

Appendix F-Small Sub Group Recommendations

MARSS Workgroup – Sub-Group Recommendations

Prepared September 13, 2017

Participants – Workshop 1

- Denise Collins
- Kerstin Forsythe Hahn
- Rebecca Gaspard
- Jodi Pope
- Wendy Legge
- Mary H. Lynn
- Beth Scheffer

Participants – Workshop 2

- Kerstin Forsythe Hahn
- Wendy Legge
- Mary H. Lynn
- Beth Scheffer

Participants – Workshop 3

- Wendy Legge

- Mary H. Lynn
- Beth Scheffer

Participants – Workshop 4

- Wendy Legge
- Mary H. Lynn
- Kerstin Forsythe Hahn

A number of the MARSS Workgroup members participated in a series of sub-group workshops. A different assembly of members participated in each workshop. From this work, a summary of recommended changes to the pilot-based requirements are provided below for full-group consideration and decision-making.

Decision Key

- Must = Must have in first release.
- Nice = Nice to have in first release if relatively easy and cheap to do so.
- Future = Plan and architect for this future enhancement.
- No = Not necessary, ever.

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
1.	Build vs. Buy	Overall Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the needed flexibility, a desire to reduce cost, and the reduction in functionality from that defined in the pilot project, the sub-group participants recommend that a build approach be taken with MARSS. This does not preclude the purchase of some solution components. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial cost lower with a build approach.

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
2.	Security controls over non-public data and public data not ready for display	<p>No, redacted vs. non-redacted not in system (only redacted submitted)</p> <p>Must have, flag for public data that is not yet ready for public display (but data request could access) (e.g. agency notice plan in draft stage)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially, the security component need only control for agency edit rights for respective rule data (i.e. agency x cannot view agency y's data that is not publicly displayable), but otherwise all uploaded data/documents are to be considered publicly viewable. An indicator to flag items as not yet ready for public display should remain, with a default of ready for public display, but any entered/uploaded data/documents should be considered to be public and accessible upon request. While supplemental items might be uploaded, they are to be considered as public. They can be flagged as not ready for public display however. Initially, the ability to upload data/documents flagged and secured as non-public for internal agency purposes during rule development is not supported. A decision might be made in the future to exclude non-public data entirely from the system or it may be included, which would necessitate proper access controls. Any needed redaction will be done prior to uploads. Redaction technology is not needed. Clarification is needed as to the non-redacted content being a part of the official rulemaking record. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the need to properly control access to redacted data removes a fair bit of complexity and some cost. Security flag (not ready for public viewing) is not a significant cost.
3.	Version control	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies will have the discretion as to which versions to upload and which to keep. The system will track that an item is a replacement for another item through date relationships and classifications. A history of versions remaining in the system will be traceable through dates and displayable as a history of versions, as currently done with the Statute and Rules Publication. Older versions should be classified as supplemental. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None/minimal
4.	Classifications	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various classifications should be maintained, such as rule proceeding type, document type, etc. Agencies must be able to change the proceeding type. Changes to dependent data must be supported by the system through alerts/business rules regarding changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
5.	Contact Info & Notifications – Legislative Committees	<p>Must have – contacts tracked & committee as search criterion</p> <p>Notifications of official notices - nice to have)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MARSS system will make available the list of legislative committees as well as contact information that the legislature currently provides to the Revisor’s Office. • Rulemaking requires committee chair information and ranking minority member information as well as LCC contact information. • The agencies will be responsible for selecting the appropriate persons from the list in the system to assign to their rulemakings. • The system will provide some sort of notification or alert to the agency if the committee information changes for a particular rulemaking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If simple notifications are desired for committees, none. Not a full-blown subscription service.
6.	Mobile Access	<p>Must have – public views</p> <p>Nice to have – editing rights</p> <p>Public comments – future</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System must be mobile-friendly in its public displays (mobile phone/tablet optimized). • The ability to modify the content of the system (agency functions) on a mobile device is not a must have, but might be useful (e.g. via use of tablet). • Future public comment entry via a mobile device should be considered with public comment discussion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considerable for public views. • Security features may be needed for editing and comment submissions.

