

***Coordination of Regional Pollution Prevention Information Centers***

***EPA Grant 83375501-0***

***Semiannual Report***

***November 1, 2008 – April 30, 2009***

***submitted by: Jean S. Waters, P2Rx coordinator***

***University of Nebraska at Omaha***

Executive Summary .....	1
Project Accomplishments .....	2
<b>1.1. Identify, evaluate, and measure outcomes and outputs from information services and outreach</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1.1. Establish P2Rx/EPA measurement workgroup.....	2
1.1.2. Quantify current measures.....	2
1.1.3. Workgroup evaluate and recommend measures .....	2
1.1.4. Determine gaps in information .....	2
1.1.5. Make recommendations based on information services measurement.....	2
1.1.6. Help centers prioritize their work and share components of the overall strategy.....	3
<b>1.2. Measure and evaluate current networking activities</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3. Pursue efficiencies in information delivery</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.3.1. Centralize the Topic Hub™ database.....	3
1.3.2. Centralize the library databases.....	4
1.3.3. Provide limited Web consulting to centers and external partners.....	4
1.3.4. Facilitate more information access on P2Rx.org website .....	5
1.3.1. Make improvements to the National P2 Programs Directory .....	5
<b>1.4. Facilitate communication among centers</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.4.1. Administrative calls and meetings .....	6
1.4.2. Centers' Web personnel quarterly calls .....	6
<b>1.5. Program Coordinator Evaluation</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1.6. External outreach</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.6.1. National Environmental Partnership Summit 2009 .....	6
1.6.2. Work with National P2 Results/measurement workgroup.....	6
Project Task Summary-revised.....	8
Attachments .....	12
<b>1.7 Common Questions</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>1.8 Topic Hub keywords call minutes</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>1.9 Minutes of call with Idaho DEQ</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>1.10 Administrative group call minutes</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>1.11 Annual meeting minutes</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>1.12 Web call minutes</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>1.13 Marketing committee minutes</b> .....	<b>44</b>

## **Executive Summary**

The Program Coordinator for the Pollution Prevention Information Network (PPIN) has had a productive first half of the second project year. The PPIN network operates as the Pollution Prevention Resource Exchange (P2Rx).

One of the most significant changes this period is the change in metrics by the P2Rx centers. Centers will no longer report activity and web measures, but will now collect user demographics and intermediate outcomes according to the logic model. All centers have either put up a pop-up that records the demographic status of users and gives them a “cookie” to track their usage through the site, or they have put up a “static” feedback page, asking users their demographic information and some intermediate outcomes. There is still work to be done to establish follow-up questions from “known” users, such as rapid response customers and advisory boards, and the results need to be analyzed semiannually.

Topic Hub link-checking has been centralized within the coordinator’s office, in order to provide efficiency to the centers.

Centers have agreed to cooperatively pursue national focus areas. This will be done in the next fiscal year. Centers will work closely with the EPA P2 coordinators to accomplish this.

New products are being developed to take advantage of web 2.0 tools. There will be significant outreach and follow-up to engage the P2 community of practice in using these new tools.

The free keyword function of the Topic Hubs has been reviewed and will be fully operational soon.

The P2Rx website has been redesigned and more content is apparent on the home page. Additionally, several features have been added, taking advantage of web 2.0 products. These include the latest websites that have been tagged by the P2TagTeam, the P2Rx wikis, and P2 videos.

Work has been done on the P2 Programs Directory to allow NPPR members to be displayed with recognition of their membership. This work is on-going.

Monthly administrative calls and quarterly web developer calls were held and documented. The annual meeting was held and documented.

P2Rx was active in the National Environmental Summit, with a display table, the Fun Walk, an update presentation on P2Rx to the P2 coordinators and the NPPR, and a roll-out of the new social bookmarking campaign, “I’m delicious”.

P2Rx centers also continued to support the P2 Metrics efforts and the coordinator provided a list of all the programs who provided data to the recently completed aggregated report which was “published” electronically by NPPR.

## **Project Accomplishments**

### ***1.1. Identify, evaluate, and measure outcomes and outputs from information services and outreach***

#### ***1.1.1. Establish P2Rx/EPA measurement workgroup***

The evaluation team of Beth Anderson, Yvonne Watson, Andrea Hramits, Charles Bevington, Hugh Gibson, and Pam Swingle (EPA) and Andy Bray, Elizabeth Bird, and Jean Waters (P2Rx), and Abt Associates (contractor) has concluded their meetings.

#### ***1.1.2. Quantify current measures***

Current measures being done by the centers were quantified. Abt compiled the data that centers collected in the PPIN evaluation report. This information is included in the final report, posted at [http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008\\_survey\\_results/FINAL%20PPIN%20Evaluation%20Report\\_August8.pdf](http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/2008_survey_results/FINAL%20PPIN%20Evaluation%20Report_August8.pdf)

#### ***1.1.3. Workgroup evaluate and recommend measures***

Centers have historically measured their website usage, tracking the number of user sessions, page impressions, and number of visitors who visit 10 or more times per quarter. While this information is interesting and shows usage of the websites, it does not show the *demographic* of the user. Centers have not known whether the people visiting the website are end-users of the information (such as businesses) or intermediate users of the information (such as Technical Assistance Programs). The logic model of information dissemination is built upon reaching the end-user, either via a Technical Assistance Program (TAP) or reaching them directly. Direct contact can be made through training, rapid response, or via the website.

The workgroup recommended that instead of tracking the amount of activity on the website, centers devise a way to try and ascertain the *kind* of user who is accessing information from the website. Thus, two approaches are being taken by centers. One is to implement a pop-up “cookie” on the website. The other is to have a static “feedback” link on the website. In both cases, the user will be asked if they plan to use information for their business or to help someone else.

The cookie mechanism and language used in the question plus the language used for the static feedback page are the result of several committee meetings. The final questions are posted at p2rx.org and are included in the appendix.

The cookie was implemented by NEWMOA in January 2009 and on P2Rx in March 2009. P2RIC, WRRRC, GLRPPR, and WSPPN have implemented the cookie. Zerowaste, PPRC, and Peaks have put up the static feedback page and P2RIC plans to get it up. Peaks is also working on getting the cookie up.

P2Rx and Centers may still track their web usage for their own purposes but it will no longer be a requirement for PPIN reporting.

#### ***1.1.4. Determine gaps in information***

The next steps on the website are to analyze the products being viewed with respect to type of user. If this can be determined, it should inform product development and influence priorities for maintenance of existing information. A decision will be made as to whether or not to continue this analysis based upon the value of the information compared to the difficulty in getting it.

It also needs to be determined whether and when to ask follow-up questions of users who take a cookie. Currently, the technical details of implementing a “cookie counter” have not been worked out. Once there is a way to see how many times a user has visited a website, based upon their “cookie count” a follow-up question could be asked, to see how useful the information is they are obtaining from the website or whether it has changed their behavior.

There has also been a gap in center’s collecting intermediate outcomes, such as behavior change or other intermediate outcomes if environmental outcomes are not available. This is being addressed in the “common questions” that have been prepared for all centers to use on their static feedback pages, in their follow-up with known users, and in their advisory board surveys.

#### ***1.1.5. Make recommendations based on information services measurement***

Centers agreed to follow up technical assistance contacts, such as rapid response questions and possibly workshops or other direct assistance by recording the type of customer making the request and following up with these clients to see if any changes occurred as a result of the assistance. Currently there is no system-wide mechanism in place to conduct or record this follow-up. It is conceivable that a survey-type instrument could be used for follow-up, but centers have not discussed exactly how follow-up would be implemented.

In addition to following up with individual clients, centers may want to analyze and prioritize the type of information needed by clients based upon requests from rapid response users or known website users. It is not clear if we have the technical capability to do this, and even if we do, we would want to be sure that we have sufficient data to make it valuable.

#### *1.1.6. Help centers prioritize their work and share components of the overall strategy*

Center directors met in January, 2009, to further discuss the results of the recent PPIN Evaluation, conducted by Abt and to plan for the next year. The minutes of the meeting are attached. Significant results from the meeting are:

- Centralize topic hub maintenance (link-checking) and programs directory maintenance (except for P2RIC and GLRPPR) with the P2Rx coordinator (note: this does not include updating Topic Hub content)
- Eliminate reporting of web and activity measures
- Institute cookies or static feed-back page (using “common questions” – agreed-upon language) on all Center websites to determine type of client and short-term outcomes in accordance with the logic model of information dissemination
- Institute surveys for known clients (such as rapid response clients or advisory boards) to determine intermediate outcomes in accordance with logic model
- Provide Beth a list of additional questions centers might want to use in surveying by February 16, 2009 so Beth can get ICR approval
- Marketing committee work on how to engage community of practice around national focus areas
- Technology/content committee work on what exact technology will be used to publish new national focus product

Considerations for next PPIN RFP

- Collaboration among centers for national focus topics
- Migrating selected topic hubs to archived or other status

#### ***1.2. Measure and evaluate current networking activities***

The common questions committee proposed questions all centers can use in order for centers to follow up with advisory boards and/or clients to which Centers provided technical assistance. The Common Questions for Training/Workshop Follow-up, Rapid Response Follow-up, and Advisory Board/Stakeholders Follow-up are posted on the P2Rx website <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/toc.cfm>. Also Centers agreed to post a static page “feedback” survey on their websites. The coordinator’s office will check the results of static feedback pages weekly, in case any respondent leaves their e-mail and asks to be contacted. The static feedback questions will be aggregated from all centers and statistically analyzed by the P2Rx coordinator semiannually. The coordinator’s office is also setting up the surveys for Centers.

A link to each of the surveys is provided to the Centers. In the case of the static feedback page, Centers can simply post the link on their website. For training/workshop follow-up, they can print the survey or send it as an e-mail link after the event. In the case of rapid response, they can send the link in an e-mail.

#### ***1.3. Pursue efficiencies in information delivery***

##### *1.3.1. Centralize the Topic Hub™ database*

The Topic Hub database has been centralized. All the data is now fed from one server to every center. It was discovered that the “free keyword” function of the Topic Hubs does not work. This feature was discussed

originally but never implemented. It was originally designed to allow Centers to enter their own keyword (not one from the database of 2024 keywords). This feature was originally deemed necessary due to the fact that as new topics or technologies are developed, the existing list of keywords may not be adequate. Since the feature had never been implemented, a call was held among interested Center personnel to discuss how to proceed. Minutes of this call are attached. The main items that resulted from this call are to resurrect the free keywords feature, setting up an automated e-mail notification for Laura Barnes (GLRPPR librarian) when a keyword is added. Laura will review the submission and determine whether or not to add the word. Also, the keywords are not currently included in the “search” query for the Topic Hubs, so Nate (webmaster for NEWMOA, subcontractor to the coordinator) will change that code. Nate will reconcile the keywords that have been added in the past and Laura will determine whether or not to accept them. Finally, the coordinator will re-write the Topic Hub user manual to reflect the new changes. The minutes of this call are included in the appendix.

In March, the Coordinator’s office began monthly link checking for all the Topic Hubs. The first month, there were 357 broken links, 195 of these were repaired by the coordinator, the remaining 162 were distributed to the center that authored the Topic Hub so that center could either find a replacement link or delete the link. In April there were 124 broken links. One center has 40 broken links they have not yet repaired or deleted.

The “user manual” that is provided to assist centers when entering a new Topic Hub or updating an existing Topic Hub is out of date. The coordinator will re-write it with review from NEWMOA (the coordinator’s web contractor). It is important to have an accurate reference for centers because Topic Hubs are currently under review and changes need to be made. Center personnel change over time and some people who are making the updates to the Topic Hubs may have never worked with them before.

PPRC and NEWMOA reviewed Topic Hubs as part of their previous PPIN grant. The coordinator has followed up with the centers that received a review to determine implementation of the suggested changes. Zerowaste plans to have their changes implemented by the end of May on EMS. The status of the GLRPPR updates to the Flexographic and Lithographic Topic Hubs is unknown. WRRC has implemented changes to the Industrial Composting Topic Hub. NEWMOA has updated the Mercury Topic Hub and the update of the Metal Fabrication Topic Hub is in progress. P2RIC is working on the P2 Topic Hub. PPRC updated the Fiberglass Topic Hub and the Lean and Environment Topic Hub (which they rewrote). Additionally, PPRC arranged for a review of the Aerospace Topic Hub from the Washington Department of Ecology but they have not received the review yet.

