC MOEP10D000265	Forward						
10/09/2011	$7,498,576.44	Increase							

Compass Data Warehouse Document Review **Compass Document: ME EPB12H00069**

Document Summary: General Ledger Entries
Doc Type: ME
Doc No: EPB12H00069
Order Date: 04/20/12
Closed Date: 06/21/19
Servicing Finance Office: RTPFC
Order Amount: $9,016,247.73
Net Paid Amount: $9,016,247.73
Closed Amount: $9,016,247.73
Available Amount: $0.00
Vendor Code: 2200009693 * **Vendor:** GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
Vendor Legal Name: GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
Description: Document ME EPB12H00069 reversed on 09/06/2018
Extended Description:
The purpose

Document Details: Expand

Line #	Line Amt	Expended Amt	Closed Amt	Refunded Amt	Available Amt	BFY	Fund	Org	Program	Project	FOC	CostOrg	Comments	Extended Description
1	$685,00	$685,000.00	$685,00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM	205		RE|12D3T5	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $685,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $75,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). $166,500 is for Oil Database funding (LSMD0000) and $18,500 for Oil Database security (LSMDSC00).

	0.00		0.00						0000			1006	
2	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	205		RE|12D3T51006	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $685,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $75,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). $166,500 is for Oil Database funding (LSMD0000) and $18,500 for Oil Database security (LSMDSC00).
3	$12,027.76	$12,027.76	$12,027.76	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMD0000	205		RE|12D3T51006	RE12D3T51006
4	$1,336.42	$1,336.42	$1,336.42	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMDSC00	205		RE|12D3T51006	RE12D3T51006
5	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	$400,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|12D3T51008	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $360,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $40,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
6	$40,500.00	$40,500.00	$40,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	205		RE|12D3T51009	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $40,500(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $4500 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
7	$4,500.00	$4,500.00	$4,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	205		RE|12D3T51009	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $40,500(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $4500 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).

8	$166,500.00	$166,500.00	$166,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	2505		RE|12D3T5101 0	To amend Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020 to deobligate existing oil funding and reobligate the oil funding to correct the lines of accounting data for lines 4 and 5 on the contract for the following: Previous lines of accounting Site/Project code: Line 4: $166,500 for Oil Database funding (LSMD0000) and Line 5: $18,500 for Oil Database security (LSMDSC00) The correct Site/Project Codes should be: Line 4: $166,500 (Oil Database funding) LSMM0000 - and Line 5: LSMMSC00 - $18,500 (Oil Database Security)
9	$18,500.00	$18,500.00	$18,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T5101 0	To amend Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020 to deobligate existing oil funding and reobligate the oil funding to correct the lines of accounting data for lines 4 and 5 on the contract for the following: Previous lines of accounting Site/Project code: Line 4: $166,500 for Oil Database funding (LSMD0000) and Line 5: $18,500 for Oil Database security (LSMDSC00) The correct Site/Project Codes should be: Line 4: $166,500 (Oil Database funding) LSMM0000 - and Line 5: LSMMSC00 - $18,500 (Oil Database Security)
10	$406,852.00	$406,852.00	$406,852.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|12D3T5101 2	Incremental funding for EMP - Guident Technologies Contract EP-BPA-12-H-0020 for Emergency Management Portal (EMP) - $406,852 is for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000); $45,206 is for EMP Security (LEXMSC00); $31,377 is for Oil database funding (LSMM0000); and $3,486 is for Oil database security (LSMMSC00) for total funding at $486,921.
11	$45,206.00	$45,206.00	$45,206.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T5101 2	Incremental funding for EMP - Guident Technologies Contract EP-BPA-12-H-0020 for Emergency Management Portal (EMP) - $406,852 is for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000); $45,206 is for EMP Security (LEXMSC00); $31,377 is for Oil database funding (LSMM0000); and $3,486 is for Oil database security (LSMMSC00) for total funding at $486,921.
12	$31,377.00	$31,377.00	$31,377.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	2505		RE|12D3T5101 2	Incremental funding for EMP - Guident Technologies Contract EP-BPA-12-H-0020 for Emergency Management Portal (EMP) - $406,852 is for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000); $45,206 is for EMP Security (LEXMSC00); $31,377 is for Oil database funding (LSMM0000); and $3,486 is for Oil database security (LSMMSC00) for total funding at $486,921.
13	$3,486.00	$3,486.00	$3,486.00	$0.00	$0.00	2012	H	D3T	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|12D3T5101 2	Incremental funding for EMP - Guident Technologies Contract EP-BPA-12-H-0020 for Emergency Management Portal (EMP) - $406,852 is for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000); $45,206 is for EMP Security (LEXMSC00); $31,377 is for Oil database funding (LSMM0000); and $3,486 is for Oil database security (LSMMSC00) for total funding at $486,921.

14	$247,500.00	$247,500.00	$247,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $315,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $35,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
15	$67,500.00	$67,500.00	$67,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	H	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $315,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $35,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
16	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	205		RE|13D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $315,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $35,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
17	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	H	D3T	303D91	LSMMSC00	205		RE|13D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $315,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $35,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
18	$22,500.00	$22,500.00	$22,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1004	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, TO EPB12H00069 initial funding for Option Year 1, 4/16/2013 - 4/15/2014. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $22,500(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $2,500 is EMP security (LEXMSC00).
19	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	205		RE|13D3T5 1004	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, TO EPB12H00069 initial funding for Option Year 1, 4/16/2013 - 4/15/2014. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $22,500(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $2,500 is EMP security (LEXMSC00).

20	$153,000.00	$153,000.00	$153,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1003	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $163,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $17,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
21	$17,000.00	$17,000.00	$17,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	205		RE|13D3T5 1003	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $163,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $17,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
22	$234,000.00	$234,000.00	$234,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
23	$26,000.00	$26,000.00	$26,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	205		RE|13D3T5 1005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
24	$67,500.00	$67,500.00	$67,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	H	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	205		RE|13D3T5 1005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
25	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	H	D3T	303D91	LSMM	205		RE|13D3T5	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database

									SC00			1005	funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
26	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEUM0000	2505		RE|13D3T51005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
27	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEUMSC00	2505		RE|13D3T51005	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $234,000,000(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $26,000 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). Oil Database Funding: $67,500 is for Oil DB Maintenance (LSMM0000)and $7,500 is for Oil DB security (LSMMSC0). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00).
28	$19,286.00	$19,286.00	$19,286.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D4L	303DC9	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|13D4L15005	Incremental funding to support ERNS web service data pull for the OSWER/Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office (FFRRO) under the Guident Technologies contract #EP-BPA-12-H-0020, TO #EP-B12H-00069. Contractor estimate: 136 hours for $19,285.36
29	$24,600.00	$24,600.00	$24,600.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013 2014	B	51HA	ZZZGF2	n/a	2508		RE|1351HHA103	To provide incremental funding to support OARM efforts under the Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Option Year 1 4/16/2013-4/15/2014. Contract will provide OARM with access to the Field Readiness (FR) application to SHEM data managers in addition to providing technical support and training to the Safety, Health, and Environmental Program in the use of FR, and will include SHEMD in the FR Change Control Board and change control process.
30	$5,400.00	$5,400.00	$5,400.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	51HA	ZZZGF2X03	HQ00BM00	2508		RE|1351HHA103	To provide incremental funding to support OARM efforts under the Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Option Year 1 4/16/2013-4/15/2014. Contract will provide OARM with access to the Field Readiness (FR) application to SHEM data managers in addition to providing technical support and training to the Safety, Health, and Environmental Program in the use of FR, and will include SHEMD in the FR Change Control Board and change control process.

31	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|13D3T5 1006	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal (EMP) Funding for EMP Maintenance: $9,000 (LEXM0000) and EMP security: $1,000 (LEXMSC00).
32	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|13D3T5 1006	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020. Emergency Management Portal (EMP) Funding for EMP Maintenance: $9,000 (LEXM0000) and EMP security: $1,000 (LEXMSC00).
33	$245,856.00	$245,856.00	$245,856.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|13D3T5 1007	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $245,856(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $27,317 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
34	$27,317.00	$27,317.00	$27,317.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013	T	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|13D3T5 1007	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. Emergency Management Portal Funding: $245,856(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $27,317 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00).
35	$40,992.90	$40,992.90	$40,992.90	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TD	D3T	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|13D3B1 5004	Forward funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support the Emergency Management Portal Funding: $778,865.10(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $40,992.90 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00). Period of Performance 04/16/2012-04/16/2017
36	$778,865.10	$778,865.10	$778,865.10	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TD	D3T	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|13D3B1 5004	Forward funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support the Emergency Management Portal Funding: $778,865.10(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $40,992.90 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00). Period of Performance 04/16/2012-04/16/2017

37	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$157,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TD	D3T	303D72	LEUM0000	2505		RE|13D3B15004	Forward funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support the Emergency Management Portal Funding: $777,207.35(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $40,905.65 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00). Period of Performance 04/16/2012-04/16/2017
38	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$17,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2011	TD	D3T	303D72	LEUMSC00	2505		RE|13D3B15004	Forward funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support the Emergency Management Portal Funding: $777,207.35(LEXM0000) for EMP Maintenance and $40,905.65 is for EMP security (LEXMSC00). ERNS Management Database funding: $157,500 for ERNS Management DB Maintenance (LEUM0000) and $17,500 is for ERNS Management DB security(LEUMSC00). Period of Performance 04/16/2012-04/16/2017
39	$7,299.50	$7,299.50	$7,299.50	$0.00	$0.00	2011	HD	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	2505		RE|13D3B15004	Incrementally fund Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support Oil DB Maintenance at $12652.06 (LSMM0000) and for Oil DB a security at $665.90(LSMMSC00.)
40	$3,862.84	$3,862.84	$3,862.84	$0.00	$0.00	2012	HD	D3T	303D91	LSMM0000	2505		RE|13D3B15004	Incrementally fund Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069 to support Oil DB Maintenance at $12652.06 (LSMM0000) and for Oil DB a security at $665.90(LSMMSC00.)
41	$31,500.00	$31,500.00	$31,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3T	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3T5001	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $31,500 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $3,500 for Oil DB security(LEXMSC00.)
42	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3T	303D91	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3T5001	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $31,500 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $3,500 for Oil DB security(LEXMSC00.)

43	$175,000.00	$175,000.00	$175,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $175,000.00 for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $7,585.84 for EMP Maintenance security(LEXMSC00)to exercise the new option year starting 4-15-2014.
44	$7,585.84	$7,585.84	$7,585.84	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3T5 1002	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $175,000.00 for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $7,585.84 for EMP Maintenance security(LEXMSC00)to exercise the new option year starting 4-15-2014.
45	$120,600.00	$120,600.00	$120,600.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3R5 1006	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $120,600 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $13,400 for Oil DB security(LEXMS00.)
46	$13,400.00	$13,400.00	$13,400.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3R	303D91	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3R5 1006	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $120,600 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $13,400 for Oil DB security(LEXMS00.)
47	$231,750.00	$231,750.00	$231,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3T5 1003	
48	$25,700.00	$25,700.00	$25,700.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3T5 1003	

4/9/15	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2013 2014	B	51HH	ZZZGF2	n/a	2508		RE|1451HHA013	Incremental funding for contract EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Guident Technologies for OARM access to the Field Readiness (FR) applicastion.
5/10/15	$45,000.00	$45,000.00	$45,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3T5 1004	GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES - EMP LGR database
5/11/15	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3T	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3T5 1004	GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES - EMP LGR database
5/12/15	$54,000.00	$54,000.00	$54,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3R5 1008	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $72,000 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $8,000 for Oil DB Security(LEXMS00.)
5/13/15	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	H	D3R	303D91	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3R5 1008	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EP-BPA-12-H-0020, Task Order EPB12H00069. $72,000 for Oil DB Maintenance (LEXM0000) and $8,000 for Oil DB Security(LEXMS00.)
5/14/15	$99,000.00	$99,000.00	$99,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3B	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|14D3B5 1010	$99,000 Superfund funding for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000)

15	$11,000.00	$11,000.00	$11,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	T	D3B	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|14D3B5101 0	$11,000 Superfund funding for EMP Maintenance Security (LEXMSC00)
16	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$9,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|15D3P1500 3	$9,000 Superfund funding for EMP-LGR Maintenance (LEXM0000)
17	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|15D3P1500 3	$1,000 Superfund funding for EMP-LGR Maintenance Security (LEXMSC000)
18	$450,000.00	$450,000.00	$450,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|15D3C1500 7	$450,000 Superfund funding for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000)
19	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|15D3C1500 7	$50,000 Superfund funding for EMP Maintenance Security (LEXMSC00)
20	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|15D3C1501 1	RE15D3C15011

611	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|15D3C15011	RE15D3C15011
612	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	ZQ00	2505		RE|15D3R15010	RE15D3R15010
613	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	ZQ00	2505		RE|15D3R15010	RE15D3R15010
614	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|15D3C15011	RE15D3C15011
615	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	HQ00BM00	2505		RE|15D3C15011	RE15D3C15011
616	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|15D3P15009	Incremental Funding from PROD for EMP-LGR application via EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB12H00069 in the amounts of $1,500 for EMP maintenance security (LEXMSC00).

617	$13,500.00	$13,500.00	$13,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXM0000	205		RE|15D3P15009	Incremental Funding from PROD for EMP-LGR application via EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB12H00069 in the amounts of $13,500 for EMP maintenance (LEXM0000).
618	$247,500.00	$247,500.00	$247,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|15D3C15017	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12H-0020, Task order #1 EPB12H00069, Superfund/HS funding in the amount of $247,500 for EMP maintenance (LEXM0000).
619	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LEXMSC00	205		RE|15D3C15017	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12H-0020, Task order #1 EPB12H00069, Oil funding in the amount of $5000 for (Oil DB) EMP maintenance security(LEXMSC00).
710	$45,000.00	$45,000.00	$45,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	205		RE|15D3C15017	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12H-0020, Task order #1 EPB12H00069, Oil funding in the amount of $45,000 for (Oil DB) EMP maintenance (LEXM0000).
711	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	205		RE|15D3C15017	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12H-0020, Task order #1 EPB12H00069, Superfund/HS funding in the amount of $27,500 for EMP maintenance security(LEXMSC00).
712	$41,500.00	$41,500.00	$41,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015 2016	B	51HH	ZZZGF2X03	n/a	204		RE|1551NWH013	Incremental funding for contract EP-BPA_12-H-0020, Guident Technologies for OARM access to the Field Readiness (FR) application.

713	$8,500.00	$8,500.00	$8,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2014	TD	51HH	ZZZGF2	HQ00BM00	2504		RE|1551NWH013	Incremental funding for contract EP-BPA_12-H-0020, Guident Technologies for OARM access to the Field Readiness (FR) application.
714	$94,500.00	$94,500.00	$94,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXM0000	2505		RE|15D3C15018	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12h-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $94,500 for EMP Maintenance (LEXM0000.)
715	$10,500.00	$10,500.00	$10,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|15D3C15018	Incremental funding for Guident Technologies EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $10,500 for EMP Maintenance Security(LEXMSC00.)
716	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|15D3R15015	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. (formerly Guident Technologies) EP-BPA-12-B0020 T.O. EOB12H00069. $10,000 = Security (LSMMSC00).
717	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|15D3R15015	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. (formerly Guident Technologies) EP-BPA-12-B0020 T.O. EOB12H00069. $90,000 = Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000).
718	$80,675.00	$80,675.00	$80,675.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXM0000	2505		RE|16D3P15007	RE16D3P15007

7 01	$90,900.00	$90,900.00	$90,900.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	205		RE|16D3R15003	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. (formerly Guident Technologies) EP-BPA-12-B0020 T.O. EOB12H00069. $90,900 = Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000).
8 01	$10,100.00	$10,100.00	$10,100.00	$0.00	$0.00	2015	H	D3R	303D91	LSMMSC00	205		RE|16D3R15003	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. (formerly Guident Technologies) EP-BPA-12-B0020 T.O. EOB12H00069. $10,100 = Security (LSMMSC00).
1 01	$20,075.00	$20,075.00	$20,075.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXMSC00	205		RE|16D3P15007	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $20,075 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00).
2 01	$180,675.00	$180,675.00	$180,675.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3P	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|16D3P15007	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $180,675.00 for EMP Maintenancenhancements (LEXM0000). CO is Patrice Cunningham
3 01	$20,075.00	$20,075.00	$20,075.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3P	303D72	LEXMSC00	205		RE|16D3P15007	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $20,075 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00).
4 01	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3P	303D72	LEXM0000	205		RE|16D3C15003	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $100,000.00 for EMP Maintenance Enhancements (LEXM0000). CO is Patrice Cunningham

8015	$125,000.00	$125,000.00	$125,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXD0000	2505		RE|16D3C15004	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $125,000 for EMP Development/Modification/Enhancement (LEXDIC00) for Option Year 4.
8016	$325,000.00	$325,000.00	$325,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMIC00	2505		RE|16D3C15004	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $325,000.00 for EMP Operation & Maintenance (LEXMIC00) for Option Year 4. CO is Patrice Cunningham
8017	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|16D3C15004	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $25,000.00 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00) for Option Year 4.
8018	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|16D3C15004	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $25,000 for EMP Security (LEXDSC00).
8019	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	H	D3R	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|16D3R15011	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $10,000 = Security (LSMMSC00).
8020	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|16D3R15011	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $10,000 = Security Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000).