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
7.	Searching	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A robust set of searching mechanisms are required to support public ease of access, including legislative staff. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Search parameters (e.g. between these dates) & filters (to various types/classifications, e.g. adopted) ○ Topic/keyword ○ Revisor ID ○ More than one parameter can be used in one search ○ Faceted (a search within a search) searches are possible ○ Intact phrases can be used ○ By agency, all agencies, selected agencies, with automatically associated agencies brought along (e.g. DOLI would be accompanied by agencies such as the Plumbing Board and the Board of Electricity where appropriate) ○ Search alternative names with a new name automatically ○ Step through highlighted search criteria ○ Sort by and group by ○ By legislative committee ○ By Statutory Authority and Session Law ○ Have simple and advanced search options ○ Ability to add additional search capabilities, based on the data in the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
8.	Canned reports	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need capability from day one, e.g. The Docket. • More reports over time. • Downloadable in various formats (Excel, PDF, Word, and CSV). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
9.	Saved queries	<p>Must have – agencies</p> <p>Future - Legislative aides /public</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For agency users, must have. • Future: Legislative aides/public, having accounts to save queries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consideration: turnover of LAs, changing users. ○ Consideration: volume of users, license based. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Time • Future Cost Implication: User Licenses/Self-Provisioning Component

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
10.	Views	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is desired for the MARSS system to be linked to from the official Minnesota Rules publication hosted on the Revisor website (e.g. the history section of a published Minnesota Rule could link directly to the State Register publication found in the MARSS system or further link to the rule proceeding pages with full details on a rulemaking). • As noted for related items in this list, the public will only see data flagged as ready for public viewing, although it might technically be public and releasable per a data request. • History and detail is viewable with a rulemaking proceeding, given that it is flagged for public viewing (the default). • All rulemaking proceeding data is controlled by the agency owner(s) up until adoption. • The public will be able to see where a rule proceeding is in the process via a simple timeline of events and rulemaking record items, dependent on agency uploads/entry. • Future: Should non-public data be added, which is still being determined, it will not be viewable by the public or by agencies other than the agency(ies) owning a rulemaking proceeding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
11.	Dashboard	<p>Must have – agencies</p> <p>Future – workflow</p> <p>Future – public self-provisioning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A simple version of a dashboard is desirable, i.e. a list of saved queries and canned reports, my rules, some alerts, etc. – must have for agency users. • No assignment/workflow “to-dos” – reconsider with workflow. • Reconsider if self-provisioning of accounts and listserv sign-ups added – does a public “dashboard” or account view come with this? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
12.	Required Data and Optional Supplemental Data	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rulemaking record items are defined in Statute. Some Statutory “catchall” language needs consensus if any are official rulemaking record items (e.g. 14.365(8)). If supplemental in nature, these items can be uploaded optionally at the discretion of each agency. In other words, agencies should not be expected to be consistent regarding supplementation item determinations. • Agencies are expected to come to agreement regarding required data in the system. Data will either be required in a certain context or it will be optional. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. Statutory Authority (if entered, we can report back to the agencies if a Bill is introduced to amend the Statutory Authority.) • Agencies will maintain flexibility and decision-making regarding what and when to upload where flexibility is needed. • Some data will be required beyond the rulemaking record items if the data is needed for system logic (alerts, prompts, workflow, notifications, controls) as requested by the agencies. In fulfilling requests of the agencies for system functionality that require new system logic, the Revisor’s Office will make agencies aware of the data that will become required in order for the system logic to work. • Decisions/governance over required data/docs are expected to occur through an ongoing agency working group in collaboration with the Revisor’s Office and the IRC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Before Implementation: Discussion is needed around this item. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
13.	Data change History	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system will track creation dates, update dates, deletion dates, and dates of record expungement as they relate to retention schedules as needed. • The system will maintain the data required by Law for record destruction as it relates to data contained in MARSS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
14.	Records Retention Policy Handling	Must have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agencies will be responsible for monitoring their own records retention schedules and deleting data and documents in the system accordingly. • Official rulemaking record items are permanent, and therefore no records retention policies apply. • If an item is deleted from the system, the delete will be physical, not logical. In other words, the deletion will be full and final without the ability to reverse the deletion. This will ensure that discoverable data is not retained behind the scenes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
15.	Notifications During Rule Proceeding	Future, largely Some notifications initially, nice to have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially, notifications which agencies are required to fulfill based on a rulemaking events or timings will be handled outside the system per agency effort, except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some minimal notifications, such as when a Statute changes or with bill introductions, are desirable with the first implementation. • An advanced business rule engine for process-based notifications associated with workflow would be considered with workflow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as workflow
16.	Workflow assignments	Future, maybe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A workflow component is not needed initially. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initially, agencies would be required to manage workflow assignments outside of the system. ○ Initially, uploads and data entry are to be done based on the agency's discretion without process support by the system. In other words, agencies will be responsible for uploading rulemaking record items when required without the benefit of prompts and reminders. • It is worth the time/effort to plan for potential workflow capabilities (some workflow/notifications), i.e. "rough in the plumbing" for the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workflow engine not needed initially • Workflow engine probably purchased if workflow is desired in the future • There is some relatively low cost in exploring and roughing in initially
17.	Notifications via Public Listservs	Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially, notifications about rulemakings will remain unchanged. Users will use the same means they use today to register to follow a rulemaking. The system, where possible, will allow the agency to provide instructions to users as to how to sign up for their particular agency's rulemaking notices. • In the future, providing listserv sign ups per rule or per agency or across agencies (topic-based) would be desirable. • Self-provisioning of accounts for joining lists and saving queries by the public would be a future component. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A component like GovDelivery may be needed at the time this is added to the system, but adding the "pipes" to build this in the future will be minimal in relation to cost.