### *1.3.2. Centralize the library databases*

The P2Rx.org website now has a “Google” search box which indexes all the Centers websites, including the library. This solution accomplishes the goal of combining library data plus sector resources and other information on the websites without physically (electronically) combining the databases.

Centers could put this search on their websites, but when a user uses the search, they would end up on the P2Rx.org website, rather than the originating center’s website. WRRC has a Google search box that is more specific for documents and “library” resources. When it is available, they will provide the code so P2Rx can have this search. This more targeted search would be used for documents, rather than all resources.

### *1.3.3. Provide limited Web consulting to centers and external partners*

NEWMOA is the subcontractor providing web consulting to centers and doing the web work for P2Rx. They have provided assistance to five centers during this period. Three of the Centers needed help with implementation of cookies and some Topic Hub questions. One center had a problem with displaying News, and one center had general web function questions.

The coordinator had an adobe connect call on March 17 with the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality to discuss the possibility of sharing Topic Hubs on their website. Andy and Nate (NEWMOA, web contractor of the coordinator) reviewed the software code that would be necessary for Idaho to display the Topic Hubs and other information on their website. The minutes of that call are included in the Appendix.

#### *1.3.4. Facilitate more information access on P2Rx.org website*

The P2Rx.org homepage was redesigned to put more content on the front page, so users would have a better understanding of the content available. By having more content right on the homepage, users can get a sense of what content there is, without having to read and understand the categories we might assign to classes of information. For example, Topic Hubs may not mean anything to a new user, but the list of titles allows for an intuitive understanding that these items are information resources about the specific areas.

Part of the redesign included adding a box that contains the latest web resources (urls) that are being tagged as “P2TagTeam” by our community of P2 practitioners. The P2TagTeam initiative was launched by P2RIC and seeks to engage the P2 community in social bookmarking. The marketing committee felt it is best to use P2Rx as the “umbrella” for this effort, because it is a national effort and all centers will potentially participate and benefit. As a result, a “box” was created on P2Rx.org to show the latest urls that are tagged. In addition to these “Hot Links,” there is a tab on this box that highlights “case studies.” Currently, two Centers have case study databases so links are provided to both of them. In the recently completed PPIN evaluation by Abt Associates, one of the information priorities identified by businesses was case studies. Therefore, during the redesign of the website, the availability of this resource was highlighted.

Another new product that has recently been introduced by P2RIC is the P2Rx Wiki, “SUSTAIN Updates.” These topical wikis are generated in response to listserv traffic on the P2, environmental, social behavior, and environmental health listservs. Currently, there are seven topics, Green Lodging, Green Commuting, Green Business Certification, Mercury in Compact Fluorescent Lightbulbs, Ethylene Oxide, Air Fresheners, and Cutting fluids.

The fourth tab on this new box links to the online P2 InfoHouse library, housed with WRRC. They are currently posting the top documents accessed, the top topics, and the best references. These are all chosen based upon usage by the web traffic. Currently, WRRC posts this information monthly, following analysis of web traffic.

Some other things changed on the P2Rx.org website include adding video – using the P2RIC and WRRC you tube channels, putting the P2 News in a different format, so the entire headlines are visible, putting the search feature for the National P2 Programs Directory on the home page, so users don’t have to go to the directory first but can simply search for a P2 program right from the P2Rx homepage. The regional centers are listed in the left-hand navigation and can also be accessed directly from the map on the home page. Likewise, links to Center products have an icon on the homepage and are listed in the left-hand navigation bar. These products are Tribal P2 website, National Mercury Reduction Programs Database, Homes Across America, Webinars (PPRC and WSPPN co-sponsor, site is housed on PPRC), P2 Results database (links to a general page from which users can find the P2 Results link to their regional center), and Rapid Response, which links to a form that automatically directs the question to the correct center based on the user’s state.

Again, the goal with the website redevelopment was to present more information directly, so users don’t have to click through so many pages, and so they will have a better understanding of the content they will get, based upon the information available right on the homepage (rather than trying to understand a single title or label).

#### *1.3.1. Make improvements to the National P2 Programs Directory*

The coordinator web personnel worked with Tom Fort of Zerowaste Network to modify the current National P2 Programs Directory so it would display whether or not the program is a member of the National Pollution Prevention Roundtable (NPPR). Significant progress was made on this project but it was not quite ready in time for NPPR to populate their membership data prior to the National Environmental Partnership Summit. This project should be completed during the next six months. It will allow NPPR to only display their members on their website if they choose to do so.

#### *1.4. Facilitate communication among centers*

#### *1.4.1. Administrative calls and meetings*

Monthly administrative conference calls were arranged and facilitated in November, December, January, February, and March. . An agenda is distributed prior to each call and input is solicited. Minutes are posted to the administrative section of the P2Rx.org Website, <http://p2rx.org/WebCall/getAdminGroup.cfm> following the calls. They are also included in the appendix. In addition to the regular monthly calls, Center directors had a call on March 31 to discuss the new PPIN Request for Proposal. Center directors discussed what national focus they want to pursue and possible collaborations between centers started to take shape. Center directors were given three weeks to think/discuss with other centers about what they want to do and how to effectively collaborate, and another call was held on April 21 to continue the discussion.

On January 27-29, center directors had the annual meeting in Dallas, TX. Center directors discussed potential collaboration between centers on topics of common interest which would have national focus instead of regional. Minutes from the meeting are attached in the appendix.

#### *1.4.2. Centers' Web personnel quarterly calls*

Quarterly calls of Web personnel from all the Centers were held on December 4 and March 26. Minutes are included in the appendix and posted at <http://p2rx.org/WebCall/getCall.cfm>.

### **1.5. Program Coordinator Evaluation**

The executive committee has not evaluated the P2Rx coordinator during this grant cycle. In March, the coordinator provided the committee with a list of milestones for the grant and with a job description for the P2Rx coordinator (written by the coordinator). The committee should meet to review the coordinator by June 15.

#### *1.6. External outreach*

##### **1.6.1. National Environmental Partnership Summit 2009**

Centers are preparing for the National Environmental Partnership Summit which will take place in San Francisco on May 4-7, 2009. The Marketing Committee had calls on March 19, and April 15 to plan for the conference and the P2Rx presence. They discussed the P2Rx Fun Walk, which is an alternative networking event held annually at the summit, Web 2.0 Giveaways, P2 Quiz, Social Bookmarking (Delicious), and other potential activities for the Summit. Minutes from the Marketing Committee are attached in the appendix.

The Center directors participated with EPA P2 Coordinators in a planning meeting prior to the Summit. This was specifically an opportunity to explain some of the new Web 2.0 tools that P2Rx is planning to try and to strategize about how to effectively work together on national sector focuses. The coordinator presented an update on P2Rx at the National Pollution Prevention Roundtable (NPPR) breakout session at the summit. It was attended by about 60 people.

The Fun Walk was held and about 15 people participated in the walk and about twice that many paid but did not go that morning. About 50 people signed up to contribute to the social networking site, "delicious" and use the keyword, "P2TagTeam" to designate web documents or websites of interest to the P2 community. P2Rx had "I'm Delicious" ribbons for folks to affix to the bottom of their nametags if they signed up. The booth also contained Hershey's Kisses with labels on the bottom that stated, "I'm delicious; p2rx.org; P2TagTeam" and there were bookmarks and postcards that explained how to participate. P2RIC has plans for a retention marketing campaign to keep all who signed up engaged with using delicious. P2Rx is looking for ways to capitalize on the information generated by the community. One possible scenario is to include urls tagged by P2TagTeam with the appropriate Topic Hub, for example.

##### **1.6.2. Work with National P2 Results/measurement workgroup**

P2Rx centers remain a vital part of gathering P2 metrics from P2 programs across the country and aggregating the results. The coordinator participates with this group and there was one conference call during this time period. NPPR publishes a final report of P2 Results from the database maintained by P2Rx centers

periodically. A report was published this year. The coordinator helped gather the names of all the programs who entered data into the system so that information could be published with the report.

## Project Task Summary-revised

The project task summary follows the detail of the project strategy.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Evaluate and measure outcomes and outputs from <b>information services and outreach</b> (Project Strategy 1.1)	<i>Quarter 1</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Solicit workgroup</li> <li>▪ Compile measures</li> <li>▪ Coordinate with EPA consultant on measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workgroup continues to meet</li> <li>▪ Abt (contractor) compiled existing measurement data</li> </ul>	Current measures compiled by EPA contractor, Abt
	<i>Quarter 2</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conduct face-to-face workgroup meeting</li> <li>▪ Identify gaps in measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publish meeting minutes</li> <li>▪ Publish recommended measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Face-to-face meeting complete</li> <li>▪ Common questions approved and implemented</li> </ul>
	<i>Quarter 3-4</i> Compile auxiliary measures obtained from centers	Publish expanded measurement results	In addition to pop-up or static page, questions are being developed for “known” customers
	<i>Quarter 5-6</i> Analyze measurement results with workgroup and executive committee	Publish recommended changes to information services	Common question results will be aggregated and reviewed next period
	<i>Quarter 7-8</i> Help Centers prioritize work and share components of overall strategy	Establish network-wide priorities with center responsibilities	Need aggregated results

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Measure and evaluate current <b>networking</b> activities (Project Strategy 1.2)	<i>Quarter 1</i> Compile networking measures	List current measures	Contractor has completed compiling measures
	<i>Quarter 2</i> Recommend measures; review	Publish recommended measures	Review of recommendations on September 10 are posted on P2Rx.org.
	<i>Quarter 3-4</i> Assist centers with internet implementation to gather audience statistics	P2Rx Centers implement audience measures	Centers are now measuring demographic of users and intermediate changes; following the logic model.
	<i>Quarter 5-6</i> Compile information gathered by centers	Publish summary of audience statistics and networking measures	Not begun
	<i>Quarter 7</i> Make recommendations for changes/improvements	Publish recommendation document	Not begun
	<i>Quarter 8</i> Help Centers prioritize work and share components of overall strategy	Establish network-wide priorities with center responsibilities	Not begun

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Pursue efficiencies in information delivery (Project Strategy 1.3)	<i>Quarter 1-4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Get agreement from centers on hosting site and mechanism of display for Topic Hubs</li> <li>▪ Help centers migrate data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2Rx standard for centralized Topic Hubs</li> <li>▪ Produce centralized Topic Hub database</li> </ul>	Topic Hub Database is centralized.
	<i>Quarter 5-8</i> Contact external partners to share Topic Hubs	Topic Hubs displayed with three or more external partners	One external partner has been trained on how to display Topic Hubs
	<i>Quarter 1-4</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Get agreement from centers on hosting site and mechanism of display for virtual, centralized library</li> <li>▪ Help centers migrate data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2Rx standard for centralized library</li> <li>▪ Produce centralized library</li> </ul>	A Google search box has been installed on the P2Rx.org site to index and search all eight center's sites, including their libraries.
	<i>Quarter 5-8</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help centers display library on their sites</li> <li>▪ Find external partners to display library</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Library displayed on individual center sites</li> <li>▪ Library displayed with three or more external partners</li> </ul>	Implementation has not begun
	<i>Ongoing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assist Centers with web or database issues</li> <li>▪ Provide minimum training on P2Rx products to new web personnel</li> <li>▪ Assist external partners with display of P2Rx products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of documented "bugs" in Bugzilla</li> <li>▪ Number of updates of software in CVS</li> <li>▪ Number of trainings</li> <li>▪ Number of external partners assisted</li> </ul>	NEWMOA (the subcontractor) provided assistance to five centers. No bugs have been reported to Bugzilla.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Accomplishments</b>
Facilitate communication among centers (Project Strategy 1.4)	<i>Ongoing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monthly conference calls among Center directors</li> <li>▪ Quarterly regional updates</li> <li>▪ Monthly conference calls among web personnel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Center directors conference call minutes</li> <li>▪ Regional updates e-mail “newsletters”</li> <li>▪ Web developers’ conference call minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Seven calls were held and minutes posted</li> <li>▪ Regional updates were provided by centers in December and are included in the minutes</li> <li>▪ Web calls were held in December and March; minutes are posted</li> </ul>
Program coordinator evaluation (Project Strategy 1.5)	<i>Quarter 2, 4, 6</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Executive committee evaluate coordinator with input of all center directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluations posted</li> <li>▪ Response posted</li> </ul>	Executive committee has not yet conducted an evaluation of the coordinator

## Attachments

### 1.7 Common Questions

#### Common Questions Committee Call; December 9, 2008

##### Action Items:

- *The committee will propose follow-up questions for website users on the Admin call December 10, 2008*
- *Lynn will propose a scheme for asking usefulness of products on the Websites*
- *The committee will meet via conference call again before the Admin meeting*

Lynn Turner, Debra Taevs, Beth Anderson, and Andy Bray were on the call. We discussed the Common Questions, version 1.3. The first question (actually three statements) would be posed to users of our website. These statements identify two short-term outcomes and provide us with a measure of effectiveness. Lynn and Deb would also like to see the opportunity for users to provide feedback.