91	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	H	D3R	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|16D3R15020	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $90,000 = Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000) & $10,000 = Security (LSMMSC00).
92	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	H	D3R	303D91	LEXM0000	2505		RE|16D3R15020	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $90,000 = Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000) & $10,000 = Security (LSMMSC00).
93	$118,750.00	$118,750.00	$118,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXD0000	2505		RE|17D3C17003	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $118,750 for EMP Development/Modification/Enhancement (LEXDIC00) for Option Year 4.
94	$308,750.00	$308,750.00	$308,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMIC00	2505		RE|17D3C17003	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $308,750.00 for EMP Operation & Maintenance (LEXMIC00) for Option Year 4. CO is Patrice Cunningham
95	$23,750.00	$23,750.00	$23,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|17D3C17003	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $23,750.00 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00) for Option Year 4.
96	$23,750.00	$23,750.00	$23,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2016	T	D3C	303D72	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|17D3C17003	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $23,750 for EMP Security (LEXDSC00).

97	$477,750.00	$477,750.00	$477,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMIC00	2505		RE|17D3C17009	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $477,750.00 for EMP Operation & Maintenance (LEXMIC00) for Option Year 4. COR: Rob Thomas CO is Patrice Cunningham
98	$183,750.00	$183,750.00	$183,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3C	303D72	LEXDIC0000	2505		RE|17D3C17009	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order: EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $183,750 for EMP Development/Modification/Enhancement (LEXDIC00) for Option Year 4 extension.
99	$36,750.00	$36,750.00	$36,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3C	303D72	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|17D3C17009	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $36,750 for EMP Security (LEXDSC00) Option Year 4 extension.
100	$36,750.00	$36,750.00	$36,750.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3C	303D72	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|17D3C17009	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $36,750.00 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00) for Option Year 4 extension.

Document Details: Expand

Line #	Line Amt	Expended Amt	Closed Amt	Refunded Amt	Available Amt	BFY	Fund	Org	Program	Project	FOC	Cost Org	Comments	Extended Description
101	$9,500.00	$9,500.00	$9,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	H	D3R	303D91	LSMMSC00	2505		RE|17D3R17015	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $9,500 = Security (LSMMSC00).

102	$85,500.00	$85,500.00	$85,500.00	$0.00	$0.00	2017	H	D3R	303D91	LSMM0000	2505		RE|17D3R17015	Incremental funding for Oil Database: CRGT, Inc. EP-BPA-12-B0020 Task Order EOB12H00069. $85,500 = Maintenance/Enhancements (LEXM0000)
103	$138,123.77	$138,123.77	$138,123.77	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXMIC00	2505		RE|18D3C17001	RE18D3C17001
104	$72,214.93	$72,214.93	$72,214.93	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3P	303DC8	LEXD0000	2505		RE|18D3C17001	RE18D3C17001
105	$12,036.75	$12,036.75	$12,036.75	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXMSC00	2505		RE|18D3C17001	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc. EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $12,036.75 for EMP Security (LEXMSC00) for BPA Bridge/Continuity of Services.
106	$6,535.17	$6,535.17	$6,535.17	$0.00	$0.00	2017	H	D3P	303D91	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|18D3C17001	RE18D3C17001
107	$12,036.75	$12,036.75	$12,036.75	$0.00	$0.00	2017	T	D3P	303DC6	LEXDSC00	2505		RE|18D3C17001	Incremental funding for SalientCRGT, Inc., BPA Contract: EPA-BPA-12H-0020, task order EPB-12H-0069 in the amount of $12,036.75 for EMP Security (LEXDSC00) for BPA Bridge/Continuity of Services.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

PAGE 1 OF PAGES 7

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 019

3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.

5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*

6. ISSUED BY CODE RTPPOD

RTPPOD
US Environmental Protection Agency
RTP Procurement Operations Division
(E105-02)
4930 Old Page Road
Durham NC 27703

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE RTPPOD

RTPPOD
US Environmental Protection Agency
4930 Old Page Road
Research Triangle Park NC 27709

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
Attn: NA
P.O. BOX 1475
HERNDON VA 201721475

CODE 008698862 FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*

x 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. EP07D000102 EP10D000265

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)* 03/16/2010

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*
See Schedule

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)* Mutual Agreement of the Parties

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

GSA Contract #: GS-35F-0799M
DUNS Number: 008698862

The purpose of this modification is to extend this Call Order for one (1) month. This extension is to allow for continuation of programming services while another BPA is awarded for Oracle Programming Services for the US EPA. When this successor BPA is awarded, a successor Call Order will be put in place for these services with the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Management. This extension also increases the ceiling price for this Call Order by $366,000.00.

Continued ...

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)* Dan Ackerman, EVP

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)* Christopher Davis

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*

15C. DATE SIGNED 3/14/12

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*

16C. DATE SIGNED 3/15/12

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	Please see the attached pages for further details. Reason for Modification : Other Administrative Action Period Of Performance End Date changed from 15-MAR-12 to 15-APR-12 Total Amount for this Modification: $366,000.00 New Total Amount for this Version: $4,766,320.62 New Total Amount for this Award: $9,180,009.06 CHANGES FOR LINE ITEM NUMBER: 3 Total Amount changed for the Option Period is changed From: $4,400,320.62 To: $4,766,320.62 Delivery Location Code: RECON SHIP Reconstruct Ship To Washington DC USA Payment: RTP Finance Center US Environmental Protection Agency RTP-Finance Center (D143-02) 109 TW Alexander Drive Durham NC 27711 FOB: Destination Period of Performance: 03/16/2010 to 04/15/2012				

1. The extension to the period of performance for this Modification also increases the ceiling amount for the Option Period of this Call Order by $366,000.00. There is no funding on this Modification.

2. Accordingly, the Limitation of Government's Obligation Clause for this Call Order is hereby changed as follows:

FROM:

1. LIMITATION OF GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION (RTP-G-3)

(a) The call order's services are incrementally funded. For those services, the sum of **$4,185,688.44** of the total price is presently available for payment and allotted to this Call Order for the Base Period.

For the Option Period, incremental funding in the amount of **$4,302,888.00** of the total price is presently available for payment and allotted to this Call Order.

(b) For items described in paragraph (a) of this clause, the Contractor agrees to perform up to the point at which the total amount payable by the Government, including reimbursement in the event of termination of those items for the Government's convenience, approximates the total amount currently allotted to the contract. The Contractor will not be obligated to continue work on those items beyond that point. Subject to the clause entitled "Termination for Convenience of the Government," the Government will not be obligated in any event to reimburse the Contractor in excess of the amount allotted to the contract for those items. As used in this clause, the total amount payable by the Government in the event of termination of applicable contract line items for convenience includes costs, profit, and estimated termination cost for those items.

(c) Notwithstanding the date specified in the allotment schedule in paragraph (i) of this clause, the Contractor will notify the Contracting Officer, in writing at least 5 days prior to the date when, in the contractor's best judgment, the work will reach the point at which the total amount payable by the Government including any cost for termination for convenience, will approximate 75% of the total amount then allotted to the Call Order for performance of the applicable items. The notification will state (1) the estimated date when that point will be reached and (2) an estimate of items up to the next scheduled date for allotment of funds identified in paragraph (i) of this clause, or to a substitute date as determined by the Government pursuant to subparagraph (d) of this clause. If after such notification, additional funds are not allotted by the date identified in the Contractor's notification, or by an agreed to substitute date, the Contracting Officer will terminate any item(s) for which additional funds have not yet been allotted, pursuant to the clause entitled "Termination for Convenience of the Government."

(d) The parties contemplate that the Government will allot additional funds for continued performance of the Contract Line Items identified in paragraph (a) for this clause and will determine the estimated period of contract performance which will be covered by the funds. The provisions of paragraph (b) though (d) of this clause will apply in like manner to the additional allotted funds and to the new estimated period of contract performance. The Call Order will be modified accordingly.

(e) If, solely by reason of failure of the Government to allot additional funds, by the date indicated below, in amounts sufficient for timely performance of the Contract Line Item identified in paragraph (a) of this clause, the Contractor incurs additional costs or is delayed in the performance of the work under this Contract and if additional funds are allotted, an equitable adjustment will be made in the price of the items, or in the time of delivery, or both. Failure to agree to any such equitable adjustment hereunder will be a dispute concerning a question of act within the meaning of the clause entitled "Disputes."

(f) The Government may, at any time prior to termination, allot additional funds for the performance of the Contract Line Item identified in paragraph (a) of this clause.

(g) The termination provisions of this clause do not limit the rights of the Government under the clause entitled "Default." The provisions of this clause are limited to the work and allotment of funds for the Contract Line Item set forth in paragraph (a) of this clause. This clause no longer applies once the contract is fully funded except with regard to the rights or obligations of the parties concerning equitable adjustments negotiated under paragraph (d) or (e) of this clause.

(h) Nothing in this clause affects the right of the Government to terminate this Call Order pursuant to the Contract clause entitled "Termination for convenience of the Government."

(i) The parties contemplate that the Government will allot funds to this Call Order incrementally as follows:

Funding for this Call Order	
Funding at Award of Call Order:	$100,000.00
Modification #1	$ 0.00
Modification #2	$900,000.00
Modification #3	$880,000.00
Modification #4	$905,000.00
Modification #5	$250,000.00
Modification #6	$1,378,688.64
Modification #7	$ -0.20
Modification #8	$500,000.00
Modification #9	$913,288.00
Modification #10	$790,000.00
Modification #11	$681,600.00
Modification #12	$200,000.00
Modification #13	$ 0.00
Modification #14	$200,000.00
Modification #15	$ 0.00
Modification #16	$100,000.00
Modification #17	$350,000.00
Modification #18	$340,000.00
Total Funding for Order:	$8,488,576.44
March 31, 2012	**$ 97,432.62**

TO:

1. LIMITATION OF GOVERNMENT'S OBLIGATION (RTP-G-3)

(a) The call order's services are incrementally funded. For those services, the sum of **$4,185,688.44** of the total price is presently available for payment and allotted to this Call Order for the Base Period.

For the Option Period, incremental funding in the amount of **$4,302,888.00** of the total price is presently available for payment and allotted to this Call Order.

(b) For items described in paragraph (a) of this clause, the Contractor agrees to perform up to the point at which the total amount payable by the Government, including reimbursement in the event of termination of those items for the Government's convenience, approximates the total amount currently allotted to the contract. The Contractor will not be obligated to continue work on those items beyond that point. Subject to the clause entitled "Termination for Convenience of the Government," the Government will not be obligated in any event to reimburse the Contractor in excess of the amount allotted to the contract for those items. As used in this clause, the total amount payable by the Government in the event of termination of applicable contract line items for convenience includes costs, profit, and estimated termination cost for those items.

(c) Notwithstanding the date specified in the allotment schedule in paragraph (i) of this clause, the Contractor will notify the Contracting Officer, in writing at least 5 days prior to the date when, in the contractor's best judgment, the work will reach the point at which the total amount payable by the Government including any cost for termination for convenience, will approximate 75% of the total amount then allotted to the Call Order for performance of the applicable items. The notification will state (1) the estimated date when that point will be reached and (2) an estimate of items up to the next scheduled date for allotment of funds identified in paragraph (i) of this clause, or to a substitute date as determined by the Government pursuant to subparagraph (d) of this clause. If after such notification, additional funds are not allotted by the date identified in the Contractor's notification, or by an agreed to substitute date, the Contracting Officer will terminate any item(s) for which additional funds have not yet been allotted, pursuant to the clause entitled "Termination for Convenience of the Government."

(d) The parties contemplate that the Government will allot additional funds for continued performance of the Contract Line Items identified in paragraph (a) for this clause and will determine the estimated period of contract performance which will be covered by the funds. The provisions of paragraph (b) though (d) of this clause will apply in like manner to the additional allotted funds and to the new estimated period of contract performance. The Call Order will be modified accordingly.

(e) If, solely by reason of failure of the Government to allot additional funds, by the date indicated below, in amounts sufficient for timely performance of the Contract Line Item

identified in paragraph (a) of this clause, the Contractor incurs additional costs or is delayed in the performance of the work under this Contract and if additional funds are allotted, an equitable adjustment will be made in the price of the items, or in the time of delivery, or both. Failure to agree to any such equitable adjustment hereunder will be a dispute concerning a question of act within the meaning of the clause entitled "Disputes."

(f) The Government may, at any time prior to termination, allot additional funds for the performance of the Contract Line Item identified in paragraph (a) of this clause.

(g) The termination provisions of this clause do not limit the rights of the Government under the clause entitled "Default." The provisions of this clause are limited to the work and allotment of funds for the Contract Line Item set forth in paragraph (a) of this clause. This clause no longer applies once the contract is fully funded except with regard to the rights or obligations of the parties concerning equitable adjustments negotiated under paragraph (d) or (e) of this clause.

(h) Nothing in this clause affects the right of the Government to terminate this Call Order pursuant to the Contract clause entitled "Termination for convenience of the Government."

(i) The parties contemplate that the Government will allot funds to this Call Order incrementally as follows:

Funding for this Call Order	
Funding at Award of Call Order:	$100,000.00
Modification #1	$ 0.00
Modification #2	$900,000.00
Modification #3	$880,000.00
Modification #4	$905,000.00
Modification #5	$250,000.00
Modification #6	$1,378,688.64
Modification #7	$ -0.20
Modification #8	$500,000.00
Modification #9	$913,288.00
Modification #10	$790,000.00
Modification #11	$681,600.00
Modification #12	$200,000.00
Modification #13	$ 0.00
Modification #14	$200,000.00
Modification #15	$ 0.00
Modification #16	$100,000.00
Modification #17	$350,000.00
Modification #18	$340,000.00
Modification #19	$ 0.00
Total Funding for Order:	$8,488,576.44
April 1, 2012	**$ 463,432.62**

2. INCREMENTAL FUNDING: This Call Order is incrementally funded. The amount presently available for payment and allotted to the Call Order Option Year is **$4,302,888.00.** It is estimated this amount will cover performance though **04/01/2012.**

ORDER FOR SUPPLIES OR SERVICES

PAGE OF PAGES 1 | 5

IMPORTANT: Mark all packages and papers with contract and/or order numbers.

1. DATE OF ORDER 03/16/2010

2. CONTRACT NO. (If any) GS-35F-0799M BPA# EP07D000102

3. ORDER NO. EP10D000265

4. REQUISTION/REFERENCE NO. T0T008 QT-RT-10-000559

5. ISSUING OFFICE (Address correspondence to)
U.S. EPA Mail Drop: E105-02
OARM SERVICE CENTER
RTP PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS DIVISION
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK , NC 27711

6. SHIP TO:
a. NAME OF CONSIGNEE U.S. EPA Project Officer: JOAN M KARRIE
PESTICIDE MONITORING PROGRAM SECTION
b. STREET ADDRESS 401 M STREET S.W. Mail Drop: 7507
c. CITY WASHINGTON **d. STATE** VA **e. ZIP CODE** 20460
f. SHIP VIA:

7. TO:
a. NAME OF CONTRACTOR GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC
b. COMPANY NAME Fax: (703) 326-0677 Ph: (703) 326-0888
c. STREET ADDRESS P.O. BOX 1475
d. CITY HERNDON **e. STATE** VA **f. ZIP CODE** 20172

8. TYPE OF ORDER
☐ a. PURCHASE
REFERENCE YOUR:_____
Please Furnish the following on the terms and conditions specified on both sides of this order and on the attached sheets, if any, including delivery as indicat
☒ b. DELIVERY - Except for billing instructions on the reverse, this delivery order is subject to instructions contained on in this side only of this form and is issued subject to the terms and conditions of the above-numbered contract.