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
18.	Reviews by Non-Agency Users	Future, maybe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Related to workflow, reviews by entities other than agencies are not necessary, initially. In other words, initially, support for the direct submission of documentation by a range of stakeholders is not supported by the system and must be handled separately. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agencies will obtain the necessary approvals and signatures outside the system and will then control uploads. ○ Because of this, users, roles, and permissions will be simplified initially. ○ Initially, electronic signatures are not needed. • It is worth the time/effort to plan for potential non-agency reviews which might include electronic signatures, i.e. “rough in the plumbing,” for the future. • The system will support reviews with one, two or three of these categories of data (related to next item): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Publicly viewable public data (display) ○ Not ready for public viewing, but public and accessible via a data request (flagged as such to exclude from displays) ○ Non-public and protected as such. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-public data might be included at some point in association with workflow and approvals (requiring proper security). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relatively low cost in exploring and roughing in initially • Cost of adding non-agency reviewers? • Public/Not Public • Public display {Y/N} • Business rule: If non-public, public display = N
19.	Interested and Affected Persons and Entities Lists	Future – consider with listservs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially, support for Interested and Affected Persons and Entities Lists is not needed in the system. • Agencies will manage their Interested and Affected Persons and Entities Lists outside the system as well as manage notifications to these groups. • We will reconsider with future public listserv capability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as listservs

#	Functionality	Decision (see above)	Impact on Solution Components, System Requirements & Business Capabilities	Impact on Costs
20.	Public Comments	Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially, agencies will upload public comment-related items at their discretion, no special support for the public submission of comments is needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ OAH system will continue to support public comment process. • This topic needs further discussion before a decision to implement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss the different public comment time periods. ○ Consider that direct access to one place for public comments is valuable. ○ Consider that a one stop shop for rule info and public comments is valuable. ○ Comments should be able to be flagged for whether they are ready for public display, as other data will be “flaggable.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considerable relates to providing a “rough in” for a future enhancement. A future component will need to be purchased/developed in order to add this support.
21.	Agency Managed Topics	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topics should be controlled (which are associated with rules, along with keywords which are not controlled). However, an agency managed Admin UI is not needed, as Revisor Office management of topics is desired. • Agencies should be able to suggest additions to topics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
22.	Document Templates	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The management of common document templates will be handled outside the system. • An agency admin UI for template management is not needed. • The ability to have a repository of the most recent templates for download and subsequent upload will not be available in the system. • The ability to pre-populate templates with known data is not supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less development time for the 2nd phase of the project.