If people didn't find what they're looking for, or if they want to provide a suggestion, we should give them the option to ask a question or provide open-ended feedback. It should be optional for them to leave their e-mail. The open-ended feedback piece could be a link from our user questions pop-up.

Lynn would also like a permanent "We'd like to hear from you" option. This could be posted on the Websites, like the icon we did for the survey and let people take it passively. We would need to ask them if they are using information from our website for their business or organization or if they are using it to help someone else. (Identify if they are a business or a TAP). Then we could ask them the three statements and provide an open-ended feedback box. We could also include our "laundry list" of web products, as in question 4 of the Common Questions.

Lynn said it would be good to know how each of the web products helps our users. Beth pointed out that we need to know outcomes from the logic model. It is somewhat problematic to ask these questions without getting bogged down but Lynn will work on a proposed scheme and get back to us.

#### Current Cookie question on NEWMOA's site:

In an effort to better understand how users are applying the information they find on NEWMOA's website, we ask that you please answer the question below. No personal information is collected or used.

How will you use the information you are looking for?

- To assist my business, organization, agency, or facility
- To provide assistance to another business, organization, agency, or facility
- I do not wish to answer

Submit

[close window](#)

[view privacy policy](#)

**Proposed follow-up pop-up question for website users –**

Would you answer three questions after you use this site? (yes/no)

If they say “yes,” here are the statements:

Do you agree with the following three statements?

1. Information from this website has improved my ability to do my job.

(strongly agree/somewhat agree/neither agree or disagree/ somewhat disagree/strongly disagree)

2. I found the information I was looking for.

(strongly agree/somewhat agree/neither agree or disagree/ somewhat disagree/strongly disagree)

3. I have increased awareness of reducing pollution at the source (P2) as a result of using this website.

(strongly agree/somewhat agree/neither agree or disagree/ somewhat disagree/strongly disagree)

Click here to [ask a question or provide feedback](#).

**Feedback form**

Provide your e-mail if you'd like us to respond:

Your e-mail (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

Your question or comment:  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Static Page for Training/Workshop

1. How will you use the information from this training: (check one)

- to assist my business, organization, agency, or facility
- to provide assistance to another business, organization, agency, or facility
- for personal or general interest
- I do not wish to answer

2. How else can we assist you? Comments? Questions? And/or tell us how you were able to use this information.

### *1.8 Topic Hub keywords call minutes*

## Keyword Call for Topic Hubs Monday, March 23

**Attendees:** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray, Nate Bisbee, and Rachel Colella (NEWMOA), Laura Barnes (GLRPPR), Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Michelle Gaither (PPRC)

#### ***Action Items:***

**Andy/Nate:** Fix the Topic Hub database so Hubs look at the central keyword database

**Jean/Veronica:** Update the Topic Hub User Manual

**Andy/Nate:** Review the Updated Topic Hub User Manual

**Andy/Nate:** Resurrect free keywords feature, set up an automated email notification for Laura when somebody submits a keyword for reviewing.

**Andy/Nate:** include keywords as one of the fields searched in a Topic Hub search

**Andy/Nate:** reconcile keywords that have been added in the past and are pending approval, with the existing list

**Laura:** review pending keywords and make determination whether or not to accept them

Jean gave an overview on how different Topic Hubs have different number of keywords associated with each of them. She also said that the purpose of keywords is for site visitors to find easier what they are looking for. Keywords are searchable, which makes it even easier to find information. However, at this point the search feature for the keywords does not work, and Andy and Nate said they are going to fix that problem.

Laura said that she is concerned on how well the keywords associated with the Topic Hubs are representing the content, because visitors might not find everything they look for or all the information the site is offering. She also asked where visitors are coming from to the website, from a search engine or from P2Rx. Jean said that most of the traffic is coming from search engines like Google.

Michelle said they are working on new Topic Hub (Climate Change) and it would be nice to be able to add keywords to that topic hub. Rachel said that it is kind of hard to verify a keyword with the approved keywords list because there are more than 2000 words you have to check. She also asked if it is possible to come up with an automatic filler/finder if the word is listed in the approved list, and Andy and Nate said it is not easy to implement. However, Andy said that it is possible to select several keywords and then click submit. Jean walked through the process of how to add keywords. (Steps: Log in → Keyword admin → Relate Topic Hub...)

Andy talked about the pending keyword list and said that there should be somebody who would approve or disapprove a keyword. Jean asked Laura if she agrees to be the reviewer for the keywords. Laura did agree to do it and Jean said she'll send her the login credentials.

Nate and Andy said they need to reinstate the keyword box, where suggestions for new keywords are given. Laura would be the one to review those suggestions. The procedure for accepting a keyword is straight forward; Laura would accept a keyword and list it on the keyword list. For the disapproving a keyword, Laura would have to know who submitted the keyword, and send an email letting them know that the particular keyword was not approved.

### ***1.9 Minutes of call with Idaho DEQ***

#### **Sharing Topic Hubs on Idaho DEQ**

**March 17, 2009**

Attendees: Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), Joanna Pierce and Anthony Hawkey (Idaho DEQ), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx)

Jean started the call by showing NEWMOA's Topic Hub web page. She said that the Topic Hubs that were developed by NEWMOA are displayed first, and in addition, below that list, there are the rest of the Topic Hubs which were developed by other centers. She talked about "Visit another Topic Hub" drop down box, where visitors can choose to view other topics. Another box that is displayed on NEWMOA's website is the "Search" box, which lets visitors perform a search through the Topic Hub. Another option is the "browse by keywords" link, where visitors can choose a keyword and find the Topic of interest.

Joanna asked what would be the best way to share the documents, links, and information they already have on their website. Andy said that they are using cold fusion, and Nate can send Anthony the code that could be integrated on their website. This code would request the "Complete list of links" and Nate said that they can customize the application and add some DEQ stuff.

Anthony also said that he can write a java application that could select the displayed options in the drop down menu, so they can choose the Topic Hubs they want to display, and it would be applied only on their website.

Jean said that if Joanne wants ever to submit links or any resource information, she would be happy to display them.

Andy said that Nate will put a place holder on the website for “Idaho Links” and will add a place holder on “Table of Contents” on the bottom and on the “Complete list of links” on the top.

Nate also mentioned that each center has its own style sheet so Anthony can choose whatever he likes as a style on their website.

Joanne asked how they should proceed when they are working on a topic, and would like to share that content. Andy said that they will have to contact NEWMOA every time they want to share something.

Jean made a note that they all need to remember the procedure on how they’re sharing Topic Hubs with Idaho, so in the future, if they need to do it again, they would know the steps and procedures.

Joanne asked whether they can post P2 News and Events on their website. Jean said that if they want the news box, it is easy to get it from P2Rx website. However, that would be the national news feed. Joanne was wondering whether it is better to display regional news only, or add the national as well. She said that for now, they will put something informal for the national news and will concentrate on the regional news.

Jean also suggested sharing the calendar for the events. She showed NEWMOA’s calendar as an example.

### ***1.10 Administrative group call minutes***

**P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call;** Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008

**Attendees:** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt Julie Woosley(WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng and Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies), Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), Deb Taevs (PPRC)

#### ***Action Items:***

**Gary** - send Jean the information about Savannah activities

**All** – poll their regional programs about topics that will be a P2 focus for them. Begin to lay the groundwork for collaboration with regional programs and with other centers.

#### ***Follow-up questions to ask known users:***

At the beginning of the call Jean reminded center directors that EPA will want them to be able to identify primary vs secondary clients, TAPs vs businesses, follow up on how useful the information provided was, whether it was used by the client or it was passed on. Jean also mentioned that they can start with the people they know through rapid response, advisory board, conferences, webinars and so on. The “common questions” committee of Andy, Ed, Deb, and Lynn is trying to come up with some standardized questions. There will be about 5 or 6 questions, which will be designed to quantify the short term outcomes. After these are in place, the committee can design some more questions that would target the intermediate and long term outcomes. Our goal for now is the short term outcomes.

Gary asked about implementation of these questions, and whether or not we would need an Information Collection Request (ICR). The Common Questions committee will address implementation in their proposal back to the center directors.

#### ***Next RFP for P2Rx:***

Jean proposed an opportunity for center collaboration and an idea for the P2Rx work next year.

Centers could identify grass-roots priorities from their region. Perhaps several programs in a region have P2 Interns, or work with the hospitality sector, or lean & green, or greenhouse gasses... There are probably programs in other regions working on the same things.

A center could take a lead nationally on such a priority. They could collaborate with another center, perhaps. They could identify the P2 programs across the country that are interested in collaborating on that topic and could ask them what resources are needed. This does not have to be complicated. The P2Rx centers or P2 coordinators should be able to tell the center what programs in their regions have worked in the center's area of interest. If the center sends an e-mail to those programs, the programs will likely agree to participate. The center can ask them what resources they would need.

The center can offer its typical resources: (it may not be able to provide all of this, but here are some examples):

- 1) listserv
- 2) monthly or bimonthly conference calls (center would keep and post minutes)
- 3) two or three national webinar trainings (experts from the workgroup, EPA, or elsewhere would give presentations on specific items identified by the workgroup)
- 4) Webinars the TAPs could "sell" (for free) directly to the businesses they're working with
- 5) Topic Hub and sector resources (if there is an existing Topic Hub, fine - if not, one MAY be created. Sector resources from programs in the workgroup will definitely be posted)
- 6) P2 News on that topic (this could be delivered via listserv and RSS)
- 7) P2 Program Directory designation (we could identify the P2 programs participating in this "workgroup")
- 8) Calendar of Events
- 9) P2 Results support - the centers would help assure the programs in the workgroup entered measurement data into the P2 Results database

In addition to taking a leadership role on a priority area, a center would support their region, generally, as they have in the past. These would be the two main tasks for the proposals.

Why do this?

Client Focus –

This approach allows the centers to focus. They are essentially limited to \$100K per center. If centers don't share some work, they simply will not have enough bodies to accomplish anything meaningful. This approach would connect us with TAPs more closely. Centers can be much more effective if they serve a narrow audience. They have traditionally served TAPs. There simply isn't enough money for a center to try and serve businesses and TAPs. They would be focusing on their regional TAPs in a general way (like it

has been done in the past) and on a group of TAPs from across the country who are committed to a project.

#### Results Focus –

By choosing a single priority area, centers can be "centers of excellence" in that area. This builds on the traditional strength of centers - gathering and disseminating information - but now they are able to put more resources into a single priority area. This should increase the results that TAPs can obtain from this priority area. The centers will help all the TAPs who are working on the priority by providing training and information. In addition, the listserv and conference calls will GREATLY increase the visibility and quantity of results obtained. There will be some peer pressure and the benefit of encouragement by working together.

#### Outcomes Focus –

Centers will be able to query the TAPs in the workgroup about the usefulness of their products and services. They will KNOW who is using the website! Centers should definitely be able to quantify the short-term outcomes they need to report. They will have two built-in groups of clients -- regional TAPs and national workgroup TAPs.

Jean asked center directors to pursue this idea and ask the programs in their region what topics they would agree to work on.