10. REQUISITIONING OFFICE
PESTICIDE MONITORING PROGRAM SECTION
Buyer: DAN NEUSTEDTER (919) 541-4749

9. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA
T0T008 2010 T D3L 302D72C 2505 $10000.00 LEXDSC00
T0T008 2010 T D3L 302D72C 2505 $90000.00 LEXD0000
TIN:
DUNS: 008698862

11. BUSINESS CLASSIFICATION (Check appropriate box(es))
☒ a. SMALL ☐ b. OTHER THAN SMALL ☐ c. DISADVANTAGED ☐ d. WOMAN-OWNED

12. F.O.B. POINT FOB DESTINATION
13. PLACE OF
a. INSPECTION DESTINATION
b. ACCEPTANCE City State
14. GOVERNMENT B/L NO.
15. DELIVER TO F.O.B. POINT ON OR BEFORE Date 03/16/2010 - 03/15/2011
16. DISCOUNT TERMS NET30

17. SCHEDULE (See reverse for Rejections)

ITEM NO. (a)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (b)	QUANTITY ORDERED (c)	UNIT (d)	UNIT PRICE (e)	AMOUNT (f)	QUANTITY ACCEPTED (g)
1	Information Technology	Ex. 4 CBI	LOT	Ex. 4 CBI	$ 100,000.00	

See Billing Instructions On Reverse

18. SHIPPING POINT
19. GROSS SHIPPING WEIGHT
20. INVOICE NO.
$ .00 — **17(h)TOT (Cont. Pages)**

21. MAIL INVOICE TO:
a. Name U.S. EPA RTP-FINANCE CENTER U.S. EPA Mail Drop MC-D143-02
b. Street Address (or P.O. Box) MAIL DROP D143-02
c. City DURHAM **d. STATE** NC **e. ZIP CODE** 27711
$ 100,000.00 — **17(i) GRAND TOTAL**

22. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY (Signature) Joel P. Smith
23. NAME (Typed) JOEL P SMITH (919) 541-0184
TITLE: CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER

AUTHORIZED FOR LOCAL REPRODUCTION / Previous edition not usable
OPTIONAL FORM 347 (REV. 6/95) / Prescribed by GSA/FAR 48 CFR 53.213 (e)

1. CALL ORDER: This IT Professional Services Ceiling Priced Call Order is being issued in accordance with BPA EP07D000102 and SIN 132-51 (Information Technology Professional Services) which is included in contract number GS-35F-0799M.

2. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE: From date of award for one calendar year with one, one year option period.

3. POINT OF CONTACT: The contact person for these support services is displayed in block #6 of the OF347 form.

4. INSPECTION OF SERVICES: Inspections shall be conducted in accordance with the FAR 52.246-6 Inspection--Time-and-Material and Labor-Hour and the Performance Work Statement.

5. REQUIREMENT: The contractor will provide EPA with services to manage the Emergency Management Systems Development and Integration System in accordance with the attached Performance Work Statement.

6. PAYMENTS: Partial payment is authorized. For support services for license/software, partial payment is authorized monthly in arrears upon Project Officer (PO) approval. Contractor shall comply with the requirements of FAR 52.232-7 (Alternate II).

7. PROJECT PLAN: Within 10 days after the period of performance commences for this Call Order, the contractor shall develop a Project Plan addressing the requirements of the PWS. The contractor shall submit one copy of the Project Plan to the Project Officer listed on the call order and one copy to the Contracting Officer.

8. COMMENCEMENT OF WORK: The Contractor shall begin work when the period of performance commences for this call order. If the contractor has not received an approval from the Contracting Officer regarding the Project Plan within twenty (20) days after its submission, the contractor shall stop work until the Project Plan is approved. The contractor shall resume work only when the Contracting Officer finally approves the Project Plan. The contractor shall also stop work if and when the costs of project exceed $100,000.00. If a modification to the Call Order is required such as a change in scope, resources, and/or tasks, the Contractor shall develop a revised Project Plan containing the above outlined information.

9. INVOICE SUBMISSION: The Contractor shall submit one (1) copy of the invoice to the following: Contracting Officer, Project Officer and RTP Financial Management Center (See address in block 21 on page 1).

10. GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LIST: Attachment #2 (1 page) includes the Government Property List that is hereby included with this call order.

11. GOVERNMENT PROPERTY FAR CLAUSE: FAR 52.245-1 (Government Property) is hereby included by reference to this call order.

12. GOVERNMENT PROPERTY EPA CLAUSE: Attachment #3 (6 pages), that includes EP Clause 52.245-120 (Government Furnished Property, SEP 1994) is hereby added to this call order.

Clause(s):

CUSTOM **N.C. SALES TAX EXEMPT**

North Carolina General Statute 105-164.13(17) and Rule No. 48 Sales and Use Tax Regulations.
EPA Federal Tax Identification Number 520852695

CUSTOM **OPTION TO EXTEND THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THE CONTRACT**

(a) The Government has the option to extend the effective period of this contract for one (1) additional period. If more than sixty (60) days remain in the contract effective period, the Government, without prior written notification, may exercise this option by issuing a contract modification. To unilaterally exercise this option within the last 60 days of the effective period, the Government must issue written notification of its intent to exercise the option prior to that last 60-day period. This preliminary notification does not commit the Government to exercising the option.

(b) If the option is exercised, the Ceiling Price will be modified to reflect a new and separate Ceiling Pirce of $ TBD for the first option period.

(c) If the option is exercised, the "Period of Performance " will be modified to cover a option period #1.

CUSTOM **PROJECT OFFICER**

The project officer defined in block 6 is hereby designated as the project officer for this requirement. As such, he/she shall:

1 - Provide all information of a general nature necessary in the performance of this order.
2 - Be responsible for inspection and acceptance of the services for the certification of invoices.

The Project Officer does not have the authority to issue any technical direction which changes or modifies the scope of work, or alter the period of performance.

EPAAR **1552.211-79 COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (OCT 00)**

COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (OCT 2000)

(a) Definition. Information Resources Management (IRM) is defined as any planning, budgeting, organizing, directing, training, promoting, controlling, and managing activities associated with the burden, collection, creation, use and dissemination of information. IRM includes both information itself, and the management of information and related resources such as personnel, equipment, funds, and technology. Examples of these services include but are not limited to the following:

(1) The acquisition, creation, or modification of a computer program or automated data base for delivery to EPA or use by EPA or contractors operating EPA programs.

(2) The analysis of requirements for, study of the feasibility of, evaluation of alternatives for, or design and development of a computer program or automated data base for use by EPA or contractors operating EPA programs.

(3) Services that provide EPA personnel access to or use of computer or word processing equipment, software, or related services.

(4) Services that provide EPA personnel access to or use of: Data communications; electronic messaging services or capabilities; electronic bulletin boards, or other forms of electronic information dissemination; electronic record-keeping; or any other automated information services.

EPAAR **1552.211-79 COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (II) (OCT 00)**

(b) General. The Contractor shall perform any IRM related work under this contract in accordance with the IRM policies, standards and procedures set forth in this clause and noted below. Upon receipt of a work request (i.e. delivery order or work assignment), the Contractor shall check this listing of directives (see paragraph (d) for electronic access). The applicable directives for performance of the work request are those in effect on the date of issuance of the work request.

(1) IRM Policies, Standards and Procedures. The 2100 Series (2100-2199) of the Agencys Directive System contains the majority of the Agencys IRM policies, standards and procedures.

(2) Groundwater Program IRM Requirement. A contractor performing any work related to collecting Groundwater data; or developing or enhancing data bases containing Groundwater quality data shall comply with EPA Order 7500.1A - Minimum Set of Data Elements for Groundwater.

EPAAR 1552.211-79 COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (III) (OCT 00)

(3) EPA Computing and Telecommunications Services. The EnterpriseTechnology Services Division (ETSD) Operational Directives Manual contains procedural information about the operation of the Agencys computing and telecommunications services. Contractors performing work for the Agencys National Computer Center or those who are developing systems which will be operating on the Agencys national platforms must comply with procedures established in the Manual. This document may be found at:
http://epa.gov/docs/irmpoli8/.

(c) Printed Documents. Documents listed in (b)(1) and (b)(2) may be obtained from:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Services Division
Distribution Section
Mail Code: 3204
Ariel Rios Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: (202) 260-5797

(d) Electronic Access. A complete listing, including full text, of documents included in the 2100 Series of the Agencys Directive System is maintained on the EPA Public Access Server on the Internet at http://epa.gov/docs/irmpoli8/.

****end of clause****

SUPPLEMENTAL INVOICING INFORMATION

If desired, this order (or a copy thereof) may be used by the Contractor as the Contractor's invoice, instead of a separate invoice, provided the following statement, (signed and dated) is on (or attached to) the order: "Payment is requested in the amount of $ _____ . No other invoice will be submitted." However, if the Contractor wishes to submit an invoice, the following information must be provided: contract number (if any), order number, item number(s), description of supplies or services, sizes, quantities, unit prices, and extended totals. Prepaid shipping costs will be indicated as a separate item on the invoice. Where shipping costs exceed $10 (except for parcel post), the billing must be supported by a bill of lading or receipt. When several orders are invoiced to an ordering activity during the same billing period, consolidated periodic billings are encouraged.

RECEIVING REPORT

Quantity in the "Quantity Accepted" column on the face of this order has been: ☐ inspected, ☐ accepted, ☐ received by me and conforms to contract. Items listed below have been rejected for the reasons indicated.

SHIPMENT NUMBER	PARTIAL		DATE RECEIVED	SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED U.S. GOV'T. REP.	DATE
	FINAL				
TOTAL CONTAINERS		GROSS WEIGH	RECEIVED AT	TITLE	

REPORT OF REJECTIONS

ITEM NO.	SUPPLIES OR SERVICES	QUANTITY REJECTED	UNIT	REASON FOR REJECTION

* U.S. government Printing Office: 1995 -- 386-738/20005

PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT

1. **Title of Project:** Office of Emergency Management Systems Development and Integration

2. **Period of Performance:** One year from Call Order Issuance.
   Option Periods: One one-year option period.

3. **Call Order Officer:** Joan Karrie
   Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
   1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20460

   Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

4. **Alternate Call Order Officer** **Constance Haaser**
   Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
   1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20460

   Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Background Information

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) is located in the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER). The Office is composed of a *National Decontamination Team (NDT)*, a *Business Operations Center*, and four Divisions: *Regulatory and Policy Development*, *National Planning and Preparedness*, *Program Operations and Coordination*, and *Evaluation and Communications*. The Office is generally responsible for implementing the Oil Pollution Prevention Program under the Clean Water Act, oversight of the National Emergency Response and Removal programs under Superfund and the Oil Pollution Act, and oversight of National Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention programs under the Clean Air Act and Title III of SARA. The Office plays a major role in leading Agency efforts related to Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, including serving as The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Emergency Coordinator, chairing the multi-agency National Response Team, and managing the Agency's National Incident Coordination Team during environmental emergencies involving multiple EPA program offices or foreign countries. The Office manages and maintains

EPA's Headquarters (HQ) Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and leads EPA coordination of activities under the Federal Response Plan, the National Security Emergency Preparedness Program and the government-wide National Response Plan. The Office actively participates in federal chemical, biological, and radiological counter-terrorism planning and coordinates closely with the Department of Homeland Security, the White House Homeland Security Counsel, and EPA's Office of Homeland Security. Additionally, the Office represents EPA on domestic and international efforts to promote more effective chemical emergency preparedness and response and works with the Chemical Safety Board, OSHA, and other government agencies to conduct investigations of chemical accidents and implement recommendations to improve chemical safety. Lastly, the Office conducts the policy analyses and program evaluation necessary for national leadership of the programs under its purview and provides technical assistance, training, outreach, and communication to the Regions, States/Tribes, local governments, and other stakeholders in each of its assigned program areas.

Current OEM applications to be maintained, enhanced, or developed during the period of performance of this Task Order are the following:

Emergency Management Portal

OEM uses the Agency's existing portal technology and Web Access Management (WAM) to create single points of entry for the Emergency Management Community within the Emergency Management Portal (EMP). EMP core modules reside at EPA's National Computer Center (NCC). EMP consists of the following modules.

- Reporting and Analysis: EMP will use one of the Agency's existing business intelligence tools, Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition (OBIEE), to perform reporting and analysis functions on the data housed in the EMP database.
- Resource Management: Resource management will be deployed as two modules. One for equipment and the other for personnel field readiness. The Equipment Module, a centralized national application, serves as an inventory resource tracking system that relates equipment, personnel, and removal/emergency sites for each Regional emergency response warehouse. The Equipment Module is in production. The Field Readiness module will house identity, contact, deployment, training record, fitness, and skills information for both professional responders and Response Support Corps volunteers.
- Document Management: Document management will be performed by the collaborated adaptation of the Superfund Document Management System (SDMS). This application will allow paperless documentation of removal sites.
- Technical Information including the Decontamination Portfolio: This module contains information useful to OSC concerning procedures for decontamination and containment, health and safety, toxicity and other resources. The Decontamination Portfolio module is in production.
- Site and Data Management: The Site and Data Management Module will contain

the information about removal and emergency sites, field data, and the resulting analyses associated with those sites. This module will share data with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), and the SDMS, as well as receive data from the field via SCRIBE and other regional tools.

- National Approach to Response (NAR) Preparedness Plan Tracking: The NAR tracking application provides a framework within the EPA to address overall Agency readiness for multiple simultaneous nationally significant events. NAR Tracking is in production.
- Oil Database: The Oil Database Module is designed to help EPA regional staff organize information on regulated facilities and to record performance of various program activities related to the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Rule and Facility Response Plan Rule in a nationally-consistent data framework. In addition, it is designed to capture descriptive information about facilities regulated under 40 CFR part 112 to assist EPA HQ staff in evaluating Oil Pollution Prevention regulatory options, impacts, and program implementation.
- Informational "home" pages: Each module has/will have an editable home page (portlet page) with information relating to the module's central topic.
- Existing applications that may be accessed through the EMP are: WebEOC, Emergency Response Notification (ERNS), Emergency Response (ER) Analyzer, Compendium for Environmental Testing Laboratories (CETL), and the System for Risk Management Plans (SRMP.)

The Continuity of Operations Portal

OEM uses the Agency's existing portal technology and WAM to create single points of entry for the Continuity of Operations Planners Community within the Continuity of Operations (COOP) Portal. The COOP Portal modules reside at EPA's National Computer Center (NCC). The COOP Portal consists of the following modules:

- Core COOP Assessment Tool (CCAT): CCAT is an assessment application that allows the COOP Planners from each organizational entity (AA-ships and Regions) to assess the progress toward continuity of operations readiness using specific criteria. COOP Plans are assessed once each year. CCAT is in production.
- COOP Essential Personnel: This module will maintain a list of EPA COOP essential personnel, their contact information, requirements, and readiness.
- Informational "home" pages: a home page exists for each organizational entity which allows them to communicate specifically to their COOP community concerning training, exercises and general COOP information. These pages are in production.

In addition, other tasks that will/may be required during the period of performance of this Task Order are the following:

Geographic Information System (GIS) Support, Reporting and Other Tasks

- GIS support: OEM requires two types of GIS support. An on-site GIS expert shall be required to provide routing GIS support to the EPA EOC. Also, in case of a nationally significant emergency, the EOC may require additional GIS support for a short period of time.
- All technology development shall include security solutions to be developed and planned as part of the technology.
- All applications will include a reporting and analysis component. This will typically be a combination of Business Intelligence software, GIS software and reports built into each application.
- OEM may be required to develop small applications or to determine if a project will expand into a larger development effort.

Systems Development Philosophy

Requirements will be communicated to the contractor in writing with the approval of the Task Order Project Officer (TOPO) or Alternate TOPO (ATOPO.) The requirements may consist of detailed system requirements/specifications, screen layouts, navigation and interface among screens, data validation rules, and detailed storage and processing requirements, maps, models and diagrams. The contractor shall adhere to Federal, Agency, and Office data, modeling, and technology standards.

The contractor shall develop data models, normalized data structures, processing/storage requirements, and prototypes. Data elements shall be identified, defined and checked against the OEM data dictionary to ensure their consistency across different datasets. Approved data elements become a part of the OSWER data dictionary. The contractor shall complete the work to meet the requirements of the assignment, complete initial alpha testing, and document the completed work. EPA subject matter experts (SMEs) will test each deliverable and communicate in writing any modifications to be made by the contractor.