Deb said she has a meeting coming and she will definitely ask programs in her region.

#### ***Annual admin meeting (Jan 27-29; Savannah):***

Jean reminded everybody to mark their calendars for the Annual admin meeting in Savannah on January 27-29, 2009.

Gary said he'll send Jean the information about the local ( Savannah) activities.

#### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call; Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

***Attendees:*** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Rachel Colella (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt and Julie Woosley (WRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies), Deb Taevs and Paula Del Giudice (PPRC)

#### ***Calendars Update:***

Jean asked all center directors whether they distributed the calendars to TAPs

Debra is getting them all out, Julie in the next week should be done, Myla – got all out except one (Elizabeth), NEWMOA sending calendars out with holiday cards, probably within the next week, Rick – needs to get them out, Thomas will be getting them out soon. Bob has distributed  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the calendars and is working on the rest.

Jean reminded everybody again that the calendars are a perfect marketing tool, and it is a good way to stay in people's eye.

Jean said that the agenda for the next admin meeting that will take in Dallas is up on the web. She also said that they invited the P2 coordinators to attend the meeting. Beth is paying to bring in a couple of coordinators, but the rest should pay by themselves.

**Agenda Review:**

Jean also mentioned they will have a facilitator from Region 9.

The agenda was reviewed in a group discussion and some ideas were identified.

<b>Tuesday, Jan 27<sup>th</sup></b>	
11:00	P2Rx Executive Committee meeting – <b>some center directors suggested that the meeting of the executive committee should be changed if possible because not everybody can make it at 11:00. Maybe move it to Thursday morning or having both committees simultaneously</b>
noon	lunch
1:00	facilitated discussion with P2Rx and P2 Coordinators
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ P2Rx topic-focus for 2009 proposals – how do we make it happen?- <b>Jean said that the main question is what P2Rx can do for working with TAPs across the region and how can they reach out to assistants who are grantees. What activities to give up so it won't be too much to focus on</b></li> <li>▪ How do we work together – how do we share our strengths?</li> <li>▪ How do we collaborate with TAPs nationally? (how do we find local programs in addition to state programs; how do we get their buy-in?)</li> <li>▪ How do we show we're effective?</li> <li>▪ What activities do we give up?</li> </ul>
3:00	Break
3:30	Facilitated discussion continues
5:00	adjourn
6:00	group dinner
<b>Wednesday, Jan 28<sup>th</sup></b>	
8:00	breakfast
8:30	Facilitated discussion continues with P2Rx and P2Coordinators continues
10:00	Break
10:30	Facilitated discussion concludes with action items J – <b>come up with action items</b>
12:00	lunch
1:00	P2Rx Centers break out to detail collaboration opportunities among Centers
	P2 Coordinators meet in person in Dallas and via conference call – review national topic focus strategy (discussion from facilitated sessions)
3:00	Break
3:30	P2Rx committee meetings – <b>Jean asked Bob if he wants to be moved to the marketing committee, and also asked Myla if she is agrees to be on the marketing committee. Myla informed Jean that Mike Vogel is not going to come to the meeting.</b>

	P2 Coordinators meet privately to discuss implementation strategies; national focus areas; and how to get TAP buy-in – <b>Beth said that P2Rx has to do more outreach and marketing to TAPs, advertising it more. She also mentioned that the RFP was taken out</b>
5:00	adjourn
6:00	group dinner
<b>Thursday, Jan 29<sup>th</sup></b>	
8:00	Breakfast
8:30	P2Rx Committee report-outs- <b>Andy suggested having a call prior to committee meetings and Jean said that that should be helpful. She also said that it is not necessary to decide that topics they will focus on. She said that the center directors can wait until May because the implementation will not start before October when money arecoming in. Jean also suggested that centers have to have TAPs interested in the focus topics. Centers have to have broader topic focus to pull TAPs into this.</b>
10:00	Break
10:30	Wrap-up session
12:00	box lunch and adjourn

Jean suggested that after the meeting all center directors have to have a conference call to discuss the specifics of the action items implementation.

***Web group update:***

Jean said that the minutes from the web group call are posted on the website. She did give a briefing about what was discussed on that call. She reminded that the pop-ups are working on NEWMOA website, and the pop-ups serve the intent to find who our users are, TAPs or businesses. She also said that the committee is working on the follow-up questions. Jean asked if anyone opposed to the questions proposed for follow-ups and everybody agreed.

Andy said he will make the cookies available to all center directors in January.

Jean said that a webinar will take place in December, and if center directors know anybody who would be interested, they should promote it.

Gary said it will be at a national level.

Jean also said that Zac is comparing the Web-trend to the Google analytics. Thenext webbies call will be March 26. She also reminded that as centers get new web people, they should show them the user guides.

WRRC is switching to Urchin to follow web usage and it costs about \$3,000.

***Center updates:***

**NEWMOA**

Andy said they did the first pass of reviewing the hubs, and will do another pass before it goes to peer review. They also updated the mercury topic hubs, national release on mercury list serve. The internship topic hub should be released from Jan 5<sup>th</sup>. Launch of hub will be used to try and get programs together on a call. They will try to start having these conversations in January.

Outside P2Rx, climate and waste policy work. What tools will allow source reduction to generate reductions in greenhouse gasses.

## **WRRC**

Julie reported that Curt did survey of R4 states, green hospitality programs or correctional institutions – all but two programs have had a green hospitality program or are putting one together. Not as much toward correctional institutions.

WRRC want to make sure the states know what each other is doing and will put all the information in one place.

New definition of solid waste will change RCRA, will open the secondary waste market. If it's recycled, it gets pulled out of RCRA system.

To have a Google box on WRRC website, they need a couple of volunteers to index their site – Thomas volunteers, Rick also.

## **GLRPPR**

A correctional institute in Illinois won a governor's P2 award. Laura is working part time elsewhere but still involved in GLRPPR. She is involved with community colleges offering Green Business workshops. For the workshop she had 65 attendees. They surveyed them to see what workshops they'd be interested in – energy efficiency, industrial pollution prevention, greening your office/basics of sustainability. Laura teaches Green Business 101. Community colleges are seeing a demand state-wide. These are mostly aimed at small to medium sized business. Gary says they've done similar things but he'd like to get copies of materials. Rick also wants to follow up. Is this our opportunity for certification? Laura says they think they can make the three courses a certification. She also asked folks what they plan to do when they get back to work – and trying to capture short-term outcomes.

## **Zerowaste**

How could each P2Rx center address climate change? Thomas has options for oil and gas industry to reduce methane. They follow-up with customers to see if they have implemented changes, if so, they identify measures, if not, they identify barriers. Group Thomas joined grew OSHA certification out of nothing. They are incorporating environment to certify EHS professional. Having environment 101 class that includes emphases on prevention not just compliance.

## **P2RIC**

Rick is trying to do green business training, working with area businesses. He asked businesses to come up with a scorecard and they'll work out training from there.

He also have put together ethanol information but haven't convened the group. What them to pressure their supply chain.

GSN, looks like lean and green training will be suggested for all of 3<sup>rd</sup> shift around the country at food processing plants.

Rick is working on reviving P2Rx website.

Rick also attended the energy and climate change conference in California. They talked about how to reach out to people and how to make green happen.

### **Peaks to Prairies**

Myla said they are working to get sustainability topic hub off the ground – they have done internal technical edit, and are in the process of getting it reviewed for content.

They continue to working on school chemical clean outs in SD and are still working on tribal P2 webpage, improving it. They try to better incorporate feedback and are developing promotional materials for tribal P2.

Working on residential construction, may focus on regional building climate types.

Updating P2 document – guidebook for MT local governments. Greening government

### **WRPPN**

No representative from WRPPN was on the call

### **PPRC**

Deb said that they got 10 or 12 reviews of Topic Hubs finished. They are still finalizing Lean and Fiberglass. Prabin is supposed to finish P2 Results programming at the end of December. They are working towards finalizing carbon footprint topic hub.

PPRC is working with private company on greenhouse and toxic footprint, and continuing STAR training in the region. EPP and byproduct synergy.

**P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call; Wednesday, January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Attendees:** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Rachel Colella (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt (WRRRC), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Lynn Turner (Zero Waste), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies), Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), Beth Anderson (EPA)

**Action Items:**

ALL: If there are other questions a center wants to ask regarding the pop-up or static link questions, they should bring it to Dallas meeting

ALL: Semiannual Activity and Web report is due to Jean on January 20

ALL: send Jean and Veronica the thoughts on what each center wants to give up and how you plan to collaborate by Thursday, January 22

ALL: Send Veronica the Power Point slides for the Dallas meeting presentation on “health” and general focus of the regional P2 programs by January 22

**Expansive Agenda Review:**

0.5 hours	Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update on EPA draft P2 Strategy (Beth report)</li><li>• Update on health of state P2 TAPs (center directors report)</li></ul>
-----------	---

- Center directors, can you provide a couple of powerpoint slides on the “health” and general focus of your regional P2 programs? Send to Veronica by COB Thursday, Jan 22. This is just to provide us context of our constituents at the beginning of the meeting (Your introduction of yourself and slide can only take 2 minutes each)
- Things we’re doing well – we’ll have a couple of slides of additional analysis from the Abt evaluation, highlighting what the centers are doing well. (5 minutes)
- P2 Strategy – Beth is getting resistance to make this public but will have a couple of slides on it if possible (5 minutes)

6.0 hrs	facilitated discussion with P2Rx and P2 Coordinators <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ P2Rx topic-focus for 2009 proposals – how do we make it happen?</li><li>▪ How do we work together – how do we share our strengths?</li><li>▪ How do we collaborate with TAPs nationally? (how do we find local programs in addition to state programs; how do we get their buy-in?)</li><li>▪ How do we show we’re effective?</li><li>▪ What activities do we give up and how do we collaborate?- <b>what would we be able to share among</b></li></ul>
---------	--

	<p style="color: red;">centers, how do we deal with contacts in program directories</p>
--	---

- We'll have a couple of "vision" slides about how this could work – having a national focus, then we can discuss.
- Can centers offer their "strength" to the group? (these are some strengths highlighted from San Diego meeting last year)
  - NEWMOA – content development; IT support
  - WRRC - library
  - GLRPPR – engineers, IT support
  - Zerowaste – industry/business connection; case studies
  - P2RIC – new web applications
  - Peaks – extension, tribes, green buildings
  - WSPPN – networking; webinars
  - PPRC – measurement, content development
- How will we get buy-in from TAPs outside our region?
- How will we show our effectiveness?
- If we get the TAPs to contribute their metrics and we can tell the national story of the impact, is that sufficient?
  - We can probably also get the TAPs in our focus area to answer the "common questions"
    - What activities do we give up and how do we collaborate?
  - Can we "archive" some Topic Hubs? What would this look like?
  - Can we migrate the Hubs to a wiki that our "partners" would maintain?
    - Would this be delivered from the central server?
    - How would we share these wikis?
  - Can we pare down the P2 Programs directory?
    - It might be more useful with fewer choices
    - We need to maintain the contact info of people who are referenced in the Topic Hubs, but may not want to display them
    - We need to continue to keep the contacts updated
  - How can centers collectively share responsibilities?

2 hours	P2Rx Centers break out to detail collaboration opportunities among Centers (facilitated)
---------	--

Detail of what we'll submit for the next round of proposals

- What "common" functions? Same as San Diego?
- What money?
- How to handle changes in focus, collaboration, etc.

1.5 hours	P2Rx committee meetings- <span style="color: red;">committees should have a call before the Dallas meeting</span>
-----------	---

Partnering and Marketing Committee –

- How do we build on our strengths to promote more use of our information and networks?
  - Specific tasks
    - Do we offer an environmental listserv digest once or twice a month to summarize what’s being talked about on some selected environmental listservs? Is this a listserv message or RSS feed (or both)?
    - What follow-up do we need to provide (if any) when identifying these “hot topics”?
    - What other tasks should be done?
  - Specific deadlines
- How do we get TAPs and other partners outside our region to participate in national focus topics?
- Do we want more users, more satisfied users, more users who give us their metrics, or what?

Content and Technology committee –

- How do we accomplish our goal of having current, useful content, given our limited resources?
  - Can we have one center add links to all the topic hubs throughout the year? How can we leverage partners to update content? How do we keep the narrative current? Do we drop sections?
  - Can we build new mechanisms (like wikis) to allow partners to help us maintain content?
  - How can the new mechanisms be delivered so it’s easy for all the centers?
- Do we need to leverage news more or drop it?
- How should we change the Programs Directory?

1.5 hours	P2Rx committee report-outs
1.5 hours	Wrap-up session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICR for Common Questions (finalize “common questions” committee work)</li> <li>• Update of web plans (Andy)</li> <li>• Unfinished business</li> </ul>

20 minutes: The “common questions” are posted as links at [http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common\\_questions/](http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common_questions/) Beth can take forward a list of questions we want to ask, but we should discuss – Centers don’t have to ask every question on Beth’s list, but there are some questions we all need to ask for statistical purposes.

40 minutes:

Web plans (a few slides, Andy?)

- P2 Programs directory displayed with NPPR logo for members
- Keywords feature of Topic Hubs will be upgraded so we can add keywords
- Can we centralize Webtrends? What about using Google Analytics?
- Pop-up cookie code status
- P2 Results status

- Sharing Topic Hubs with external partners – still a good idea?
- Centralized library – can be accomplished by Google search of all libraries

30 minutes:

Unfinished business

There will be 3 coordinators present at the Dallas meeting. Jean also mentioned that Zac Fowler (P2RIC) will email the report on Google analytics and web trends to everybody.

### ***Common Questions:***

Jean stated that Zero Waste wants to have a static link that would allow people to give them feedback. NEWMOA is using the pop-ups. The common questions regarding pop-ups and static link are posted on [http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common\\_questions/](http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common_questions/)

Rick asked whether they can use both (pop-ups and static link) at the same time and Jean said they can.

### ***P2 Programs Directory:***

Andy, Tom Fort (Zerowaste), and Jean had a call with NPPR and Scott Butner (Chemalliance)); the question is: Can we give out the contact e-mails for an EPA national meeting?

NPPR wants to highlight its members.

Jean asked whether they want to pare down the size of the directory, since the collection is too big.

Jean also asked whether anybody wants to keep all programs on the list as it is.

Gary mentioned that Region 4 is already limited

### ***RFPs for next year:***

Beth submitted the RFPs for PPIN Programs, she doesn't know when the answer will be out, maybe in 1 month or so. The RFPs for program coordinator is also coming out.

### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call; Wednesday, February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**Attendees:** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx); Andy Bray and Rachel Colella (NEWMOA); Gary Hunt and Julie Woosley (WRRRC); Bob Iverson (GLRPPR); Rick Yoder (P2 RIC); Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies); Ed Gonzalez (WRPPN); Paula Del Giudice and Deb Taevs (PPRC); Beth Anderson (EPA);

## **Action Items:**

**All:** Send Jean the email of the person at your center that needs to receive the list of broken links

**All:** Provide Beth a list of additional questions centers might want to use in surveying by February 16, 2009 so Beth can get ICR approval (customer satisfaction only)

**All:** Let Jean know about the decision each committee (marketing and content/technology) takes regarding a scheduled call or further actions

**Jean:** Revise the technology committee, it has too few members

**P2 Programs Directory:** Clear criteria need to be established if we want to list 2-3 “main” P2 programs at the top of a state’s list of P2 programs

**All:** send Gary the web-based collections your center would like indexed with his Google box

### ***Answer with a new P2 resource you've discovered since Dallas:***

NEWMOA: Lisa Jackson, EPA Administrator

WRRC: Green space issues

GLRPPR: MnTAP Metal Finishing Pages (<http://lib.wmrc.uiuc.edu/glrppr-blog/2009/01/january-2009-site-of-the-month-mntap-metal-finishing-pages/>)

P2RIC: OZARKS Center for Sustainable Solutions,  
<http://www.drury.edu/multinl/story.cfm?nlid=246&id=22451>

Peaks to Prairies: Montana green schools ABC series, chemical cleanouts, eco logo and green seal, [usgbc.org](http://usgbc.org) the US Green Building Council site.

WSPPN: New west coast collaborative underway in Environmentally Preferable Purchasing (EPP) that will involve coordinators in Washington, California, Hawaii, Arizona, Colorado, and Oregon. Ed will collaborate with PPRC.

PPRC: Seattle Climate Action Plan has sector-specific guidebooks for carbon footprinting,  
<http://www.seattle.gov/climate/SCPresources.htm>

### ***Dallas Action Items:***

The following are the action items discussed at the Dallas meeting:

1. Centralize topic hub maintenance (link-checking) and programs directory maintenance (except for P2RIC and GLRPPR) with the P2Rx coordinator (note: this does not include updating Topic Hub content) - Jean said that Jocelyn Hegge is going to check the broken links for all the centers. She will

look for replacement links but if she cannot find one, she will send the list of broken links to center directions. Jean asked center directors to tell her who else from their center should receive the broken links. Centers will have a week to fix the broken link or it will be deleted.

2. Eliminate reporting of web and activity measures- Jean said that centers can still track their web activity on their own but no longer need to report it to her.
3. Institute cookies or static feed-back page (using “common questions” – agreed-upon language) on all Center websites to determine type of client and short-term outcomes in accordance with the logic model of information dissemination. Beth will get an ICR for user satisfaction questions so all centers can ask the same questions. In addition, Centers can ask other questions if they don’t use their EPA grant money or if they only ask fewer than 10 people. For example, one of the states from the region could put the survey together and distribute it; however, centers can analyze the results using the grant money.
4. Institute surveys for known clients (such as rapid response clients or advisory boards) to determine intermediate outcomes in accordance with logic model. Andy can make a “survey monkey” that centers could use. Centers could provide a link to their known users and centrally collect the data. The seven center directors on the call agreed they would use this. The process and timeframe are:

- Decide on the questions for the survey (today)
  - ICR approval (which will take about 2 months)
  - Andy will put together the survey using SurveyMonkey
  - Centers can start sending the link (about 3 months – May 2009)
5. Provide Beth a list of additional questions centers might want to use in surveying by February 16, 2009 so Beth can get ICR approval
  6. Marketing committee needs to work on how to engage community of practice around national focus areas
  7. Technology/content committee needs to work on what exact technology will be used to publish new national focus product

Andy proposed to build a framework to help move the committees work forward. He suggested scheduling a call for each committee meetings. Let Jean know on what each committee decides. Rick said it would be helpful for the technology committee to get more members.

8. Considerations for next RFP
  - Collaboration among centers for national focus topics
  - Migrating selected topic hubs to archived or other status

Andy said he transferred the EMS Topic Hub to Thomas (Zero Waste) from Rick (P2RIC). Julie (WRRC) is about to transfer the EMS in Government Topic Hub to Thomas.

### ***Update on Programs Directory:***

Tom Fort of Zero waste has been working on the P2 Programs Directory database in order to display a small icon for NPPR members. In the process of doing this work, there was a call with Tom, Andy Bray, Jean, and

several NPPR board members about what they desired. NPPR has been displaying the P2 Programs directory on their website. On the call, it was expressed that there is some desire to have the "main" P2/assistance program displayed at the top of the list of P2 programs for a state. Currently, some states have more than two dozen programs listed. The purpose of changing the display would be so businesses could easily know who to contact for P2 assistance. The "main" program(s) could be a P2 grantee, an SBAP program, or an SBDC that provides environmental assistance. We could potentially also use this info to have a separate display of EPA grantees only, for example.

Jean asked if center directors agree to designate a few programs on top of the list that would be the first place a customer has to go for help. Rick said he agrees that there should be a better way to connect businesses with programs; maybe put two main programs on the top and then list the rest of the programs alphabetically. Maybe list the P2 grantees differently than those who provide direct P2 assistance. Myla was not sure if the listing P2 grantees would work for Peaks. Beth said EPA lists about 3 programs as a point of contact for each state on their P2 website.

Jean asked center directors to respond to the following two questions:

1. Would it be valuable to have 2-3 programs on top of the list of state programs?
2. Would centers be able to let Jean which programs to list?

NEWMOA: yes/yes

WRRC: yes/yes

GLRPPR: no(does not see what the value is)/yes

P2RIC: no/yes

Peaks to Prairies: yes/yes

WSPPN: California might have to have more than 2 contacts listed yes/yes

PPRC: yes/yes

The criteria for "main" programs needs to be clearly defined.

**WRRC indexing sites:** - Gary requested centers let him know what on-line collections (publications) they'd like indexed with his Google search box. If he indexes their whole site, it is not as useful and he does not have enough capacity to accomplish it. He is also interested in useful collections outside of P2Rx. Gary gave an update on what progress and problems he encountered while implementing the site indexing. The current license limit is 100,000 documents. This box differs from the free Google search that is on P2Rx.org because it is directed specifically at publications/collections of resources. The free Google search that is on P2Rx.org looks at everything on every center that is accessible to any search engine. (in other words, if the center does not have it blocked from being indexed, it will be available via the P2Rx.org Google search box)

### ***Common Questions:***

Beth said that the questions regarding behavior change most likely will not be approved through ICR. However she said that if centers ask less than 10 people the same set of questions, they don't need the ICR approval and they can use the grant money to do that. The purpose of the questions is to show that centers are following the logic model. She also said that she'll send the static questions and the pop-up questions for approval.

### **P2Rx Admin Group Conference Call; Wednesday, March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

Veronica, Paula, Ed, Rachel, Andy, Bob, Lynn, Gary and Julie, Rick, Beth, Jean, Myla

RFP for PPIN – out soon; The P2 grant RFP is now posted: <http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/p2home/pubs/grants/ppis/2009rfpp2grant.html>

proposal deadline is April 17<sup>th</sup>; The PPIN RFA is still in review. May be released in a week or 10 days?

The Source Reduction Assistance and P2Rx coordinator RFPs both are weeks away from release.

Schedule a call within a week of release.

**Common questions** – Veronica is going to make the “Static Page” survey monkey, centers will receive their link. Veronica will be able to collect the common questions/results. Centers can customize but we warn you to keep it short! You'll have to use non-federal funding to conduct surveys. Veronica has posted the surveys on P2Rx.org/admin, [http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common\\_questions/Static%20Page%20revised%20suggestions.doc](http://p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/common_questions/Static%20Page%20revised%20suggestions.doc)

Veronica will also make survey monkey for you to ask your known clients and stakeholders questions. Again, we'll have common questions but your center can customize.

Jocelyn needs to create paper survey for Ed, March 25.

Does anyone need help getting the link on their page? Paula, Ed, maybe Myla

### **Topic Hub**

**Keywords** – Right now, the function for centers to add “free” keywords does not work. We're going to have a call to discuss keywords for Topic Hubs – Michelle, Rachel, Laura, Andy, Nate, and Veronica are currently invited.

**External sharing** – we're having a conversation with Idaho to see about sharing Topic Hubs (selected ones) on their P2 site.

**Broken link procedure** – Jocelyn in our office is checking all the Topic Hub broken links. She's fixing the ones she can, and will send each center the list of links she can't find. Can you turn the list around in one week? We anticipate she'll do this monthly. The first time has been somewhat overwhelming. Please work with Jocelyn if you feel she should have been able to find the broken link she sent to you.

Jocelyn found 416 broken links from Topic Hubs. She has reviewed 230 of them, finding replacements for about half of them. How do redirects fit into this?

**Programs Directory** update – Tom Fort (Zerowaste) modified current database to accept data as to whether or not a program is a member of NPPR. NEWMOA will complete the transformation and ask NPPR to populate the fields. Modifications may be done via the current system programs have to update their information or NEWMOA may make the modifications directly in the database. This is not confirmed currently. At this time, there is no plan to allow NPPR administrative functions with the database. (we'll continue to be a bottleneck – but hopefully not too restrictive)

**Indexing of Sites** - Do centers want to know how to block spiders? Currently, the Google box on P2Rx indexes your whole site.

## **P2 Results**

Call for data – Jeff Burke sent the request for us to ask programs to participate in P2 Results. This is important to P2Rx. Please confirm with Jean and Jeff after you sent the request to programs in your region.