As coding proceeds, the TOPO/ATOPO will monitor progress against specifications and schedule. The EPA SMEs will test modules of code as they are completed and provide feedback through the TOPO/ATOPO to the contractor development team. This feedback process will always be done in writing. Every system update will go through a set of rigorous tests before it is released to users. After completion of software development, the contractor development team shall thoroughly test the system and release the alpha version only when and if it passes the quality assurance tests. There are both unit tests and a complete system test, all performed by the contractor. The SMEs will then perform an independent test of the system. The results of this testing will be communicated to the contractor in writing by the TOPO/ATOPO and any needed corrections shall be made. The new version shall again be submitted for quality assurance testing. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with this version, it shall be released into the staging environment for beta testing by a core group of users who participated in the requirements development process. The TOPO/ATOPO will communicate in writing with the contractor to make any necessary corrections. The

beta test period will be closed by user acceptance of the beta test version and approval by the TOPO/ATOPO, after which, the application shall be moved to the production environment by the contractor in coordination with NCC.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this Task Order is to secure the services of the contractor to provide technical and operational support services to OEM for the development, maintenance and operation of enterprise-wide information management tools to support emergency preparedness, prevention, and response. The information management tools developed through this Task Order will support both HQ and Regional personnel, including the emergency response field personnel (On-scene Coordinators), and therefore must be stable, portable and available for use in a variety of scenarios. The contractor shall provide or acquire the personnel to complete the tasks below.

Work shall be performed at the contractor's location with the exception of the following

- Meetings scheduled at the EPA location,
- Special request work for on-site assistance,
- Special request for a meeting at an off-site location (including Regional offices across the country) to meet with SMEs/Users,
- Work performed by the contractor for Task 16, which requires a contractor to be on-site in one of two locations, the EOC (Washington, DC) or on-site in the COOP location (Ft. Meade, MD) for a total of 40 hours/wk
- Work performed by the contractor for Task 17 which may require a contractor to be on-site in one of two locations, the EOC (Washington, DC) or on-site in the COOP location (Ft. Meade, MD).

Key EPA Personnel

Joan Karrie
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Constance Haaser
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Joshua Woodyard
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Peter Gattuso
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Task 1: Project Closeout and Transition

Subtask 1.1: Closeout of the Task Order

The contractor shall provide for the closeout of the Task Order at the end of the period of performance.

Subtask 1.2: Transition

The Transition Plan contains four major sections:

Task Order Documentation Inventory

The contractor shall: conduct a physical inventory of the project and team libraries for systems documents, life cycle documents, and other documentation (e.g., third party software); reconcile inventoried documentation with that listed in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) (if applicable); review the status of all products; update the Product Assurance Deliverables Accountability Report; arrange for the return of needed documentation and disposal of all unwanted documentation; ascertain in which format the documentation shall be delivered (e.g., hardcopy, softcopy; Lotus Notes, Word, ERWIN, Visio).

Transition of Security

The contractor shall conduct the following activities in the Transition Plan: produce a Security Transition Plan, provide a list of mainframe and/or UNIX or other accounts associated with the Task Order, provide the names of the contractor employees with access to the aforementioned accounts, provide the names of all contractor employees with access to EPA computer and email systems, document any additional security procedures needed for or involved in applications (e.g., library accesses, tables), ascertain which contractor staff have EPA HQ badges that must be returned, discuss security issues with the EPA Information Security Officer, and determine if debriefings on the Privacy Act information are appropriate for the Task Order.

Training EPA and Designated Contractor

A major factor in the successful transition of the Task Order to EPA and/or the designated contractor is training. To facilitate training, the contractor shall develop a Transition Plan to include (at a minimum) a Training Plan identifying specific training sessions, objectives, and curriculum. Each session should delineate what training shall occur, and all appropriate documentation should be provided to the successor.

Management and Scheduling

The contractor shall: review Transition Plan activities and schedules based on the time available to conduct the transition, review schedules to ensure that they reflect the transition dates reflected in the PWS (if applicable), monitor priorities and schedules relative to the Transition Plan to identify potential conflicts, notify the TOPO and ATOPO when conflicts are identified.

Deliverable 1.2.1: The contractor shall provide a Transition Plan, which shall address delivery of Documentation, Security, Training and Management.
Deliverable 1.2.2: The contractor shall provide a Document Inventory, Documents, and Disposal Plan for unwanted documents.
Deliverable 1.2.3: The contractor shall provide Training Materials.
Deliverable 1.2.4: The contractor shall provide Security Documentation.
Deliverable 1.2.5: The contractor shall provide a Schedule of Transition Activities.
Deliverable 1.2.6: The contractor shall provide a Transition Results Report.

Task 2: Maintenance and Enhancement of the Emergency Management Portal structure, technology, and architecture.

The purpose of this task is to support the overall portal infrastructure of EMP. Support of each individual module of EMP will be described in its own task. EMP has been built as part of the Agency's existing portal architecture to house the applications listed below and to have the ability to draw data from and move data to the Agency's existing warehouses and data marts. EMP has a core set of integrated modules which access one relational database and use some common tables. Other modules of EMP will display data from existing databases owned by OEM, such as SRMP. Access to independent modules may be through a simple web link or the application may be modified to work with WAM. Current integrated modules consist of the following.

- Equipment
- Site and Data Management
- Technical Information/Decontamination Portfolio
- Field Readiness
- NAR Tracking
- Oil Database

Each module has/will have an editable home page (portlet page) with information relating to the module's central topic. Additional "home" pages contain only technical information as text and links to documents and external web sites. Home page content is modifiable by specific owners and stored in a set of tables in EMP.

Each version of EMP and associated database shall be accessible to the user in two instances:

- Production (Emergency Management) instance, which houses the authoritative and reportable data, and
- Training (EMP-Training) instance which is an exact replica of the Production instance but accesses a database that is intended for use during testing and user training. The database accessed by the Training instance shall be replaced at identified intervals with a copy of the Production data.

All tasks related to EMP apply equally to the two instances, unless otherwise specified.

Subtask 2.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 2.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 2.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 2.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 2.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 2.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 2.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.

Deliverable 2.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 2.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 2.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary including business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 2.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 2.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 2.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 2.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 2.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 2.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 2.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 2.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 2.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 2.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule

Deliverable 2.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 3: Equipment Module

This application provides warehouse management and tracking of equipment that may be deployed during a removal action or emergency. It is a centralized national application with a component that is able to work disconnected on a local computer and transfer data to the data mart when connected via the internet. The module relates equipment, personnel and events and is required by OEM to serve as the inventory system and resource tracking for all Regional and Special Team emergency response warehouses. This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing software, including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. This module is in production, but has required extensive revisions based upon user comments and requirements clarifications. Remaining work includes improving equipment maintenance functionality, upgrading the look and feel to match the Agency standard for web pages, combining the equipment database with the rest of EMP, enhancing the offline functionality, and responding to user requirements for improvements to the software.

Subtask 3.1: Requirements Gathering

The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 3.1.1: The contractor shall provide Well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 3.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 3.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 3.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 3.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 3.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 3.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 3.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this

software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 3.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 3.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 3.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 3.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 3.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 3.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 3.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 3.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 3.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 3.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 3.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 3.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Subtask 3.6: Regional Data Conversion
This subtask is largely complete; however, there may be additional data migration or regional data cleanup needed. The application required a one-time data migration task to move data from existing Regional systems into the EMP database. As these data were migrated, Regional users examined the data for accuracy and accepted the final data migration. However, several Regions have identified additional data that they wish to be incorporated in the EMP database as well as data within the current database that can be improved. These additions and improvements constitute this task.

EPA will deliver any additional data for migration to the contractor. The contractor shall create migration script to move these data into the EMP database. The TOPO/ATOPO will work with the contractor and the Regions to resolve any issues. Data will be examined by each Region for accuracy. The TOPO/ATOPO will provide the contractor with the results of the Regional review. The contractor shall correct the script and migrate the data again. The data shall be migrated one last time from the corrected

script into the Training and Production instances of the EMP database.

EPA will work with the contractor and Regions to identify data that can be improved in terms of accuracy, integration, and completeness. The contractor shall develop strategies and timetables to implement the improvements, which will be approved by EPA HQ and the affected users. The contractors shall create script(s) to implement the changes, provide the resultant changes to EPA for review, incorporate any corrections into the script, run the script again and provide data again for review. Once acceptable, the data shall be corrected once within the Training and Production instances of the EMP database.

Deliverable: 3.6.1: The contractor shall provide accurate data migration scripts and initial migration into the test/training database for all additional data provided by the Regions.
Deliverable: 3.6.2: The contractor shall provide accurate final data migration into the production database for all additional data.
Deliverable: 3.6.3: The contractor shall provide accurate data improvement scripts and initial data change into the test/training database for all approved data improvements.
Deliverable: 3.6.4: The contractor shall provide accurate final data changes within the production database for all approved data improvements.

Task 4: Field Readiness Module
This module consists of tracking training and experience for responders and inspectors including On Scene Coordinators, Response Support Corps members, OECA inspectors, other responders, and responder supporters. It may also provide other features such as deployment tracking, and course registration. This task shall consist of requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, and enhancements, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and regional data conversion subtasks.

Subtask 4.1: Requirements Gathering
Much of this subtask is already complete. The remaining work consists of gathering requirements and enhancing the existing prototype based on user review.
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 4.1.1: Well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 4.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 4.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 4.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 4.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 4.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 4.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 4.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 4.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 4.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 4.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 4.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 4.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 4.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 4.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 4.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 4.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 4.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 4.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 4.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 4.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 4.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 4.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 4.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 4.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 5: Document Management
This module consists of adaptation EMP to use the Superfund Document Management System (SDMS) to store and retrieve all documents from EMP. This module will be accessed from and used within many of the other EMP modules, as well as acting as a stand-alone application for document storage and management.

Subtask 5.1: Requirements Gathering

The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 5.1.1: The contract shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 5.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 5.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 5.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 5.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 5.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.

Deliverable 5.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 5.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 5.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task will be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 5.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 5.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 5.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 5.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 5.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 5.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 5.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 5.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 5.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 5.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 5.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 5.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 5.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 5.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 5.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 5.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions

properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 6: Technical Information and Decontamination Portfolio Module
The Decontamination Portfolio contains documents, hyperlinks to information, and discrete data. It is now in production. There have been minor revisions and there will be further revisions based upon user comments and feedback. The data entry user interface is accessed from one entry point. The information is also displayed under other applicable headings, such as Response Technologies, Health and Safety, Risk and Toxicology. Additional other information sets may also be developed, such as for Disposal. The Decontamination Portfolio is currently developed as a portal application. The next full version of Decontamination Portfolio will also include re-development of the application as standard JAVA web pages, the same technology as the rest of EMP. EPA's authoritative source for data about substances of interest to the Agency is the Substance Registry System (SRS), maintained by the Office of Environmental Information (OEI.) The Decontamination Portfolio references such substances, which are currently held as a full copy of the SRS data within the EMP database. At this time, the SRS data must be uploaded to the EMP database manually.

The SRS provides web services that can be used to search and reference SRS data or copy SRS data automatically. This task includes developing solution options for EMP that will efficiently take advantage of the SRS web services and implementation of the chosen solution within both instances of EMP.

Subtask 6.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 6.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 6.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 6.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 6.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 6.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 6.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 6.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 6.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this

software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 6.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 6.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 6.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 6.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 6.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 6.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 6.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 6.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 6.5: Deployment

Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 5.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 6.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 6.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Subtask 6.6: Monthly loading of SRS data into EMP
The contractor shall receive a monthly request from NDT specifying the new substances to be copied from the SRS database into the EMP database. The contractor shall make a monthly request from the SRS DBA for data specific to these changes. Once changes are received, the contractor shall load the data to the EMP Training and Production databases.

Deliverable 6.6.1: The contractor shall provide SRS data loaded into EMP Substances table by the last day of each month. NDT will specify by the 10th of each month whether or not there is new data that must be moved into EMP by the end of that month and, if so, what substances are included in the request. If there is no new data, this task can be canceled for that month.

Subtask 6.7: Development of Web Services Functionality between EMP and SRS
The contractor shall develop options for sharing data between SRS and EMP. The contractor shall implement the option selected by the TOPO/ATOPO.

Deliverable 6.7.1: The contractor shall provide an SRS Web Services options document by the data specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 6.7.2: The contractor shall develop, test and implement the chosen SRS web service option in both training and production instances of EMP by the date specified in the project schedule.
Deliverable 6.7.3: The contractor shall provide documentation of web services in the appropriate project management documents.

Task 7: Site and Data Management Module
Site and Data Management: The Site and Data Management module consists of two parts:

- Site, which consists of the basic information about an emergency response or removal site, as well as applications to produce action memos, pollution reports, and situation reports. A working prototype of the Site application exists. The contractor's tasks shall include modifications and enhancements to the software and database structure in response to user requirements, creation of ETL software to move structured and unstructured data into the EMP database from field collection tools, and data migration from legacy databases.
- Data Management consists of environmental sampling and monitoring data, hazardous materials tracking, and survey data (facilities or other property reconnaissance). This application will share data with CERCLIS, SDMS, and receive data from SCRIBE and other regional field applications.

This task shall consist of requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, and enhancements, testing and quality assurance, and deployment.

Subtask 7.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 7.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to

clarify requirements.

Subtask 7.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 7.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 7.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 7.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 7.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 7.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 7.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 7.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 7.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 7.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 7.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 7.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 7.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 7.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 7.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 7.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 7.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 7.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 7.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 7.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 7.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 7.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 7.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 7.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 8: Reporting and Analysis
All OEM applications have data that needs to be turned into information using state-of-the-art analysis tools. OEM has started to develop this capability with its new business intelligence reporting tool, Emergency Management Business Intelligence (EMBI) and its GIS application, ER Analyzer. EMBI is being built using Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition. The latest version of ER Analyzer was built using Microsoft Bing maps. The purpose of this task is to continue to develop EMBI for all OEM data holdings, recommend ways to better use ER Analyzer, recommend and develop additional ways of displaying, combining and analyzing OEM data.

Subtask 8.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The

purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 8.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 8.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 8.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 8.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 8.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 8.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 8.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document

shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 8.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 8.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 8.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 8.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 8.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 8.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 8.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 8.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 8.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 8.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 8.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 8.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 8.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 8.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 8.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 8.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 8.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 8.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 9: National Approach to Response Preparedness Plan Tracking

The NAR Module tracks all of the specific gaps and work plans associated with the preparedness of EPA HQ and Regions to implement EPA's National Approach to Response. In addition, it will be used as an annual evaluation tool to measure progress in completing activities in the NAR Preparedness Plan (i.e., Core NAR). Version 1 of this application is in production.

Subtask 9.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 9.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 9.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 9.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 9.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 9.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver

a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 9.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 9.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 9.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 9.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 9.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 9.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 9.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 9.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 9.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 9.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Deliverable 9.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 9.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 9.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 9.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 9.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 9.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 9.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final

draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 92.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 9.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule
Deliverable 9.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Task 10: Oil Module
The Oil Database Module is designed to help EPA regional staff organize information on regulated facilities and to record performance of various program activities related to the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Rule and Facility Response Plan Rule in a nationally-consistent data framework. In addition, it is designed to capture descriptive information about facilities regulated under 40 CFR part 112 to assist EPA HQ staff in evaluating Oil Pollution Prevention regulatory options, impacts, and program implementation. A first iteration of the Oil Module is being distributed for user comment.

Subtask 10.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 10.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 10.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 10.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the

system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 10.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 10.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 10.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 10.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 10.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 10.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project

plan.
Deliverable 10.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 10.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 10.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 10.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 10.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 10.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 10.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 10.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not

targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 10.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 10.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 10.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Task 11: Access to existing databases through EMP
Other OEM existing databases will require access points through the EMP. This may be as simple as adding a URL to a home page or as complex as creating a new front end with WAM capabilities. In addition EMP will need to share its data with other OSWER and agency databases, web pages etc. This task involves analysis of the existing application, recommendations for the best technical approach and development of any software required. Known applications that are in this category, include:

- System for Risk Management Plans: SRMP will require a new way to present its data through EMP so that read-only users can query for individual records and/or download whole data sets, such as the one for a particular state, or down load the entire database. Security for SRMP is of paramount concern due to the sensitive nature of the data.
- Compendium of Environmental Testing Laboratories: CETL is currently accessed through EMP via a link on a home page. This software may need to be modified to use WAM. It is currently accessed from EMP by a link to its URL. Modification of the front end will likely be performed by the contractor that currently supports it. Technical support to that contractor for incorporating it into EMP will be required under this task.