Measurement - conflict between EPA grants reporting and P2 Results (why two systems); report of Task Force in prep for Summit (fact sheet being prepared by Natalie Hummels, Task force meeting at Summit is Wednesday morning from 9:00 – 10:30.

Natalie wants to organize a webinar in June for P2 Greenhouse calculators for grantees. Will look at incorporating these calculators in P2 Results.

## **Prep for Summit**

Fun Walk is 7:00 am on Wednesday, May 6 – I need walk leaders Myla, Rachel, Bob, Ed, Andy, Paula.

We'll have a new look for our P2Rx home page

What products/services do we highlight?

Business card sized highlights?

SUSTAIN updates – find topics from about a dozen listservs that are monitored, narrow down, post on wiki; Rick needs to ask listservs to comment.

Sustain updates

Tribal portal

National mercury reduction database

P2 InfoHouse

Webinars/Calendar

P2Rx at the P2 Coordinators meeting, Monday May 4 (afternoon) – what do we want to cover?

Web 2.0 – Rick what it is, why we need it, how our community will use it

Provide content for others to manage, delicious, you tube, etc.

National Focuses for P2Rx

Discuss P2 Results/Grantrack

Anything else – jean send a couple of e-mails to ask centers for more agenda items.

NPPR meets on Wednesday from 11:00 – 12:30

**Content/Technology committee** report

**Marketing committee** – when will you meet? How do we roll out web 2.0 products?

**Region 3 Roundtable** – report – Beth and Curt attended; Curt handed out Measuremints; Beth handed out revised P2Rx brochures (they're on our admin page of the website)

**P2 Strategy webinar** – thanks Ed for setting up webinar – any comments? Lynn commented that she was surprised at how much input was received. It looked like a great way to start an information gathering system.

Lynn was thinking that live teleconferencing from the Summit might be useful. Perhaps there would be topics of national interest.

Gary says use the summit to identify the next series of speakers for webinars.

Beth doesn't know what the plan is for answering questions or comments on the P2 Strategy. Each center can make a response. P2Rx is named as a group in the strategy. Andy says it seems appropriate to at least review what they say about us. Comments due the end of March. Jean send something out.

**Green lodging standard** – call on 3-17-09 at 1:00 EST; 866-299-3188; code: 555-156-9181#; Also, Beth put out an FYI on green meetings standard being developed

**P2 Week** – video contest? What else might we want to do? Office of Water has a video contest on right now, <http://www.epa.gov/owow/videocontest.html>

EPA internal wiki – P2RIC You Tube channel

*1.11 Annual meeting minutes*

## **P2Rx Admin Meeting January 27-29, 2009**

## Dallas, TX

**Attendees:** Beth Anderson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Rachel Colella (NEWMOA), Bob Iverson (GLRPPR), Thomas Vinson-Peng and Lynn Turner (Zero Waste Network), Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Myla Kelly (Peaks to Prairies), Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), Paula Del Giudice (PPRC)  
**P2Coordinators:** David Bond (EPA Region 6), Wendi Shafir (EPA Region 9), Robert Guillemain (EPA Region 1)

### Action Items:

- Centralize topic hub maintenance (link-checking) and programs directory maintenance (except for P2RIC and GLRPPR) with the P2Rx coordinator (note: this does not include updating Topic Hub content)
- Eliminate reporting of web and activity measures
- Institute cookies or static feed-back page (using “common questions” – agreed-upon language) on all Center websites to determine type of client and short-term outcomes in accordance with the logic model of information dissemination
- Institute surveys for known clients (such as rapid response clients or advisory boards) to determine intermediate outcomes in accordance with logic model
- Provide Beth a list of additional questions centers might want to use in surveying by February 16, 2009 so Beth can get ICR approval
- Marketing committee work on how to engage community of practice around national focus areas
- Technology/content committee work on what exact technology will be used to publish new national focus product

### Considerations for next RFP

- Collaboration among centers for national focus topics
- Migrating selected topic hubs to archived or other status

### January 27<sup>th</sup>, (Tuesday)

#### *Introductions and Background info:*

Each center director made a short presentation regarding their center and the main programs in their region as well as the “health” and P2 focus of P2 programs in their region. The slides used for this presentation can be seen at <http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/NatMeetDallas09.cfm>

#### *Lessons Learned:*

Jean Waters presented the “Lessons Learned from PPIN Evaluations” PowerPoint. The slides used for this presentation can be seen at <http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/NatMeetDallas09.cfm>

The “What’s Left to Do?” slide is a representation of the logic model each center has.

“Specifically-We need to:” slide talks about how centers can identify the type of web site users (those that are end-users, such as businesses, vs. those who will pass on the information, such as technical assistance programs (TAPs)) through cookies or static feedback page.

Regarding the use of uniform (or common) questions by all centers to measure short term and intermediate outcomes, Abt (the contractor that conducted the recent PPIN evaluation) said that the centers are inconsistent in the questions they asked, so standard questions should be implemented when following up with customers.

Centers can measure intermediate outcomes from “identified” users, such as those who use rapid response, advisory boards, or other groups, to find out whether they did change practice/behavior and how did they do it.

#### *Cookies vs. Static page:*

Jean said that NEWMOA implemented cookies, and they can track what visitors are viewing through the site. The cookie is set via a pop-up that appears on the P2 part of NEWMOA’s website after the user has clicked on something. The user has the option to refuse the question, which identifies whether they are an end-user of the information or an intermediate user of information. NEWMOA will ask some follow-up questions after several visits, this is to be implemented in the future.

The Static Feedback Page option is for centers who don’t like pop-ups. Since there is no way to track the visitors without cookies, they will be asked to give their feedback on this static page.

Jean mentioned that centers can use both cookies and static page if they want.

The Agreements and Common Questions document can be seen at

<http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/NatMeetDallas09.cfm>

#### *Proposed:P2Rx Centers Initiate National “Sector” Focuses:*

Jean talked about how centers can collaborate on the national topics, what the process would be, and what the outcome would look like. The PowerPoint presentation can be seen at

<http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/NatMeetDallas09.cfm>

One of the biggest barriers centers have is that they will have to provide regional support plus their national support. On how can we respond more quickly to information needs and be more interactive with our users? Centers can use a blog since it can be interactive, a wiki could work if centers can engage partners to keep it up to date; centers should try to get partners engaged to find and rank information resources. The delivery to clients can happen through webinars/training-have clients participate, let interested people know about the events; use sector resources to publish info quickly; provide topical info through news and/or calendars.

#### *Facilitated Discussion:*

What is the purpose of a wiki? To point to direction and allow audience to develop/express ideas, work together without a middle-man. However, it has an editor, and it works as a supplement to topic hubs.

Centers discussed possible National focus areas they could participate in:

- Electronics (GLRPPR)
- Hospitality (WSPPN, NEWMOA, P2RIC (IT), Peaks (for tribes))
- Building and construction (Peaks to Prairies-residential part, WSPPN)
- Green business (WSPPN, P2RIC, GLRPPR)

- Municipality (PPRC, Zero Waste) and Institutions (P2RIC, GLRPPR (sustainable campuses), WSPPN, NEWMOA-greenhouse gases embodied in materials)
- Ag
- Chemicals (NEWMOA-chemical info clearing house, WSPPN) and Manufacture (P2Interns – NEWMOA; Zero Waste and PPRC – lean and green)
- Tribal – Peaks, WSPPN (casinos)
- Water conservation – WRRC (perhaps)

Questions discussed:

New collaborations among centers?

Show effectiveness-How?

What do we give up?

Jean suggested that centers have to engage more with P2 Coordinators because their support is critical. She also said that 4 to 6 national focus topics for starters would be great.

Rob said that there are limited ways to connect to organizations and P2Rx is designed to connect the dots.

Rick was reluctant to commit; he said that it is hard to commit when you don't know what you are committing to. He also added that he is already committed to hospitality. He also said that he can help put the IT resource in place.

Jean explained that this is indeed a big shift, and while centers would still have to serve their region, they also have to commit to work together with other regions.

NEWMOA expressed a concern on how to handle the existing resources, do we make them national or are national topics are going to be new resources, and how does national focus complement the regional work?

Another question NEWMOA raised is how to finance all this work.

Rick suggested implementing a national standard. He said that green businesses in Region 7 are interested in having a certification.

Rob mentioned that there should be a person at EPA as a contact to find connections, as well as at regional level. He also said that centers need to find partners if they want to collaborate, and just find the leader in the area and connect everybody.

Andy suggested that centers should look for opportunities to expand. NEWMOA is doing it for the P2 internships.

How are we doing it?

Nobody opposed in trying to make some national topics.

How do we get participation?

Does it depend on:

- Grant funding
- Who we are
- What tools we provide

Rick asked if all the centers have to have a focus and Jean said that maybe one center would do wiki or library or something else, but another center would have to have the lead on the topic.

Centers were asked to identify whether their strength is more in the content/technology area or if they would be better suited to do the networking to gather together the community of practice for a national topic.

Networking	Content/Technology
------------	--------------------

Peaks to Prairies WSPPN PPRC	P2RIC WRRRC Zero Waste PPRC (carbon footprint) GLRPPR (E-waste) NEWMOA
------------------------------------	---

Rob mentioned that if there are already people interested in a particular topic, some barriers are easier to overcome since need is already established.

### January 28<sup>th</sup>, (Wednesday)

Questions discussed:

- Details of Collaboration
- Grants for 2009
- Common Questions
- Committee meetings

#### *Details of Collaboration:*

The main idea of collaboration is to find committed partners who want to move on the process starting with EPA headquarters, P2Rx and then on state level.

NEWMOA and PPRC can collaborate on carbon footprint. Beth suggested taking what they already have on carbon footprint to a national level and broadening it.

Jean said that if centers could be narrower in what they deliver, that could deepen the expertise. Wendi asked whether centers can use less FTE on P2Rx core functions and more on national focus projects. Some changes were made to the FTEs.

Original FTE commitments made at San Diego meeting (FTEs are a minimum; some centers may choose to do more):

(0.05 FTE for the first four items combined)

Routine maintenance of Topic Hubs - link checking

P2 Directory – annual updates, focus on P2 Roundtable members at minimum

P2Rx Admin calls < 1.5 hours/month

News – display the national news box; no across the board commitment to add news

P2Rx Center Administration (0.2 FTE)

P2 Results Data System – hosted on centers sites; answer questions; manage passwords; forward questions to NEWMOA for FAQs; keep software current (0.05)

Marketing – implement what is agreed upon from what the marketing committee recommends; networking (0.1 FTE)

Maintain a functioning website (0.1 FTE)

Attend annual meetings

Rapid response – all centers will support (0.05 FTE)

Measures – Report activity & web measures semiannually

Total FTE commitment: approximately 0.6 FTE

Centralize: it was proposed the following items could be centralized and provided by the P2Rx program coordinator

- Webtrends
- Outcome reports from cookies, static pages, survey monkey sent to rapid response clients or advisory board
- Topic Hub maintenance (monthly link checks)
- Program directory maintenance (except GLRPPR and P2RIC, who want to continue to contact the programs in their regions).

Elimination of Web and Activity Measures reports:

After discussion and reflection upon the Abt evaluation, it was decided that web and activity measures do not provide us the information needed to show Centers are achieving outcomes according to the logic models. Therefore, centers will move to the cookie or static feedback page on their websites and will survey advisory groups or other “known” users to determine short-term and intermediate outcomes, respectively. This information will be reported. However, if centers have activity measures or web measures as part of their grants, they have to continue honor them

Regarding routine maintenance of Topic Hubs centers agreed to - link checking (will be centralized) finding the broken link, find the new link and re-link it. NOTE: it does not include updating the content. Also it was discussed to:

- reduce the number that centers currently maintain
- Centers decide individually about updating Topic Hubs with new resources
- Migrate some to “adopt a topic hub” or wiki or other new format that we don’t maintain

Other agreements:

- News: only core function is display of box; centers contribute to news as they want, and write it into their center grant if they do it
- Rapid Response – every center will continue to do this individually

Hypothetical exercise: National focus area: Green Hotels

Green Hotels (Resources: EPA P2 Coordinators)

- P2RIC- IT
- NEWMOA(Terri)-content
- WSPPN-Communication

Gather programs for needs assessment

The group brainstormed a list of possible activities that could be involved in the national focus area:

- On-line compendium/info

- News
- Training
- Measures
- Develop industry standards
- Recognition/awards for programs
- Update at summit/publicity
- Put news through a listserve/facebook

Ed asked how the collaboration part would be reflected in the proposals. Beth said Centers have to include in their proposals only what the individual center is able to do ( ex: round table, conference calls, training), and how much effort the center is willing to put in without specifying the topics, since topics are not known yet for sure.

Beth suggested writing proposals for 2 years at a time. She also mentioned that the exact national P2 priorities are unknown at this time, and maybe at the end of February this information will be released. This is why centers should write about their skills in the proposals. Jean proposed to revisit the subject in a month and maybe then will be clearer where everybody will fit.

Brainstorming:

Wiki:

Rick suggested putting information on wikigreen, but questioned the way measures can be collected. Besides this problem, Rick mentioned that in order to edit the content, you have to get permission first, which can be an additional barrier to content management.

Identified barriers:

- Permission
- Learn how to do it
- Find it on the web
- Perception
- Developing resource

Jean asked whether centers can use the topic hubs to complement the wikis. Rick said that best of resources can go to a wiki page, and it can have a link back to the topic hub.

*Summary:*

- Change core functions
- Outline for moving to national topic
- Display of national topics as a wiki – what it will look like for centers
- Cookies/static page go into proposals (centers should say what they are doing)
- Proposals will be written for 2 years
- Centralization
- No reason to report activities
- Jean should get web info from centers
- All agreed with core functions
- Should sustain communication between centers
- Input to agenda in San Francisco

Jean said there will probably be 3-4 national topics and every single center should participate.

Four major topics for the national focus were identified but not finalized:

1. Green hospitality (WSPPN and NEWMOA)
2. Manufacturing lean & green (PPRC and Zero Waste)
3. Residential green constructions (Peaks to Prairies and WRRC)
4. Institutions/Sustainability (P2RIC and GLRPPR)

Other potential duties assigned:

- P2RIC – wiki for green hospitality
- P2RIC+NEWMOA+PPRC - carbon footprint
- WSPPN - web training(webinars)

## **January 29<sup>th</sup>, (Thursday)**

### *Committees Report-outs:*

#### *Content and Technology Committee:*

Committee members present were Andy Bray, Rick Yoder, and Bob Iverson. Thomas Vinson attended the committee meeting but was not present for the report-out. Jean Waters also attended the committee meeting.

The Content Technology Committee discussed about wiki, RSS, and Web 2.0, content sharing, social network. Rick explained the difference between the Web 2.0 and Web 1.0. He also suggested collecting various news feeds, aggregating them, filtering them, and then creating a customized feed for P2Rx audience. This can be done using a technology called, “Yahoo Pipes.”The advantages of doing that are that it will be faster to find the news, and it will be easier for the audience to identify better information.

See the complete committee presentation on <http://www.p2rx.org/adminInfo/NatMeetDallas09.cfm>

#### *Partnering and Marketing Committee:*

Committee members present were Ed Gonzalez, Rachel Colella, Myla Kelly, Paula Del Giudice, and Lynn Turner.

Regarding the question of providing the current wall calendar or a day planner format, the committee recommends the current calendar format. The committee proposes that the side-bar information on the calendar is reflective of regional activities or national focus areas of P2 strategies. The committee recommends the cost of the calendar come from the P2Rx national coordinator grant. Additional ideas on the calendar: they could possibly do a facebook application of calendar dates, solicit photographs again, centers can use calendars as rewards to programs in their region that participate by providing P2 directory information or other participation. For the Environmental Summit, the committee recommends that P2Rx have a booth. They could offer the mensa-level P2 Quiz at the booth (PPRC did this recently). The committee recommends providing a Chico bag as a prize. Perhaps they could get the bag-monster to show up, too. Additionally, they could set up specific times to get clients to attend training at the booth. For example, a time can be set for the mercury workgroup to learn how to do “delicious” tagging. Regarding the Fun walk, the committee recommends keeping it. Alternately, they could do an activity that reflects the mission of the non-profit that is designated to receive the money (e.g., plant a tree instead of walking). Changing the name to “Walk the talk” was proposed. It was also proposed to have a calendar at the booth so if folks don’t currently receive it or if they want to contribute pictures, they could leave their business card. For the reception on the first night of the Summit, a magician

from WSPPN can be brought in (he is already booked). That would be a great opportunity to make the magician publicize P2Rx.

Lynn may do drumming performances for regional roundtables but she will not do it for the summit.

Other questions addressed:

- How do we engage communities of practice?
- Needs assessment (select goal and topic) – what topics are we trying to market?
- Who's going to be the audience?
- Promote through Webinars, trainings, listservs, calendars, IT technologies, online publications (maybe a guest columnist)
- Use EPA to help market P2Rx – no one has more visibility than EPA
- The end goal is to make P2Rx the “go to” resource.
- Marketing committee wants it built – Rick wants them to recruit helpers

A question that still has to be addressed is where the wiki will live.

Sustainability could be one of the first wikis and the National Summit could be the recruiting opportunity for community of practice.

#### *Common Questions:*

Centers agreed to report to Jean (within next 2 weeks) if they will ask a different set of questions besides the ones agreed from cookies/static page. Lynn said that she will ask more questions in addition to the ones agreed upon.

The questions from cookie and static page should be the same. All centers should display these questions on their website. The rapid response part should be easy to report since centers have customer's emails and can use SurveyMonkey. After gathering this information, the best way to show long term outcomes is through case studies.

#### *Update on web plans:*

Andy gave a short update regarding the web plans. He said the needs are shifting and that they only have quarterly conference calls. Besides these calls, there are limited topical calls involving a few people.

Andy also said they just finished centralizing the programs directory. Andy mentioned that center directors have to have a call together to revise the message that will go out to programs within the Program Directory when it is time to update their information. The functionality exists to send out individual/mass emails to all the programs in the directory to get them to update their information.

Andy will provide information on how to implement cookies, however, those centers who want to implement cookies, will still have to run webtrends in order to obtain all the information they need.

Jean also mentioned that if a center does not have the ability to run the webtrends, they will be better off if they will use static page instead of cookies. She also said that Zac Fowler did a comparison between Google Analytics and Webtrends, and that there are some differences present. To see the full report, go to <http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/toc.cfm>

Beth gave a short update regarding the call with the EPA P2 coordinators held Wednesday afternoon. She said that centers can provide Jean the information on what an EPA champion should look like. Also they should provide the list of activities centers can do for the national topics. There will be a webinar through Ed, after the P2 Strategy comes out, everybody can attend.

Beth also said that the communication is central to role that P2Rx plays. She mentioned that the bottom line is that EPA wants to see that P2Rx is effective.

### *1.12 Web call minutes*

## **P2Rx Web Group Conference Call**

Thursday, December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008

**Attendees:** Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), David Webb and Curt McCracken (WRRRC), Wes Fleming (Peaks to Prairies), Tom Fort (Zero Waste), ZacFowler and Pranita Shrestha (P2RIC), John Handzo, Ryo Yamaki and Cesar (WSPPN), Prabin Kanel(PPRC)

### **Action Items:**

- ***Jean check P2 Results wiki for two enhancements: ability to have state- or regional-specific costs for use in calculators; administrative ability for every center to determine which programs entered data***
- ***P2 Programs Directory errors need to be resolved: Andy send Veronica list of erroneous entries; Veronica find correct information***
- ***Cookie coding should be available for other centers in January***
- ***Zac compare web usage as measured by Webtrends vs. Google Analytics***
- ***Have communication in January about cookie pop-up***
- ***Next call is March 26, 2009***

### **P2 Results:**

Prabin talked briefly about the P2 results, NEWMOA and PPRC plan to have a call to decide the deadline and to decide who does what. Prabin mentioned that the feedback for P2 measurements was positive, and they documented all the requests from the wiki. Wes asked if there will be a possibility for the calculator to be region specific, and Prabin said it is possible. Andy said that they would have to implement the following actions:

- Back out from national calculators to regional
- Store the entered data (not only the calculated result but the actual data entered by the users)
- Recalculate the old data

Prabin mentioned that the application should handle year and state/region options. It is built in, but you might choose to use it or not.

Jean reminded that some people did not know how to get to the information about the programs that actually entered data in the P2 results, since this information is rarely accessed, and it would be nice for everybody to know how to do that because center directors should know that information. Andy said are able to pull that report in a centralized manner.

Jean replied that the centralized report will save her a lot of time; however centers also need to know how to access this information individually because these are the centers clients, and they have to follow up with them. She also said she'll put this request on the wiki.

### ***Programs Directory:***

Andy said they hope they can add a feature to the program to be able to flag the NPPR members.

Wes said Peaks to Prairies is interested in using the program directory contact information to send their calendars. He asked if that information could be easily pulled out. Andy said that the feature is there, but is disabled. He also said they have to clean the data because there was a problem with recognizing ID, which was not unique, and if somebody changed their program's information the data was rewritten, but not necessarily to the correct region. Andy will send Veronica a list of entries that need to be checked.

### ***Cookie Status:***

Nate summarized what NEWMOA implemented so far regarding the cookies. He said that since they launched the cookie pilot, they got 60 responses from users in about four days. Jean stated that after people are exposed to the cookie, they won't receive the pop-up again unless they delete the cookie. She also suggested for NEWMOA to run the web-trends report on the cookies and see how it works, and what information can be collected.

P2RC, P2RIC, Zero Waste, WRRRC, Peaks to Prairies agreed to implement their cookies in January.

Jean also mentioned that the Center directors want to be able to ask effectiveness questions of the people who took the cookie. It will be a pop-up with statements. Users agree or disagree with 5 choices (strongly disagree to strongly agree). She also asked if there is a way to trigger the pop-up on a specific visit of that user (ex. the fifth visit). All that information should be stored in a database. A question arose regarding how to count the individual cookies; with another cookie? Since every time the user loads the page, it is counted. Zac suggested to use session ID and token ID. Prabin mentioned that if sessions are stored in a database, it will run out of space really fast.

### ***Web Trends Reporting:***

Andy asked if anybody is using the list of filters posted on P2Rx website (<http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/toc.cfm> under WEB TRENDS INFORMATION AND REPORTS). All centers report they are using this list. One center was also filtering "loosefoot21" and "loosefoot 19" but these are servers used by P2Rx and will show a lot of traffic because they serve the Topic Hubs and Programs Directory.

Wes is using Google analytics but they don't run the web-trends. Wes added that Google analytics is an ongoing report, and you can report by time. The default user session is 30 minutes, after that it is counted as a new session. The problem with Google analytics is that it doesn't count PDFs. Zac said P2RIC is using Google analytics as well as Webtrends; Zero Waste uses Google analytics plus sawmill.

GLRPPR provided Jean their standard operating procedure for counting the topic hub usage. They count page views for P2Rx products (like Topic Hubs) based on top pages. Jean asked if other centers looked at the number of pages or looked at their directories to get Topic Hub and other product user session numbers. Peaks to Prairies, Zero Waste, and P2RIC count sessions by looking at the directory numbers. NEWMOA has a content group set up in Webtrends. They identified which pages to count for the individual products reported to P2Rx.

Jean suggested that maybe P2Rx can buy Webtrends and centralize the collection of web statistics. There may be other programs to use instead of Webtrends. Omniture is used by Prabin to count web usage. Zac has also used an open source program called webalizer. IP analytics is also open source web statistics program. AWSTATS is offered on a lot of hosting sites for free. Zach thinks it would be useful to have the web usage numbers run and compiled centrally. WRRRC would still have to run their own numbers.

Next call is scheduled for March. There will still be some communication in January for the pop-ups implementation.