Subtask 11.1: Requirements Gathering

The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 11.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 11.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 11.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 11.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 11.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 11.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 11.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by

OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 11.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 11.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 11.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 11.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 11.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 11.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 11.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 11.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 11.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 11.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 11.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 11.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 11.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions

properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Task 12: Emergency Response Spill Notification System (ERNS)
ERNS is an older Oracle/Oracle Forms application that collects information concerning chemical and oil spills. This information is initially entered in a USCG system call IRIS and transferred to ERNS. ERNS can then be updated by EPA directly or through a web service with WebEOC. ERNS was recently moved into EPA space from its original home at the USCG. This task shall involve support for that software as follows:

- Technical support/bug fixes for any errors that my occur to the Oracle forms software or database
- Upgrade of the application including database redesign and front end upgrade to fit with the look, feel and functionality of EMP
- User support including a phone number and email for users to call and resolve issues with connectivity, passwords etc. The contractor shall track calls and issues. This is a temporary arrangement that should last no longer than 6 months at which time help desk functionality will be transferred to another entity.

Subtask 12.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 12.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 12.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 12.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other

appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 12.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 12.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 12.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 12.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 12.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 12.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes

business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 12.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 12.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 12.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 12.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 12.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 12.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 12.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 12.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications

and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 12.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 12.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 12.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Task 13: Small Projects Development
The purpose of this task is to accommodate the development of small/new projects that will allow either the completion of a small application or the performance of enough analysis to determine that the project is large enough to merit its own task. There should be no more than one or two of these per year.

Subtask 13.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 13.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the

meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 13.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 13.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 13.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 13.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 13.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 13.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 13.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may

address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 13.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 13.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 13.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 13.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 13.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 13.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 13.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 13.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date

specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 13.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 13.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 13.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 13.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Task 14: The Continuity of Operations Portal
OEM uses the Agency's existing portal technology and Web Access Management (WAM) to create a single point of entry for the Continuity of Operations Planners Community called the Continuity of Operations (COOP) Portal. The COOP Portal is currently seen only by COOP Planners; however this group has decided that it should be open to all EPA employees. This will involve a modification to the security model for this application. The COOP Portal modules reside at EPA's National Computer Center (NCC). The COOP Portal consists of the following modules:

- Core COOP Assessment Tool (CCAT) is an assessment application that allows the COOP Planners from each organizational entity (AA-ships and Regions) to

assess the progress toward readiness using specific criteria. COOP Plans are assessed once each year. CCAT is in production but may require a version 2. Version 2 will allow certain users to create and new evaluation year and modify criteria or create new criteria.

- COOP Essential Personnel will maintain a list of EPA COOP essential personnel, their contact information, requirements and readiness. There is a first iteration of this application, however it needs to be viewed/tested by SMEs and completed.
- Informational "home" pages: a home page exists for each organizational entity which allows them to communicate specifically with their COOP community concerning training, exercises and general COOP information. These pages are in production. Minor modifications to these pages may be required.

Subtask 14.1: Requirements Gathering

The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality.
- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 14.1.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. There will be 3-5 meetings per software module. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or TOPO/ATOPO to clarify requirements.

Subtask 14.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation

Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 14.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the EMP modules shall have its own data model. The overall EMP ERD shall be a single data model showing all modules and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM; models shall be integrated with the current models from other modules of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 14.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 14.2.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in electronic format. The ERWIN Data Modeler software shall be used for the data model; Visio shall be the software used for other models, unless agreed to by both the contractor and EPA. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 14.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 14.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this module is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 14.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 14.3.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary that includes business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 14.3.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.3.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 14.3.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation

by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this module is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.
Deliverable 14.3.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .pdf or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.
Deliverable 14.3.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.
Deliverable 14.3.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 14.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 14.4.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.4.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.4.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 14.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 14.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 14.5.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.5.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 14.5.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Task 15: Earned Value Management (EVM)

The contractor shall conform to EPA's EVM system requirements and shall be in compliance with ANSI/EIA Standard 748-A. EPA's EVM requirements are contained in the EPA EVM Procedures document, dated December 30, 2004, which can be found on EPA's Internet website at http://www.epa.gov/docs/irmpoli8/pdfs/evm_procedures_dec18_2004_v4.pdf. The contractor shall report EVM metrics monthly, as defined in this document including Cost Variance, Schedule Variance, and Performance Variance.

Deliverable 15.1: The contractor shall provide monthly OMB Dashboard reporting using the template provided by EPA for each month. Reporting is typically due the second week of each month for accounting two months prior.

Deliverable 15.2: the contractor shall provide quarterly reporting, if required, using the template provided by EPA for each FY quarter. Reporting is typically due in the middle of the quarter for the previous quarter. Reporting for a quarter should not differ from the monthly reports already provided.

Task 16: GIS Program Implementation for Emergency Operation Center (EOC)
OEM's EOC requires support to establish GIS functionality. The EOC has a GIS server, ARC-GIS9 and ARCview 3.2. OEM requires ongoing on-site contractor support for the following:

- Creation and maintenance of standard map templates, data layers (including those from the EMP and other Oracle databases) and imagery segments for use during emergencies.
- Installation of Arc Reader software on EOC work stations
- Setup and design of the GIS data server

- Development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) and training that will allow less skilled employees to use GIS use during responses.
- Coordination with Regional Response Centers and the OEI GIS Workgroup to determine critical data sets to be housed at the HQ location

Deliverable 16.6.1: The contractor shall participate in G1S emergency response meetings (travel required) approximately 5 meetings/year
Deliverable 16.6.2: The contractor shall provide maps, using data and templates for Planning Exercises, predeployments or incidents.
Deliverable 16.6.3: The contractor shall provide updated GIS SOP's for the EOC quarterly
Deliverable 16.6.4: The contractor shall maintain the EOC GIS Quickplace website. Information updates to the site on an as needed basis.
Deliverable 16.6.5: The contractor shall deploy to the EPA COOP site to conduct GIS operations for the EPA alternate EOC once per week for maintenance. Longer term relocation may be required during an incident or exercise.
Deliverable 16.6.6: The contractor shall maintain EOC GIS data on EOC GIS server and the backup server at the EPA HQ COOP site
Deliverable 16.6.7: The contractor shall coordinate with EPA GIS workgroup and regional emergency response contacts for data tools and services
Deliverable 16.6.8: The contractor shall develop and maintain EPA Situation Unit Leader GIS information package
Deliverable 16.6.9: The contractor shall develop basic GIS training packages with an emphasis on how GIS works in the EOC

Task 17: Emergency Support – Optional (3-6 months of intense activity, if required)

In the event of a national emergency, EPA may need intense data management support for a period of 3-6 months. This may involve rapid development and deployment, which shall require the use of the Emergency Environment Assessment database (a combination of STORET, AQS and Enviromapper (or other GIS application)) and its user interfaces, currently resident at NCC. The database and the user interfaces may require modifications as circumstances change. In addition EPA will require general GIS support at the HQ EOC to generate maps of the affected areas.

Subtask 17.1: Processing of Analytical Data to Allow Publication on the Internet
The contractor shall employ standard and custom ETL tools to move data from the field/laboratory into a central database for subsequent display on the internet. This includes ensuring that the chemical names match those in SRS, standardizing units, and ensuring that EPA provided text blocks display with the appropriate data.

Deliverable 17.1.1: The contractor shall load data to the appropriate development

environment in preparation for sending data dumps to the NCC for uploading to staging and production environments. A spreadsheet with dates of data loads and file name shall be provided to TOPO/ATOPO, upon request, through the end of the month period of performance.
Deliverable 17.1.2: The contractor shall provide rReports on STORET sample counts, as needed, through the end of the period of performance.
Deliverable 17.1.3: The contractor shall provide Version Description Document and associated software release packages for STORET, EnviroMapper, and AQS as appropriate.

Subtask 17.2: GIS Support for the EOC

- High volume, rapid turn-around map preparation using data collected during the emergency. Map production shall follow the protocols, SOPs and templates maintained above.
- GIS analyses using data produced/collected during the emergency and data layers/information available through EPA and other Federal Agencies.
- GIS expertise in the EOC shall be required for 15 hours/day.

Deliverable 17.2.1: The contractor shall provide high quality maps using EOC SOPs and data from the incident. 10-30 maps per day may be required.

Title	Make	Model	Serial Number	EPA Property Number	Acquisition Value	Acquisition Date
CPU	Dell	Precision 670	6M08Y91	PSC07859	$2,108.36	5/12/2006
CPU	Dell	Precision 670	2M08Y91	PSC07862	$2,108.36	5/12/2006
CPU	Dell	Precision 670	H75QX91	PSC07811	$2,108.36	5/12/2006
CPU	Dell	Precision 670	6M08Y91	PCS07861	$2,108.36	5/12/2006
CPU	Dell	Demention 5100	G40FK81	PSC07561	$1,245.50	11/7/2005
Monitor	View Sonic	VG2030EM	QCC070101687	None	$250.00	5/4/2007
Monitor	View Sonic	VG2030EM	QCC070101682	None	$250.00	5/4/2007
Monitor	Double Sight Displays	DS 1700	M13562502636	PCS07815	$546.78	5/12/2006
Monitor	Double Sight Displays	DS 1700	M13562402634	PCS07814	$546.78	5/12/2006
Server	Dell	PowerVault 220S	PV789K9379	PSC0785	$3,500.00	11/15/2005

Delivered and Managed through Managed Desktop Services - Part of WCF desk top charges - Not purchased					Current Retail Value
Plotter	Hewlett Packard	Design Jet 4500 PS	SG67IG9008	None	$13,495.00
Printer	Hewlett Packard	Color Laser Jet 3800 DN	CNWCH45133	L03893	$700.00

Attachment 1 #2

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY EP 52.245-120 (SEP 1994)

(a) The contractor shall not fabricate or acquire, on behalf of the Government, either directly or indirectly through a subcontract, any item of property without written approval from the Contracting officer.

(b) In accordance with paragraph (a) above, the contractor is authorized to acquire and/or fabricate the equipment listed below for use in the performance of this contract. The equipment is subject to the provisions of the "Government Property" clause: **NONE**

(c) The Government will provide the following item(s) of Government property to the contractor for use in the performance of this contract. **SEE ATTACHMENT 2: GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY**. This property shall be used and maintained by the contractor in accordance with the provisions of the "Government Property" clause.

(d) The "EPA Contract Property Administration Requirements" provided below apply to this contract.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Property Administration Requirements (PAR)

1. PURPOSE. This document sets forth the requirements for Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) contractors in the performance of their Government property management responsibilities under contracts with EPA. These requirements supplement those contained in the Government property clause(s) in this contract, and part 45 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

2. DELEGATION OF CONTRACT PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION. EPA has delegated much of its contract property management oversight to the Defense Contract Management Command (DCMC). Shortly after award of a contract, the EPA contracting officer (CO) delegates the functions of property administration and plant clearance (disposal) for the contract to DCMC. Upon acceptance of that delegation, DCMC will provide notification to the contractor, identifying the assigned property administrator (PA) and plant clearance officer (PLCO). If the contract is not delegated to DCMC for administration, any reference to PA and PLCO throughout this document shall be construed to mean CO. The DCMC PA is available to the contractor for assistance in all matters of property administration. Notwithstanding the delegation, as necessary, the contractor may contact their EPA CO. In the event of disagreement between the contractor and the DCMC PA, the contractor should seek resolution from the CO. Unless otherwise directed in the contract, or this document, all originals of written information or reports, except direct correspondence between the contractor and the DCMC PA, relative to Government property, should be forwarded to the administrative CO assigned to this contract.

3. REQUESTS FOR GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

a. In accordance with FAR 45.102, the contractor shall furnish all property required for performing Government contracts. If a contractor believes that Government facilities are required for performance of the contract, the contractor shall submit a written request to the CO. At a minimum, the request shall contain the following elements:

1. Contract number for which the facilities are required.

2. An item(s) description, quantity and estimated cost.

ATTACHMENT 3

3. Certification that no like contractor facilities exist which could be utilized.

4. A detailed description of the task-related purpose of the facilities.

5. Explanation of negative impact if facilities are not provided by the Government.

6. If applicable, recommend the exception under FAR 45.302-1(a) or any applicable EPA class deviation (available upon request), and provide any other information which would support the furnishing of facilities, including contractor-acquired property (CAP).

7. Except when the request is for material, a lease versus purchase analysis shall be furnished with the request to acquire property on behalf of the Government.

The contractor may not proceed with acquisition of facilities on behalf of the Government until receipt of written authorization from the EPA CO.

4. **TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.** When the contractor receives Government-furnished property (GFP), the contractor should receive, from the transferor, (either EPA or another contractor) all of the applicable data elements (Attachment 1 of this clause) needed to maintain the required records. If this information is not provided at the time of receipt of the property, the contractor shall request it from the EPA CO. The CO will attempt to obtain the data from the previous property holder, or, if data does not exist, will assist the current property holder in estimating the elements. Prior to signing an acceptance document for the property, the receiving contractor should perform a complete inventory of the property. Responsibility, as well as accountability, passes with the signed acceptance.

When, at the written direction of the EPA CO, the contractor transfers GFP to another contractor, or another Agency, the contractor shall provide the applicable data elements (Attachment 1 of this clause). Upon return of the property to EPA, the same data must be provided by the contractor to the EPA CO.

5. RECORDS OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

a. In accordance with FAR 45.505 and 45.505-1, the contractor shall establish and maintain adequate property records for all Government property, regardless of value, including property provided to and in the possession of a subcontractor. Material (supplies) provided by the Government or acquired by the contractor and billed as a direct charge to the Government is Government property and records must be established as such.

b. The contractor shall establish and maintain the official Government property record. (If the contract contains the FAR Clause 52.245-1, the Government will maintain the official Government property records.) Such records shall contain the applicable data elements (Attachment 1 of this clause) **<u>for all items of Government property regardless of cost</u>**.

c. The Contractor shall identify all Superfund property and designate it as such both on the item and on the official Government property record. If it is not practicable to tag the item, the contractor shall write the ID number on a tag, card or other entity that may be kept with the item or in a file.

d. Support documentation used for posting entries to the property record shall provide complete, current and auditable data. Entries shall be posted to the record in a timely manner following an action.

e. For Government vehicles, in addition to the data elements required by EPA, the contractor shall also comply with the General Services Administration (GSA) and Department of Energy (DOE) record and report requirements supplied with all EPA provided motor vehicles. If the above requirements were not provided with the vehicle, the contractor shall notify the EPA CO.

f. When Government property is disclosed to be in the possession or control of the contractor but not provided under any contract, the contractor shall record and report the property in accordance with FAR 45.502(f) and (h).

6. **INVENTORIES OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.** The contractor shall conduct a complete physical inventory of EPA property at least once per year, unless otherwise directed by the PA. Reconciliation shall be completed within 30 calendar days of inventory completion. The contractor shall report the results of the inventory, including any discrepancies, to the DCMC PA upon completion of the reconciliation. The contractor's records shall indicate the completion date of the inventory.

See section 9 herein, Contract Closeout, for information on final inventories.

7. **REPORTS OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.** In accordance with FAR 45.505-14, EPA requires an annual summary report, for each contract, by contract number, of Government property in the contractor's possession as of September 30 each year.

a. For each classification listed in FAR 45.505-14(a), except material, the contractor shall provide the total acquisition cost and total quantity. If there are zero items in a classification, or if there is an ending balance of zero, the classification must be listed with zeros in the quantity and acquisition cost columns.

b. For material, the contractor shall provide the total acquisition cost only.

c. Property classified as facilities, special tooling, special test equipment, and agency peculiar must be reported on two separate lines. The first line shall include the total acquisition cost and quantity of all items or systems with a unit acquisition cost of $25,000 or more. The second line shall include the total acquisition cost and quantity of all items with a unit acquisition cost of less than $25,000.

d. For items comprising a system, which is defined as ``a group of interacting items functioning as a complex whole,'' the contractor may maintain the record as a system noting all components of the system under the main component or maintain individual records for each item. However, for the annual report of Government property the components must be reported as a **system** with one total dollar amount for the system, if that system total is $25,000 or more.

e. The reports are to be **received** at EPA and DCMC no later than October 5 of each year.

f. Distribution shall be as follows:

Original to:	EPA CO
1 copy:	DCMC PA

g. EPA Contractors are required to comply with GSA's and DOE's special reporting requirements for motor vehicles. A statement of these requirements will be provided by the EPA Facility Management and Services Division (FMSD)

concurrent with receipt of each vehicle.

h. The contractor shall provide detailed reports on an as-needed basis, as may be requested by the CO or the PA.

8. DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY. The disposition process is composed of three distinct phases: identification of excess property, reporting of excess property, and final disposition.

a. Identification of Excess Property. The disposition process begins with the contractor identifying Government property that is excess to its contract. **Effective contractor property control systems provide for disclosing excesses as they occur.** Once inactive Government property has been determined to be excess to the contract to which it is accountable, it must be screened against the contractor's other EPA contracts for further use. If the property may be reutilized, the contractor shall notify the CO in writing. Government property will be transferred to other contracts only when the COs on both the current contract and the receiving contract authorize such a transfer in writing.

b. Reporting Excess Government Property. Excess Government property shall be reported in accordance with FAR Subpart 45.6. Inventory schedules A-E (SF Forms 1426-1434) provide the format for reporting of excess Government property. Instructions for completing the forms are located at FAR 45.606-5 and samples may be found in FAR 53.301-1426 thru 1434. Inventory schedules shall be forwarded to the DCMC PLCO with a copy to the EPA CO. The cover letter, which accompanies the inventory schedules, must include the EPA CO's name, address and telephone number. Inventory schedules must also contain a notification if the property is Superfund property. If the property is Superfund property, the contractor must also prominently include the following language on the inventory schedule: **"Note to PLCO: Reimbursement to the EPA Superfund is required."** When requested, by the PLCO or the CO, the contractor will provide the fair market value for those items requested.

c. Disposition Instructions.

1. If directed in writing by the EPA CO, the contractor will retain all or part of the excess Government property under the current contract for possible future requirements. The contractor shall request, from the PLCO, withdrawal from the inventory schedule of those items to be retained.

2. If directed in writing by the EPA CO, the contractor shall transfer the property to another EPA contractor. The contractor will transfer the property by shipping it in accordance with the instructions provided by the CO. The contractor shall request, from the PLCO, withdrawal from the inventory schedule of those items to be transferred. Further, the contractor shall notify the CO when the transfer is complete.

3. If directed in writing by the EPA CO, the contractor shall transfer the property to EPA. The contractor shall ship/deliver the property in accordance with the instructions provided by the CO. The contractor will request, from the PLCO, withdrawal from the inventory schedule of those items to be transferred to EPA. Further, the contractor shall notify the CO when the transfer is complete.

4. The contractor will ship the property elsewhere if directed, in writing, by the PLCO.

5. The PLCO will either conduct the sale or instruct the contractor to conduct a sale of surplus property. The contractor will allow prospective bidders access to property offered for sale.

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS. Where applicable (all elements are not applicable to material) the contractor is required to maintain, at a minimum, the information related to the following data elements for EPA Government property:

Contractor Identification/Tag Number;
Description;
Manufacturer;
Model;
Serial Number;
Acquisition Date;
Date received;
Acquisition Cost*;
Acquisition Document Number;
Location;
Contract Number;
Account Number (if supplied);
Superfund (Yes/No);
Inventory Performance Date;
Disposition Date.

* Acquisition cost shall include the price of the item plus all taxes, transportation and installation charges allocable to that item.

NOTE: For items comprising a system which is defined as, "a group of interacting items functioning as a complex whole," the contractor may maintain the record as a system noting all components of the system under the main component or maintain individual records for each item. However, for the Annual Report of Government Property, the components must be reported as a **system** with one total dollar amount for the system, if that system total is $25,000 or more.

UNITED SATATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

BPA No. EP07D000102

Guident Technologies, Inc.
590 Herndon Parkway Suite 350
Herndon, VA 20170-6209

Reference: GS-35F-0799M

CONTRACTOR

GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.

By: Suneet Gupta
Suneet Gupta
Title: Executive Vice President

11/20/06
Date Signed

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

By: Antonio L. Leathers
Antonio L. Leathers
Title: Contracting Officer

11/21/06
Date Signed

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Professional Services and Training in Support of Oracle-Based Applications
Blanket Purchase Agreement

Pursuant to GSA Federal Supply contract number GS-35F-0799M, Contractor Guident Technologies, Inc. agrees to the terms of a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) exclusively with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

1. The following contract items can be ordered under this BPA. All orders placed against this BPA are subject to the terms and conditions, except as noted below.

MODEL NUMBER/PART NUMBER	SPECIAL BPA DISCOUNT
Special Item Number (SIN) Codes 132-50 Training Courses (Education) 132-51 Information Technology Professional Services	Ex. 4 CBI

*Guident will provide voucher discounts on a per-order basis of Ex. 4 CBI for orders exceeding Ex. 4 CBI

The Contractor shall submit, when requested, a project plan for performing a task(s).

The unit prices and rates for this BPA will be based on the GSA contract pricing currently in effect at the time the order is placed. Any associated travel cost will be reimbursed at the rates provided in the Federal Government Travel or Joint Travel Regulations, and travel must be expressly authorized by the Call Order. Open Market items may be ordered against this BPA, but may not exceed $2,500 per order. Open-market purchases are subject to t he terms and conditions of the BPA and the GSA contract.

Additional discounts for volume may be determined at the time of order.

Fixed price shall be issued for Training unless the ordering office makes a determination that it is not possible at the time of placing the order to estimate accurately the extent or duration of the work or to anticipate costs with any reasonable degree of confidence (see above). When such a determination is made, and for Professional Services, a labor-hour or time-and materials order shall be placed, with a ceiling price established. The ceiling price shall be based on an assessment of the labor categories needed for the effort, the number of labor hours per category, and the hourly rates in the schedule contract, minus any applicable BPA discount.

Under the ceiling price that is established for labor-hour and time-and material orders, the total direct labor dollars may not exceed the ceiling price, but may be any combination of the authorized labor categories. The hours shown on the call orders will be for allocation purposes only and are not limiting for purposes of work performed and hours invoiced.

2. The following delivery time frames, listed by Schedule 70 SIN, are expected under the BPA. Any exception to the below shall be explicitly stated in the offeror's quotation:

SIN 132 50 – Training shall be conducted at a time and date agreed between the EPA Contracting Office and the contractor.

SIN 132 51 – Professional Services shall commence upon receipt of the call order, or at a later time and date if agreed between the EPA Contracting Office and the contractor. NOTE: Upon request, the contractor shall submit a project plan for performing the task within (10) days after receipt of the call order. The contractor shall also be responsible to notify the EPA Contracting Officer when labor expenses incurred exceed 75% of the call order's ceiling price.

3. The total of all calls placed will not exceed the maximum order limitation in the Contractor's Federal Supply Schedule contract referenced herein.

4. This BPA does not obligate any funds.

5. The BPA expires on November 30, 2011.

NOTE: Any order issued during the effective period of this Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) and not completed within that period shall be completed by the Contractor within the time specified in the order. The BPA shall govern the Contractor's and Government's rights and obligations with respect to that order to the same extent as if the order were completed during the contract's effective period; provided, that the Contractor shall not be required to make any deliveries under this contract after one (1) years beyond the expiration date of the contract.

6. The following individual is the Contractor's point of contact to accept all orders, administer this BPA and interface with the Contracting Office and customers:

Point of Contact:	Mr. Suneet Gupta
Phone Number:	(703) 326-0888
Fax Number:	(703) 326-0677
E-mail:	sgupta@guident.com

7. The following is hereby authorized to place orders under this BPA:

Any Contracting Officer, Procurement Operations Division, OARM Service Center
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park

8. Calls may be placed against this BPA via, electronic, FAX or paper.

9. Unless otherwise agreed to, all deliveries of supplies under this BPA must be accompanied by delivery tickets or sales slips that must contain the flowing information at a minimum:

a. Name of Contractor
b. Call Order Number
c. BPA number
d. Model number
e. Purchase order number
f. Date of purchase
g. Quantity, unit price, and extension of each item (unit prices and extensions need not be shown when incompatible with the use of automated systems; provided that the invoice is itemized to show the information).
h. Date of shipment

10. The terms and conditions included in this BPA apply to all purchases made pursuant to it. In the event of an inconsistency between the provisions of this BPA and Contractor's invoice, the provisions of this BPA will take precedence.

11. Guident's proposal dated June 14, 2006 and subsequent correspondence concerning the proposal are incorporated by reference as part of this BPA.

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT	1. CONTRACT ID CODE GS-35F-0799M	PAGE OF PAGES 1 | 2

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If Applicable)
1	03/09/2007	PR-RT-07-00112/GS-35F-0799M	

6. ISSUED BY CODE TBD
U.S. EPA Mail Drop: E105-02
OARM SERVICE CENTER
RTP PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS DIVISION
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27711

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State, ZIP Code)
GUIDENT TECHNOLOGIES
ATTN: SUNEET GUPTA
SUITE 350
590 HERNDON PARKWAY
HERNDON, VA20170-6209
Phone Number: (703) 326-0888

CODE | FACILITY CODE

9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

X **10A. MOD OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.** EP07D000102

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) 11/20/2006

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods

(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment, (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted, or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If Required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14

	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office appropriation date etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority) Mutual Agreement

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is [X] is not, [ ] required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by CUF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) This order is hereby modified as set forth on the following page(s).

(Please See Block 14 on Page 2 For Modification Notes)

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
SUNEET GUPTA / Exec. VP		KAREN GLASS	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	3/9/07	BY Karen Glass (Signature of Contracting Officer)	3/12/07

NSN 7540-01-152-8070 / PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE 30-105 STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83) / Prescribed by GSA/FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by CUF section headings, including solicitation/ contract subject matter where feasible.) This order is hereby modified as set forth on the following page(s). (CONTINUED)	PAGE NO. 2

The purpose of this modification is to amend the language of Section 3 and 7, removing the current wording in each section and replacing it with the following:

Sec. 3. In accordance with FAR 8.405-1(d), for each order under this BPA that exceeds the Federal Supply Schedule's maximum order limitation of $500,000.00 a further reduction in price of Ex. 4 CBI has been negotiated.

Sec. 7. All EPA Contracting Officers are hereby authorized to place orders under this BPA. However, only the Contracting Office in the Procurement Operations Division, OARM Service Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, can make changes to this BPA.

PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT

1. Title of Project:	Office of Emergency Management Systems Development and Integration
2. Period of Performance:	Base: One year from Call Order Issuance Option Periods: Two 1-year option periods.
3. Task Order Project Officer:	Constance Haaser (202)-564-8028 Office of Emergency Management U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20460 202-564-8028 202-564-8233 haaser.constance@epa.gov

Background Information

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) is located in the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER). The Office is composed of a *National Decontamination Team*, a *Business Operations Center*, and four Divisions: *Regulatory and Policy Development*, *National Planning and Preparedness*, *Program Operations and Coordination*, and *Evaluation and Communications*. The Office is generally responsible for implementing the Oil Pollution Prevention Program under the Clean Water Act; oversight of the National Emergency Response and Removal programs under Superfund and the Oil Pollution Act; and oversight of National Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention programs under the Clean Air Act and Title III of SARA. The Office plays a major role in leading Agency efforts related to Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, including serving as EPA's Emergency Coordinator, chairing the multi-agency National Response Team, and managing the Agency's National Incident Coordination Team during environmental emergencies involving multiple EPA program offices or foreign countries. The Office manages and maintains EPA's Headquarters (HQ) Emergency Operations Center and leads EPA coordination of activities under the Federal Response Plan, the National Security Emergency Preparedness Program and the government-wide National Response Plan. The Office actively participates in federal chemical, biological and radiological counter-terrorism planning and coordinates closely with the Department of Homeland Security, the White House Homeland Security Counsel, and EPA's Office of Homeland Security. Additionally, the Office represents EPA on domestic and international efforts to promote more effective chemical emergency preparedness and response, and works with the Chemical Safety Board, OSHA, and other government agencies in conducting investigations of chemical accidents, and in implementing recommendations to improve chemical safety. Lastly, the Office conducts the policy analyses and program evaluation necessary for national leadership

of the programs under its purview and provides technical assistance, training, outreach, and communication to the Regions, States/Tribes, local governments and other stakeholders in each of its assigned program areas.

This task shall deal with the analysis, design, development, installation and maintenance of OEM applications. Requirements will be communicated to the contractor in writing with the approval of the Task Order Project Officer or alternate Task Order Project Officer (TOPO/ATOPO). The requirements may consist of detailed system requirements/specifications, screen layouts, navigation and interface among screens, data validation rules, and detailed storage and processing requirements. The contractor shall complete the work to meet the requirements of the assignment, complete initial alpha testing, and document the completed work. EPA analysts will complete the testing of each deliverable and communicate in writing any modifications, if necessary, to be made by the contractor. EPA analysts and the TOPO/ATOPO will work with the contractor's development team to develop data models, normalized data structures, and processing/storage requirements. Data elements are identified, defined and checked against the OEM data dictionary to ensure their consistency across different datasets. Approved data elements become a part of the OSWER data dictionary.

As coding proceeds, EPA analysts and the TOPO/ATOPO monitor progress against specifications and schedule. The EPA analysts test modules of code as they are completed and provide feedback through the TOPO/ATOPO to the contractor development team. This feedback process is always done in writing. Every system update goes through a set of rigorous tests before it is released to users. After completion of software development, the contractor development team thoroughly tests the system and releases the alpha version only when and if it passes the quality assurance tests. There are both unit tests done by the contractors, as well as, a complete system test also performed by the contractor. The EPA analysts then perform an independent test of the system. The results of this testing are communicated to the contractor development team in writing by the TOPO/ATOPO and any needed corrections are made to a new alpha version. The new version is again submitted for quality assurance testing. Once the EPA analysts for each task and the TOPO/ATOPO are satisfied with the alpha version, it is released for beta testing in the staging environment by a core group of users who participated in the requirements development process. The core users communicate test results to the EPA analysts who in turn work with the TOPO/ATOPO and the contractor development team to make any necessary corrections. Those corrections, too, are tested by the core users. The beta test period is closed by user acceptance of the beta test version and approval by the TOPO/ATOPO and the application is moved to the production environment by the contractor in coordination with the production operations contractor. OEM is using the Agency's portal technology to develop a series of application to support emergency management. The following applications are part of the Emergency Management Portal (EMP). This task will involve a GIS solution that will serve multiple modules and

design/development of the Field Readiness Module.

- Emergency Management Portal
  - Equipment Module
  - **Field Readiness Module**
  - Decontamination Portfolio Module
  - Environmental Assessment Module
  - Site Module (incidents, removals, exercises, events)
  - General ER Information
  - Collaboration

Purpose and Scope
The purpose of this Task Order is to secure the services of the contractor to provide technical and operational support services to the Office of Emergency Management for the development, maintenance and operation of enterprise-wide information management tools to support emergency preparedness, prevention and response. The information management tools developed through this Task Order will support both HQ personnel and Regional On-scene Coordinators and therefore must be stable, portable and available for use in a variety of scenarios. The contractor shall provide or acquire the personnel to complete the tasks below.

Work performed by the contractor for Subtask 2.6 requires a contractor to be on-site in the EOC (Washington, DC) or on-site in the COOP location (Ft. Meade, MD) for a total of 40 hours/wk. All other work performed by the contractor shall be done at the contractor's location with the exception of the following:

- Meetings scheduled at the EPA location.
- Special request work for on-site assistance.
- Special request for a meeting at an off-site location for evaluation purposes.

Period of Performance
Base: One year from Call Order issuance
Options: Two 1-year options periods.

Key EPA Personnel

Task Order Project Officer (TOPO)
Constance Haaser
Office of Emergency Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-8028

Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: haaser.constance@epa.gov

Alternate Task Order Project Officer (ATOPO)
Joan Karrie
Office of Emergency Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-9469
Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: karrie.joan@epa.gov

Alternate Task Order Project Officer (ATOPO)
Christopher Burgess
Office of Emergency Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-8026
Fax: 202-564 -8731
Email: burgess.christopher@epa.gov

Task 1: Field Readiness Module
The Field Readiness Module is part of the EMP. It consists of tracking training and experience for On Scene Coordinators and Response Support Corp. It also provides a deployment tracking system. This task shall consist of requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, and enhancements, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and regional data conversion subtasks.