## P2Rx Web Group Conference Call

Thursday, March 26th, 2009

**Attendees:** Beth Anderson (EPA), Jean Waters and Veronica Doga (P2Rx), Andy Bray and Nate Bisbee (NEWMOA), Gary Hunt, Curt McCracken and David Webb (WRRRC), Tyler Rubach (GLRPPR), Tom Fort (Zero Waste), Zac Fowler, Pranita Shrestha and Rick Yoder (P2RIC), Wes Fleming (Peaks to Prairies), John Handzo (WSPPN), and Chloe Birnel (PPRC)

### **Action Items:**

**Nate/Andy:** link the hub authority keywords to the central keyword database, so every topic hub accesses the updated keyword list

**Nate/Andy:** reinstate the free keyword feature

**Nate/Andy:** include keywords in the search string, so when people use the search box, the keywords are searched also

**Rick:** send the matrix graphic on Web 2.0 to the group

**Jean:** update Programs Directory and Topic Hubs User Manuals to reflect all recent changes

**Jean:** follow up on who wants to review the updated User Manuals besides Andy and Nate

**All centers:** install cookie pop-up if desired

**All centers:** let Jean know the wording for your center on question #2 of the static page feedback questions; install the link once provided by Jean's office.

### **Cookie Pop-up Coding Available:**

Andy provided brief background information on the cookie pop-up. In order to figure out what are the website users looking for and how they are using that information, NEWMOA and P2Rx implemented on their websites the pop-up cookie that asks the user several questions of interest. The cookies are "passive cookies"; the pop-up will be triggered only if the user clicks more than once on a website, in other words, the pop-up does not "jump" on the user as soon as the user opens the website. If Centers want to use the pop-up feature, they can now get the code and implement it on their own website.

Andy talked about the process of getting the cookie code which is described at [http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/cookie/cookie\\_setup.html](http://www.p2rx.org/AdminInfo/committees/cookie/cookie_setup.html).

Since NEWMOA implemented their cookies, they had 158 users that said they are using the information for their own business, 81 said they are using information to help other businesses, and 64 users answered they don't want to answer. However, those users who just close the pop-up window without giving an answer are not counted.

Jean asked what centers are planning to implement pop-up cookies: WRRRC, PPRC, Peaks to Prairies, WSPPN, GLRPPR, and P2RIC

### **Update on P2 Programs Directory:**

Andy briefly talked about the background information on how they are trying to invigorate the collaboration with NPPR. He also mentioned that Zero Waste is working on a feature that would display the NPPR logo next to the program name of NPPR members. NPPR will be responsible for maintaining and entering their membership data.

Jean said that after the May summit she expects more traffic on the P2Rx website, so she would like to have that flagging done by then, however, Andy said as soon as the new feature is functional on the P2 Programs Directory, it will be up to NPPR to populate the membership data.

### **Update on User Manuals/Procedures for Topic Hubs and Program Directory and CVS:**

Jean said that the Programs Directory and Topic Hubs User Manuals will be updated to reflect all recent changes. As a reminder, Jean and Andy showed everyone the Concurrent Versioning System (CVS). To view the P2Rx CVS files, go to <http://kirk.p2pays.org>. Jean asked who would want to review the Program Directory and Topic Hubs manuals after she will update them, and Nate and Andy offered to do that, however, Jean said that some more centers will have to review them as well. She will contact the centers later on about this matter.

### **Update on Static Feedback Page for Centers:**

Jean said that the link to the static feedback page was posted on P2Rx home page. Jean also mentioned that every center

has agreed to put this feedback survey on their website, but the survey will be customized for each center. She said that center directors should send the modified question #2 content, and Jocelyn from Jean's office, will make all the changes and will send them back the link. The link then needs to be posted on every center's site. The exact location of the feedback link, whether or not graphics are associated with it, and how many pages it appears on is up to each center.

David asked if it matters that information collected from the pop-up and from the feedback survey might come from same people and that the information might be duplicated.

Jean said that they did consider it, but, they don't think it will be too much duplication and it is easier to do it this way. Jean also said that if anyone needs help on putting the link up on their website, to let her know, and Andy and Nate will be able to help them.

#### ***Update on Keyword Function for Topic Hubs:***

Jean asked Andy to talk about the previous keyword call. Andy explained the steps involved in adding a keyword (log in as your center - keyword admin - Topic Hub admin - select topic - relate Topic Hub - browse through 2000+ keywords and add the relevant ones). He also said that Nate will reinstate the free keyword feature so if someone thinks of a keyword which is not on the approved list, then they can suggest it. It will be held temporarily until Laura Barnes (GLRPPR librarian) can review the word and decide whether to approve it or disapprove. In case Laura disapproves a word, she will have to communicate her decision to the person who suggested the keyword. Andy also mentioned that he and Nate have to link the hub authority keywords to the central keyword database, so approved keywords are accessible to all the Topic Hubs. He or Nate will also include the keywords in the search query so they are searchable via our search box.

Zac said that sometimes there could be a problem using the CVS because antivirus software limits the scanning of the folders when installing the CVS. He said that if that is the case, just set it up so the antivirus program won't scan it.

#### ***Update on Potential Web 2.0 Products:***

Rick talked about the SUSTAIN Updates Project. He explained how the wiki works, and that if anyone thinks of a topic that might be interesting they can suggest it. He said that they are still thinking to share the info with Green.wikia.com and Toxipedia.org.

Beth said that the EPA is asking Programs to report twice on their P2 outcomes; once on P2 Results and separately to an EPA spreadsheet. If you have thoughts about that, or if this is a burden to programs in your region, send a note to your regional EPA P2 coordinator or to Beth.

### ***1.13 Marketing committee minutes***

**P2Rx Marketing Committee Conference Call'** March 19, 2009

**Participants:** Ed Gonzalez (Chair), Rachel Colella (Secretary), Paula Del Giudice, Myla Kelly, Julie Woosley, and Jean Waters.

#### **Proposed Marketing Plan:**

Ed created a Proposed P2Rx Marketing Plan (based on a basic template he found on the internet). Overall, the group agreed that it covered the basics and was a good starting point.

Julie recommended that we define the audience and determine how we're going to reach them (social marketing approach) in this Plan. A concern is that if the audience is not engaged, the Plan won't be effective anyway. So she recommended the following:

- Decide on a process to engage partners (e.g., credit/name recognition, mints);
- Make sure marketing tools/advertising avenues are appropriate for the audience (consider demographic).

Next Steps:

- Ed will revise the Marketing Plan based on this conversation and any other changes submitted by the group – the goal is to have a final draft of Marketing Plan by mid-April.

#### **Wiki:**

Ed and Jean have spoken with Rick about how to use the wiki. The plan is to launch the Sustainability Topic Hub as the first wiki. Information will be cut-and-paste into a wiki format from the original hub. Ed will coordinate with the Sustainability Workgroup to review the information before promoting it as a resource – it would be good to have this discussion at the workgroup meeting at the Summit because there will be a captive audience.

Jean noted that the wiki format gives people the opportunity to participate, but doesn't prevent them from just using the information that's already there without having to add new information. Ed noted that there is a moderator function which allows the hub author to review content and changes submitted to the wiki before it's posted live.

#### Next Steps:

- Ed will work with Rick to set up the Sustainability wiki;
- Cut-and-paste content from hub format;
- Identify a few people who can review the wiki and submit content;
- Organize a webinar for training people how to use and contribute to the wiki;
- Add this topic to the agenda for the Sustainability Workgroup meeting at the summit.

#### **Bookmarking:**

The "delicious" tool is a bookmarking tool, where users can register and see what other people have tagged as a good resource. It has been suggested as a way to build a community of practice because the whole community participates. Rick, Ed, and Jean have briefly discussed this resource but still need to flush out some details of how it would work.

Julie thought that it might be difficult to get people to participate because they don't have a lot of time. She suggested somehow including this contribution as a task in a grant agreement (although it is too late this year). Jean agreed that this could be a viable approach – she noted that people have to record "activities" in their grant reports and their contribution to a wiki could be seen as an activity. She also added that it would be great if P2Rx can convince the EPA coordinators to add verbiage into next year's RFP to include a requirement for those applicants who want to develop content to participate in the wiki.

Possible ways to engage partners:

- Name recognition to give them credit for their contributions;
- Gifts (e.g., mints, t-shirts, etc.);
- Incorporate into grant agreements;
- Meet with audience (e.g., Environmental Summit workgroup meetings);
- Other incentives.

#### Next Steps:

- Ed, Jean, and Rick will schedule a conference call to discuss a strategic plan for how to get people to contribute to a resource, and how to retain people to continue to participate.

#### **Environmental Summit:**

Booth – P2Rx will have a booth at the summit (total cost \$1,000). At the booth will be a computer with a Mensa-level P2 Quiz developed by PPRC (and used at their Roundtable with positive feedback). Currently the quiz is in Word-format – we need to figure out if there is way to make it interactive on the computer. Not sure if we'll have internet access at the booth. Jean will investigate whether she could have the Mensa quiz programmed interactively and have it ready to be launched at the Summit.

Fun Walk – The Summit committee said we cannot do any type of giveaways this year. Instead, we can use giveaways for the Mensa-level P2 quiz at the booth, or for people who pledge to contribute to one of the web 2.0 resources noted above (e.g., wiki, bookmarking).

Web 2.0 Giveaways – The group decided to give away P2Rx t-shirts (UP2) to participants who pledge to participate or contribute to one of our resources. Participants will give us their business card and we will follow-up with them later on (this is the key to social marketing). Julie suggested that we use organic or locally-grown cotton t-shirts (there is a place in NC). Jean also knows of a place in Omaha that has t-shirts made of 50% organic cotton and 50% recycled soda bottles. Ed stated that he has used t-shirts from somewhere in the Oakland area before – this would be closer to the Summit location (no shipment = lower carbon footprint).

The group agreed that a t-shirt with the P2 University theme would be appropriate – it would include a list of all the P2Rx Centers on the back. Suggested colors for the t-shirt were black or green. Myla also suggested seeing if we could get a variety of t-shirt sizes, including women’s fitted t-shirts.

Next Steps:

- Jean will check about internet access at the booth and if where we can get a computer;
- Jean, Julie, and Ed will compare information about different types of t-shirts (organic cotton vs. recycled content) – Jean will do a cost comparison and decide which vendor we will use and how many t-shirts we will buy (her budget is \$2,000).

Ed will schedule the next conference call sometime in mid-April.

**P2Rx Marketing Committee Conference Call**

April 15, 2009

Ed Gonzalez (WSPPN), Beth Anderson (EPA), Rachel Colella (NEWMOA), Lynn Turner (Zerowaste), Julie Woosley (WRRC), Erin Bass (P2RIC), and Jean Waters (P2Rx) were on the call.

Erin provided information on how social bookmarking works and the advantages to individuals and to the P2 community. She went through the steps of signing on to Delicious.com, the usefulness of tagging urls for your personal use plus the increased usefulness of having a community such as the P2 community contributing urls and “tags” to the site. We also discussed what we might be able to do with this in the future. We plan to be able to display the community bookmarks around a specific topic, for example, in conjunction with a Topic Hub.

Jean explained that we hope to have a small “pile” of websites tagged in delicious prior to the Summit, so we will have something to show folks, to give them an idea of the usefulness.

Ed requested that Rick present this information to the P2 coordinators on Monday, May 4.

Erin presented some ideas we’ve discussed for a “tag line” and the associated process steps:

Tag line	Process Steps
P2Feed	Find it – Feed it – Share it
P2Pile	Find it – Pile it
P2Mail	Search it – Save it – Send it
P2FlagTag	Find it – Flag it – Tag it

We decided on “**P2 Tag Team**”.

**We discussed ideas for hand-outs at the Summit – decided on ribbons, bookmarks, and candy, and use P2Rx for consistent branding.**

Erin proposed we provide a ribbon that would hang from people’s nametag. The ribbon would say, “I’m delicious”. The idea is to get a conversation started, and provide an opportunity to explain what the delicious social bookmarking site is, and how the P2 community will contribute their urls. Everyone agreed to this idea.

We discussed other give-aways at the booth. We want something that folks could take home with them and remember delicious and what they’re supposed to do. Suggestions were “sticky note” flags, coasters, pens, and bookmarks. We decided on bookmarks. We want them to be attractive, so folks would put leave them out where they can see them. We’ll just make them from cardstock.

We also discussed giving away custom printed M&Ms. The point was made that the p2rx name should be on things so we have consistent branding.

Your Email address (if you want us to contact you): \_\_\_\_\_

Please do not contact me