Subtask 1.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with various groups of Headquarters and Regional employees who are the intended users of the information management tools being produced by this Task. TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements analysis is to determine whether some systems can be combined/ related to one another, eliminated, or replaced and to determine what gaps need to be filled with new systems. Most of the requirements have been gathered and prototypes have been built. Remaining work involves gathering feed back on the two prototypes (Response Support Corps and COOP essential personnel) and finalizing requirements for the OSC readiness piece.

Deliverable 1.1.1: The deliverables for this task are well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered 1 week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO.

Subtask 1.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 1.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall develop and/or participate in the development of the Personnel data model which will be included in the enterprise data model. The contractor shall develop and/or participate in the development of the functional model, process model or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of the system. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 1.1 into an integrated requirements document. Current models for Field Readiness shall be integrated with the current models from other modules in the EMP being developed by another contractor.

Deliverable 1.2.1: Models shall be delivered in electronic format. ERWIN Shall be used and the output delivered to EPA for incorporation into their enterprise ART tool. Other software tools for modeling will be discussed and agreed upon before modeling begins. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review 3 weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 1.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the final version 2 weeks after receipt of comments. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 1.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which will be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule will be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 1.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task Shall be based upon requirements gathered from existing legacy systems and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The new system should address any technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it

progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 1.3.1: Data dictionary including business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.3.2: Source code for all programs, including class libraries by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.3.3: Code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 1.3.4: Internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.3.5: Users guide and training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 1.3.6: Production software must function properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software. .

Subtask 1.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions.
The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system that were not changed, and the software is reliable.

Deliverable 1.4.1: Integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.4.2: Contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 1.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing, the contractor shall work with the Emergency Management Portal Team to incorporate the software into the rest of the EMP application and load it on the QA LAN for viewing by EPA analysts. EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

Delivery schedule for the alpha version of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements

document developed in Subtask 1.2. The contractor shall provide the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks). The software will be moved into production from the QA LAN by the Emergency Management Portal Team.

Deliverable 1.5.1: Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 1.5.2: Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule. This will be a joint effort between the Emergency Management Portal Team and the contractor.

Task 2: GIS Development
The Emergency Management Portal has several modules that collect geospatial information. The objective of this task is to determine how these data should be accessed and analyzed for field personnel and for the general public. OSWER/OEM has two applications that can be used/modified for this purpose: ER Analyzer and Cleanups in My Community.

Subtask 2.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with the Headquarters and Regional employees who are the intended users of the geospatial data. TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- System functionality.
- Data to be housed.
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems.

Deliverable 2.1.1: Well-run meetings which are facilitated and documented. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO. Meetings with subject matter experts will occur approximately twice each month. Technical meetings with the TOPO/ATOPO will occur weekly. Meeting documentation shall be delivered 1 week after the meeting takes place.

Subtask 2.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 2.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall develop and/or participate in the development of the Decontamination Portfolio data model which will be included in the OEM Enterprise Data Model. The contractor will also develop the functional model, process model or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of the system. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from

Subtask 2.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 2.2.1: Models shall be delivered in electronic format. Visio and ERWIN are used for modeling. Any other software tools for modeling that may be required will be discussed and agreed upon before modeling begins. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review 1 week after the requirements gathering and technical meetings described in Subtask 2.1.
Deliverable 2.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required.
Deliverable 2.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which will be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Final Requirements Document shall be provided by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The contractor has provided a first draft of the GIS requirements analysis. The contractor shall incorporate any comments provided by the TOPO/ATOPO and prepare a final document.

Deliverable 2.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule will be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 2.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement

Software solutions designed and developed under this task will be based upon requirements gathered from existing legacy systems and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The new system should address any technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 2.3.1: Data dictionary by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.3.2: Source code for all programs, including class libraries by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.3.3: Code walk through, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO(s).
Deliverable 2.3.4: Internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.3.5: Users guide and training materials, if requested at the direction of

the TOPO/ATOPO(s).
Deliverable 2.3.6: Production software must function properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software. .

Subtask 2.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions.
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system that were not changed, and the software is reliable.

Deliverable 2.4.1: Integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.4.2: Contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 2.5: Deployment
Upon successful completion of the testing, the contractor shall deliver the software to EPA. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the TOPO/ATOPO is satisfied with the software, a beta version is released for testing in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

Delivery schedule for the alpha version of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 2.2. The contractor shall provide the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks). Production software must function properly when installed at EPA's NCC.

Deliverable 2.5.1: Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 2.5.2: Concept of Operations Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.5.3: Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule

Subtask 2.6: GIS Program Implementation for Emergency Operation Center

The Office of Emergency Management's Emergency Operation Center (EOC) requires support to establish GIS functionality. The EOC has a GIS server, ARC-GIS9 and ARCview 3.2. OEM requires ongoing contractor support for the following:

- Creation and maintenance of standard map templates, data layers (including those from the EPM and other Oracle databases) and imagery segments for use during emergencies.
- Installation of Arc Reader software on EOC work stations
- Setup and design of the GIS data server
- Development of SOPS and training that will allow less skilled employees to use GIS use during responses.
- Coordination with Regional Response Centers and OEI GIS Workgroup to determine critical data sets to be housed at the headquarters location

Deliverable 2.6.1: Participation GIS emergency response meetings (travel required) approximately 5 meetings/year

Deliverable 2.6.2: Map production using data and templates for

- Planning
- Exercises
- Events/incidents

Deliverable 2.6.3: Updated GIS standard operating procedures for the EOC quarterly

Deliverable 2.6.4: Maintenance of the EOC GIS Quickplace website. Information updates to the site on an as needed bases.

Deliverable 2.6.5: Deploy to EPA COOP site to conduct GIS operation for OEM / alternate EOC. Once per week for maintenance. Long term relocation during an incident or exercise.

Deliverable 2.6.6: Maintenance of the EOC GIS data on EOC GIS server and backup server at the EPA HQ COOP site

Deliverable 2.6.7: Coordinate with EPA GIS workgroup and regional emergency response contacts for data tools and services

Deliverable 2.6.8: Develop and maintain EPA Situation Unit Leader GIS information package

Deliverable 2.6.9: Develop basic GIS training packages with an emphasis on how GIS works in the EOC

Task 3: COOP Portal

The Continuity of Operations Portal is an informational and functional community portlet for EPA COOP Planners. It consists of an assessment application (Core COOP Assessment Tool-CCAT), COOP Essential Personnel, and an informational "home" page. CCAT version 1 is in production. All code from CCAT version 1 will be turned over to the contractor to manage and enhance. The contractor has designed and developed a prototype of COOP Essential Personnel. Information on the current

COOP intranet page shall be used as a starting point to create the COOP Portal home page. Requirements gathering, design and development are required for CCAT version 2, completion of COOP Essential Personnel and the COOP home page.

Subtask 3.1: Requirements Gathering
The contractor shall meet with various groups of Headquarters and Regional employees who are the intended users of the information management tools being produced by this Task. TOPO/ATOPO and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements analysis is to determine whether some systems can be combined/ related to one another, eliminated, or replaced and to determine what gaps need to be filled with new systems.
Deliverable 3.1.1: The deliverables for this task are well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered 1 week after the meeting takes place. The meetings will be arranged by the TOPO/ATOPO.

Subtask 3.2: Modeling and Requirements Documentation
Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 3.1 and other information provided by the TOPO/ATOPO, the contractor shall develop and/or participate in the development of the Personnel data model which will be included in the enterprise data model. The contractor shall develop and/or participate in the development of the functional model, process model or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of the system. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 3.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 3.2.1: Models shall be delivered in electronic format. ERWIN shall be used and the output delivered to EPA for incorporation into their enterprise ART tool. Other software tools for modeling will be discussed and agreed upon before modeling begins. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review 3 weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.
Deliverable 3.2.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the final version 2 weeks after receipt of comments. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.
Deliverable 3.2.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which will be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.2.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule will be documented in Microsoft Project by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 3.3: Software Design, Development and Enhancement
Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from existing legacy systems and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The new system should address any technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The TOPO/ATOPO will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 3.3.1: Data dictionary including business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.3.2: Source code for all programs, including class libraries by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.3.3: Code walk through, as requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 3.3.4: Internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.3.5: Users guide and training materials, if requested at the direction of the TOPO/ATOPO.
Deliverable 3.3.6: Production software must function properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software. .

Subtask 3.4: Testing and Quality Assurance
The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions.
The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system that were not changed, and the software is reliable.

Deliverable 3.4.1: Integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.4.2: Contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Subtask 3.5: Deployment

Upon successful completion of the testing, the contractor shall allow access to the beta version of the software to EPA. EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

Delivery schedule for the alpha version of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed in Subtask 3.2. The contractor shall provide the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks). The software will be moved into production from the QA LAN by the Emergency Management Portal Team.

Deliverable 3.5.1: Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.
Deliverable 3.5.2: Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT

1. Title of Project: Office of Emergency Management Systems Development and Integration

2. Period of Performance:
   Base Period: April 16, 2012 – April 15, 2013
   Option Year I: April 16, 2013 – April 15, 2014
   Option Year II: April 16, 2014 – April 15, 2015
   Option Year III: April 16, 2015 – April 15, 2016
   Option Year IV: April 16, 2016 – April 15, 2017

3. Contract Office Representative:
   Joshua Woodyard
   Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
   U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
   1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20460
   Phone: 202-564-9588
   Fax: 202-564 -8233
   Email: woodyard.joshua@epa.gov

Background Information

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) is located in the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER). The Office is composed of a *National Decontamination Team (NDT)*, a *Business Operations Center*, and four Divisions: *Regulatory and Policy Development*, *National Planning and Preparedness*, *Program Operations and Coordination*, and *Evaluation and Communications*. The Office is generally responsible for implementing the Oil Pollution Prevention Program under the Clean Water Act, oversight of the National Emergency Response and Removal programs under Superfund and the Oil Pollution Act, and oversight of the National Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention programs under the Clean Air Act and Title III of SARA. The Office plays a major role in leading Agency efforts related to Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, including serving as The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Emergency Coordinator, chairing the multi-agency National Response Team and managing the Agency's National Incident Coordination Team during environmental emergencies involving multiple EPA program offices or foreign countries. The Office manages and maintains EPA's Headquarters (HQ) Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and leads EPA coordination of activities under the Federal Response Plan, the National Security Emergency Preparedness Program, and the government-wide National Response Plan. The Office actively participates in federal chemical, biological, and radiological counter-terrorism planning and coordinates closely with the Department of Homeland Security, the White House Homeland Security Counsel, and EPA's Office of Homeland Security. Additionally, the Office represents EPA on domestic and international efforts to promote more effective chemical emergency preparedness and response and works with the Chemical Safety Board, OSHA, and other government agencies to conduct investigations of chemical accidents and implement recommendations to improve chemical safety. Lastly, the Office conducts the policy analyses and program evaluation necessary for national leadership of the programs under its purview and provides technical assistance, training, outreach, and communication to the Regions, States/Tribes, local governments, and other stakeholders in each of its assigned program areas.

Current OEM applications to be maintained, enhanced, or developed during the period of performance of this Task Order are the following.

Emergency Management and COOP Portal

OEM uses the Agency's Web Access Management (WAM) to create a single point of entry for the Emergency Management and COOP Communities within the Emergency Management (EMP) & COOP Portal. Except as noted, all EMP & COOP applications have a Java front end accessing Oracle databases and are housed at the Agency's National Computing Center (NCC.) EMP includes the following applications.

User Access and Homepages

Login and Informational "home" pages: Access to the EMP & COOP Portal and all associated applications is managed using a dedicated web-accessible login page using the Agency's Web Access Management functionality. Data transfer between the EMP database and the Agency's Web Access Management database (Oracle Internet Directory) facilitates single-sign on for Agency personnel, registration of non-Agency personnel, role management, and data maintenance. The applications serve two major communities, the Agency emergency responders and the Agency COOP Planners. Each EMP application has an editable home page with information relating to the application's central topic and may have related technical information pages.

Emergency Management

Equipment Tracking (ET): The Equipment Tracking application is an in-house developed centralized warehouse and equipment resource tracking system used by the Agency's emergency response warehouses. ET allows warehouse managers to log equipment maintenance, perform inventory, and track equipment usage within the Agency's emergency response warehouses with integrated reporting at an Agency level. Reporting of equipment and warehouse-related data is accomplished via OEM's business intelligence application – Emergency Management Business Intelligence (EMBI.) A parallel demonstration/practice ET instance is provided for user training purposes.

Field Readiness (FR): Field Readiness is an in-house developed application that provides centralized data collection and management of training, certification, deployment, and exercise information for EPA's emergency management community, including professional responders and Response Support Corps volunteers. In addition, OEM has partnered with the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) to include OECA inspector and Special Agent data as well. Reporting of FR data is accomplished via EMBI. A parallel demonstration/practice FR instance is provided for user training purposes.

Oil Database (Oil DB): The Oil Database is an in-house developed application that allows EPA regional staff to track and maintain information on regulated facilities and to record performance of various program activities related to the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Rule and Facility Response Plan Rule in a nationally-consistent data framework. In addition, it captures descriptive information about facilities regulated under 40 CFR part 112 to assist EPA HQ staff in

evaluating Oil Pollution Prevention regulatory options, impacts, and program implementation. Reporting of Oil DB data is accomplished via EMBI. A parallel demonstration/practice Oil DB instance is provided for user training purposes.

Emergency Management Business Intelligence (EMBI): EMP uses Oracle Business Intelligence Enterprise Edition (OBIEE) to perform reporting and analysis functions against the data housed in the EMP database. Several EMP applications have optimized EMBI databases against which the reports are created and run. EMBI is housed at the National Computing Center's Business Intelligence Analytics Center (BIAC.) Equipment Tracking, Field Readiness, and Oil Database are the EMP applications that currently use EMBI functionality.

EMP Administration (Admin): The EMP Admin application currently allows EMP & COOP Administrator users to perform administration functions including role management, web page creation, and user alert scheduling and includes a document library also linked to other EMP applications. This application is accessed via the EMP & COOP Homepage Dashboard.

The Decontamination Portfolio (Decon): Decon is an in-house developed application that contains information useful to professional responders concerning procedures for decontamination, containment, health and safety, and toxicity of chemicals and biological weapons of mass destruction. It contains documents, hyperlinks to information, and discrete data. Decon also provides a link to the CAMEO Chemicals website for further information about the chemical of interest and other chemicals.

National Approach to Response (NAR) Preparedness Plan Tracking: The NAR tracking application is an in-house developed application that provides a framework to address overall Agency readiness for multiple simultaneous nationally significant events. The NAR Tracking application tracks all of the specific gaps and work plans associated with the preparedness of EPA HQ and Regions to implement EPA's National Approach to Response. In addition, it is used as an annual evaluation tool to measure progress in completing activities in the NAR Preparedness Plan (i.e., Core NAR).

Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS): ERNS is an older Oracle/Oracle Forms application that collects information concerning chemical and oil spills. This information is initially entered in a USCG system call IRIS and transferred to ERNS. ERNS can then be updated by EPA directly or through a web service with another application called WebEOC. ERNS is accessible via the EMP & COOP Portal.

Continuity of Operations (COOP)

- Core COOP Assessment Tool (CCAT): CCAT is an in-house developed application that allows Agency Continuity of Operations (COOP) Planners from each organizational entity (AA-ships and Regions) to assess the progress toward continuity of operations readiness using specific criteria. COOP Plans are assessed once each year and the assessment is managed within CCAT.

Demonstration/Practice Application Instances

For each application, it may be determined that a demonstration/practice parallel application must be developed and maintained and housed at NCC. Currently, Equipment Tracking, Field Readiness, and Oil DB have such parallel instances, one called "Production" and one called "Training" (known to the users as "Demo/Practice".)

- Production (Emergency Management) instance, which houses the authoritative and reportable data, and
- Training (EMP-Training) instance which is an exact replica of the Production instance but accesses a database that is intended for use during testing and user training. The database accessed by the Training instance shall be replaced at identified intervals with a copy of the Production data.

All tasks related to EMP applications apply equally to the two instances, unless otherwise specified. There is no EMBI database associated with data in the Training instance.

Other tasks that may be required during the period of performance of this Task Order are the following.

- EMP Help Desk,
- Security solutions
- Other small applications as needed
- LOE determination for large new development efforts
- User Training
- Data, database development, application development, reporting and analytics, and web development, as needed in support of OEM's Emergency Operations Center during a nationally significant event.

Systems Development Philosophy

Systems development will proceed in accordance with the EPA Systems Development procedure and processes. Requirements will be communicated to the contractor in writing with the approval of the Contract Officer Representative (COR) or Alternate COR (ACOR). The requirements may consist of detailed system requirements/specifications, screen layouts, navigation and interface among screens, data validation rules, and detailed storage and processing requirements, maps, models and diagrams. The contractor shall adhere to Federal, Agency, and Office data, modeling, and technology standards.

The contractor shall develop data models, normalized data structures, processing/storage requirements, and prototypes. Data elements shall be identified, defined, and cross-checked within the EMP data dictionary to ensure their consistency across different datasets. Approved data elements become a part of the OSWER data dictionary. The contractor shall complete the work to meet the requirements of the assignment, complete initial alpha testing, and document the completed work. EPA subject matter experts (SMEs) will test each deliverable and communicate in writing any modifications to be made by the contractor.

As coding proceeds, the COR/ACOR will monitor progress against specifications and schedule. The EPA SMEs will test modules of code as they are completed and provide feedback through the COR/ACOR to the contractor development team. This feedback process will always be done in writing. Every system update will go through a set of rigorous tests before it is released to users. After completion of software development, the contractor development team shall thoroughly test

the system and release the alpha version only when and if it passes the quality assurance tests. There are both unit tests and a complete system test, all performed by the contractor. The SMEs will then perform an independent test of the system. The results of this testing will be communicated to the contractor in writing by the COR/ACOR and any needed corrections shall be made. The new version shall again be submitted for quality assurance testing. Once the COR/ACOR are satisfied with this version, it shall be released into the staging environment for beta testing by a core group of users who participated in the requirements development process. The COR/ACOR will communicate in writing with the contractor to make any necessary corrections. The beta test period will be closed by user acceptance of the beta test version and approval by the COR/ACOR, after which, the application shall be moved to the production environment by the contractor in coordination with NCC. Each application shall have on-line help that is updated with each revision of the software as well as FAQ's for new version functionality.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this Task Order is to secure the services of the contractor to provide technical and operational support services to OEM for the development, maintenance, and operation of enterprise-wide information management tools to support emergency preparedness, prevention, and response. The information management tools developed through this Task Order will support both HQ and Regional personnel, including the emergency response field personnel (On-scene Coordinators), and therefore must be stable, portable and available for use in a variety of scenarios. The contractor shall provide or acquire the personnel to complete the tasks below.

Work shall be performed at the contractor's location with the exception of the following

- Meetings scheduled at the EPA location,
- Special request work for on-site assistance,
- Special request for a meeting at an off-site location (including Regional offices across the country) to meet with SMEs/Users,
- Work performed by the contractor for Task 14, which requires a contractor to be on-site in one of two locations, the EOC (Washington, DC) or on-site in the COOP location (Ft. Meade, MD) for a total of 40 hours/wk
- Work performed by the contractor for Task 15 which may require a contractor to be on-site in one of two locations, the EOC (Washington, DC) or on-site in the COOP location (Ft. Meade, MD).

Key EPA Personnel

Contract Officer Representative (COR)
Joshua Woodyard
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-9588
Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: woodyard.joshua@epa.gov

Alternate Contract Officer Representatives (ACOR)

Joan Karrie
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-9469
Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: karrie.joan@epa.gov

Technical Contract Officer Representatives (TCOR) For Oil Dbase Task 5 only

Peter Gattuso
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-7993
Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: gattuso.peter@epa.gov

Technical Contract Officer Representatives (TCOR) For ERNS Task 9 only

Rob Thomas
Office of Emergency Management (MC 5401A)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone: 202-564-7986
Fax: 202-564 -8233
Email: thomas.rob@epa.gov

Task 1: Develop Project Work Plan

Deliverable 1.1: The contractor shall respond to this statement of work with a detailed contract work plan. The detailed work plan tasks will be used to track all expenditures on subsequent invoices.

Task 2: Maintenance and Enhancement of the Emergency Management Portal (EMP) and COOP Portal structure, technology, and architecture.

The purpose of this task is to support the overall infrastructure of EMP and the COOP Portal. Infrastructure as deployed at the NCC. Some of the work involve within this task will/may include

- Initiating new Application Development Checklist (ADC) and participating in ADC calls,
- Maintaining familiarity with NCC environment so as to anticipate issues,
- Upgrading EMP & COOP Portal code to work under NCC infrastructure changes,

- Testing applications after infrastructure changes at NCC,
- Suggesting improvements to the EMP & COOP Portal infrastructure based on user needs and technology improvements, such as the use of Oracle APEX.
- Maintaining data exchanges with Web Access Management to support single sign-on and role security capabilities,
- Responding to notification of portal or application inaccessibility.

Subtask 2.1: Maintain and enhance EMP & COOP Portal accessibility to the user.

Deliverable 2.1.1: The contractor shall participate in Application Development Checklist and other NCC infrastructure meetings to proactively identify and manage deployment issues.

Deliverable 2.1.2: The contractor shall upgrade EMP & COOP Portal code as necessary to work under NCC infrastructure changes and test applications after infrastructure changes at NCC.

Deliverable 2.1.3: The contractor shall maintain data exchanges with Web Access Management to support single sign-on and role security capabilities,

Deliverable 2.1.4: Respond to notifications of portal or application inaccessibility within one hour during normal business hours. Work with NCC to resolve issues as necessary.

Subtask 2.2: Requirements Gathering

The contractor shall meet with HQ and Regional EPA employees who are the intended users of the Emergency Management Portal. The COR/ACOR and user community will review and agree to the requirements before development work begins. The purpose of the requirements gathering phase is to determine the following:

- Business functionality
- System functionality
- Data to be housed
- Best technical solution to meet requirements
- Integration opportunities with Federal existing systems

Deliverable 2.2.1: The contractor shall provide well run meetings that are facilitated and documented. Meeting documentation shall be delivered one week after the meeting takes place. Technical meetings with the COR/ACOR and/or SME's will occur at the request of either the contractor or COR/ACOR to clarify requirements.

Subtask 2.3: Modeling and Requirements Documentation

Using the requirements gathered in Subtask 2.1 and other information provided by the COR/ACOR, the contractor shall modify, develop and/or participate in the development of the data model, functional model, process model and/or other appropriate models that depict the design and functionality of modifications to the system. Each of the applications shall have its own data model. Overall EMP shall have a single data model showing all applications and how they relate to each other. The contractor shall modify the models to meet the emerging requirements of OEM. The models shall be integrated with the models from other applications of EMP. The contractor shall combine these models with explanatory text, also gathered from Subtask 2.1 into an integrated requirements document.

Deliverable 2.3.1: The contractor shall provide models that shall be delivered in Adobe Acrobat format, as well as the native electronic format in which they were developed. Where so specified by OEI, the models shall conform to the requirements of OEI's Enterprise Architecture specifications. The contractor shall deliver a draft version of the models for EPA's review three weeks after the final user requirements gathering meeting.

Deliverable 2.3.2: The contractor shall incorporate EPA's comments on the models and deliver the new version at an agreed upon time after receipt of comments. The time frame will depend on the complexity of the changes required. Any subsequent changes to models must be accompanied by written documentation of the changes.

Deliverable 2.3.3: The contractor shall deliver requirements documents, which shall be a combination of text and models that clearly depict the requirements expressed by OEM staff and the user community. The purpose of these documents is communication with the user community. The Requirements document for this application is incorporated in the EMP system requirements specifications. The Final Requirements Document shall be completed by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.3.4: The contractor shall develop a schedule for the completion of the project based upon the requirements gathered. The schedule shall be documented by the date specified in the approved project schedule and shall be delivered to EPA in Adobe Acrobat format as well as in the native format in which it was developed.

Subtask 2.4: Software Design, Development and Enhancement

Software solutions designed and developed under this task shall be based upon requirements gathered from the existing EMP system, existing legacy systems, and new requirements gathered from HQ and Regional employees. The improvements may address technology gaps, unique data manipulation tools for displaying existing information in more functional ways, and/or portable solutions to provide functionality to hand-held devices.

The contractor shall design and develop software, including reports, menus, screens and other programs. The COR/ACOR will actively participate in review of this software so she/he can monitor the progress of the contractor development team as it progresses toward completion of the goals set by EPA.

Deliverable 2.4.1: The contractor shall provide a data dictionary including business definitions of fields and tables by the date specified in the approved project plan.

Deliverable 2.4.2: The contractor shall provide source code for all programs, including class libraries, by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.4.3: The contractor shall provide a code walk through, as requested at the direction of the COR/ACOR.

Deliverable 2.4.4: The contractor shall provide internal system design documentation by the date specified in the approved project schedule. The system design document for this application is incorporated in the overall EMP system design document.

Deliverable 2.4.5: The contractor shall provide up-to-date, on-line user help and, if requested by users, .Adobe Acrobat or MS Word (Agency-approved version) files, by the date specified in the approved project plan.

Deliverable 2.4.6: The contractor shall provide software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center.

Deliverable 2.4.7: The contractor shall provide training materials, if requested at the direction of the COR/ACOR.

The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the Production version of the software.

Subtask 2.5: Testing and Quality Assurance

The contractor shall perform testing of all new or modified software using personnel other than those developing the software being tested. Quality assurance activities included in this testing must demonstrate that:

- The software performs to specifications outlined in the written instructions,
- The modifications have caused no problems in parts of the system which were not changed, and
- The software is reliable.

Deliverable 2.5.1: The contractor shall provide an integrated systems test plan by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.5.2: The contractor shall provide contractor test results by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.5.3: The contractor shall provide and updated alpha version of EMP in a user-accessible testing environment that is available to users by the agreed upon date for each update.

Subtask 2.6: Deployment

Upon successful completion of the testing and subsequent updating, the contractor shall deliver the modified software to EPA/NCC for upload to the Staging Environment. The EPA analysts will test the software to ensure that it performs according to specifications and that modifications have not caused any problems to parts of the system not targeted for change. Once the COR/ACOR is satisfied with the software, an updated version shall be released for testing at EPA/NCC in the production environment. The criteria for this phase of testing are the same as for the original phase. The contractor shall correct software problems identified at all phases of testing. Required corrections will be provided to the contractor in writing.

The delivery schedule for the various versions of the software will depend upon the complexity of the application. This schedule will be determined based upon the requirements document developed Subtask 2.2.

The contractor shall provide drafts of the following documentation upon delivery of the alpha version of the software. The contractor shall provide the final version of these documents with the delivery of the product (i.e., production version of the software, final draft of analytical or design tasks).

Deliverable 2.6.1: The contractor shall provide a Version Description Document by the date specified in the approved project schedule.

Deliverable 2.6.2: The contractor shall provide an Applications Deployment Checklist by the date specified in the approved project schedule

Deliverable 2.6.3: The contractor shall provide production software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Deliverable 2.6.4: The contractor shall provide demonstration/training instance software that functions properly when installed at EPA's National Computer Center

Subtask 2.7: On-line Help

Each application shall have on-line help that is updated with each revision of the software. In addition, documentation of the changes within new versions will be made available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Deliverable 2.7.1: On-line help available with each version of each application.

Deliverable 2.7.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 3: Equipment Tracking (ET)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing ET software, including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. ET application rollouts must be coordinated with EMBI-Equipment rollouts.

This task may also include working with EPA's Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM) concerning ET data migration and/or data transfer to their new Asset Management System.

Subtask 3.1: Requirements Gathering
Deliverable 3.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 4: Field Readiness (FR)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing FR software, including

requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. FR application rollouts must be coordinated with EMBI-FR rollouts.

Subtask 4.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 4.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 5: Oil Database (Oil DB)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing Oil DB software, including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. Oil DB application rollouts must be coordinated with EMBI-Oil DB rollouts.

Subtask 5.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 5.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 6: EMP Administration (Admin)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing Admin software including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. Known enhancements shall include security auditing and a feedback module for user comments.

Subtask 6.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 6.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 7: Decontamination Portfolio (Decon)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing Decon software, including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks. The task may also include the development of a directly link to the Agency's Substance Registry System, the authoritative source for information about chemicals of interest to the Agency.

Subtask 7.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 7.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 8: National Approach to Response Preparedness Plan Tracking (NAR Tracking)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing NAR Tracking software, including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks.

Subtask 8.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 8.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 9: Emergency Response Spill Notification System (ERNS)

This task will involve technical support and bug fixes for any errors that may occur to the Oracle forms software or database as well as user support. The task may also involve upgrade of the application, including database redesign and front end upgrade.

Subtask 9.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 9.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 10: The Core COOP Assessment Tool

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing CCAT software including requirements gathering, data modeling, software design, development, testing and quality assurance, deployment, and data conversion subtasks.

Subtask 10.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 10.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 11 – Other Application Development &/or Maintenance Activities

This task shall consist of maintenance, enhancement, & or development of other EPA applications that are determined to be within the purview of the Emergency Response and COOP Portal including parallel practice/demo instances as appropriate. On-line user help, help desk services, and training shall be provided for such applications.

Subtask 11.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 11.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 12: Emergency Management Business Intelligence (EMBI)

This task shall consist of maintenance and enhancement of the existing EMBI databases and reports for ET, FR , and Oil DB applications, the development of new reports as required, and user training in the use of EMBI and the embedded ad hoc reports development tool "Answers." This task may also include the development of new capabilities for EMP & COOP applications as required.

Subtask 12.1: Requirements Gathering

Deliverable 12.1.2: Documentation of the changes within new versions available as Frequently Asked Question or Quick Start Guide documents on the relevant application homepage.

Task 13: User Support and Training

This task shall consist of technical support to all users of the EMP & COOP Portal applications in the form of a full-time user help desk and various levels of user training. The contractor will maintain a 1-800 number, manned from 8am to 8pm Eastern time, Monday – Friday, and an email box for centralized user help and will provided skilled, knowledgeable, and proactive user help. Policy questions relating to the applications or data will be referred to OEM's IM Team for discussion and resolution. Monthly statistics and summaries of help desk calls will be provided to the COR & ACORs. .

Formal user training on all EMP & COOP Portal software will be provided by the contractor via web conference on a schedule determined by the COR and ACORs.

Subtask 13.1: User Training
Upon request of the COR/ACOR the contractor shall prepare training materials for each application. Upon request of the COR/ACOR the contractor shall provide the training or assist the COR/ACOR in providing the training by taking notes and answering questions. Courses may be instructor-lead face-to-face, or web-conferences, or they may be developed to be independent learning on the web.

Deliverable 13.1.1: Clear and understandable course materials for students. Lesson plan and guide for the instructor.

Deliverable 13.1.2: Well run courses that guide students through critical features of each application of EMP. Students will be provided with an evaluation form to critique each course.

Deliverable 13.1.3: Web-enabled courses for student self-study.

Subtask 13.2: Help Desk
The contractor shall provide a phone number that will provide user support between the hours of 8am and 8pm Eastern time. The phone number must also have voice mail in case users need to leave a message. A help-desk email box shall also be provided. The contractor shall respond to the messages within 3 hours.

Deliverable 13.2.1: Toll free Help Desk number and an email box

Deliverable 13.2.2: Sufficient and knowledgeable staff to answer calls between designated hours.

Task 14: Emergency Response Support

The contractor shall provide support during incidents of national significance. If the U.S. EPA Emergency Operations Center is activated, the contractor may be tasked to support the response. During times of activation, the contractor shall charge all related work to Subtask 15 for tracking purposes. It is essential that the money billed to the government is tracked separate from normal operations for cost recovery efforts.

Deliverable 14.1: As determined by the COR/ACOR during the time of the event.

This Task Order also incorporates the Contractor's Work Plan and Cost Estimate Dated April 13, 2012.

Budget

Year	Estimated Cost
Base Year	$3,381,157.80
Option Year I	$3,482,052.20
Option Year II	$3,586,026.00
Option Year III	$3,692,982.20
Option Year IV	$3,803,244.00
Total Task Order Estimated Cost	**$ 17,945,462.20**

APPLICABLE CLAUSES

The Task Order is issued under Contract No. EP-BPA-12-H-0020 against GSA Contract Number GS-35F-0799M. Contract clauses contained therein are applicable to this Task Order. This Task Order does not change or modify the Contracts in any way. In no event will any understanding, agreement, modification, change order or other matter that modifies the terms of the Contracts between the Contractor and any person other than the Contracting Officer be effective and binding upon the U.S. Government. Notwithstanding the above, the following clauses are set forth herein, as they shall be considered specifically applicable to the funds contained in this order.