S.F. No. 316 and H.F. No. 132, which had been referred to the Chief Clerk for comparison, were examined and found to be not identical.

The following document shows the differences between S.F. No. 316, the second engrossment, and H.F. No. 132, the first engrossment.

Patrick D. Murphy
May 6, 2019   Chief Clerk, House of Representatives

Explanation of Comparison Reports

When a Senate File is received from the Senate, it is given its first reading and must be referred to the appropriate standing committee or division under Rule 1.11. But if the House File companion of that Senate File has already been reported out of Committee and given its second reading and is on the General Register, the Senate File must be referred to the Chief Clerk for comparison pursuant to Rule 1.15. The Chief Clerk reports whether the bills were found to be identical or not identical. Once the bills have been compared and the differences have been reported, the Senate File is given its second reading and is substituted for the House File. The House File is then considered withdrawn. Pursuant to rule 3.33, if the bills are not identical and the chief author of the bill wishes to use the House language, the chief author must give notice of their intent to substitute the House language when the bill is placed on the Calendar for the Day or the Fiscal Calendar. If the chief author of the bill wishes to keep the Senate language, no action is required.

<div style="display: flex">

Left column (H0132-1):

1.1   A bill for an act

1.2   relating to state government; requiring involvement in user acceptance testing of
1.3   new information technology business software; proposing coding for new law in
1.4   Minnesota Statutes, chapter 16E.

1.5   BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.6   Section 1. **[16E.031] USER ACCEPTANCE TESTING.**

1.7   Subdivision 1. **Applicability.** As used in this section:

1.8   (1) "primary user" means an employee or agent of a state agency or local unit of
1.9   government who uses an information technology business software application to perform
1.10 an official function; and

1.11   (2) "local unit of government" does not include a school district.

1.12   Subd. 2. **User acceptance testing.** (a) A state agency implementing a new information
1.13 technology business software application or new business software application functionality
1.14 that significantly impacts the operations of a primary user must provide opportunities for
1.15 user acceptance testing, unless the testing is deemed not feasible or necessary by the relevant
1.16 agency commissioner, in consultation with the chief information officer and representatives
1.17 of the primary user.

1.18   (b) The requirements in paragraph (a) do not apply to routine software upgrades or
1.19 application changes that are primarily intended to comply with federal law, rules, or
1.20 regulations.

Right column (S0316-2):

1.1   A bill for an act

1.2   relating to state government; requiring involvement in user acceptance testing
1.3   from local units of governments impacted by new information technology business
1.4   software; amending Minnesota Statutes 2018, sections 168.33, by adding a
1.5   subdivision; 171.061, by adding a subdivision; proposing coding for new law in
1.6   Minnesota Statutes, chapter 15.

1.7   BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.8   Section 1. **[15.996] LOCAL GOVERNMENT USER ACCEPTANCE TESTING.**

1.9   Subdivision 1. **Applicability.** "Agency" as used in this section means any state officer,
1.10 employee, board, commission, authority, department, entity, or organization of the executive
1.11 branch of state government, including the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

1.12   Subd. 2. **User acceptance testing.** (a) An agency implementing a new information
1.13 technology business software application or new business software application functionality
1.14 that significantly impacts the operations of local units of government or agents of, or
1.15 contractors working on behalf of, local units of government must provide opportunities for
1.16 local government representative involvement in user acceptance testing, unless the testing
1.17 is deemed not feasible or necessary by the relevant agency commissioner, in consultation
1.18 with representatives of local units of government and the chief information officer.

1.19   (b) The requirements in paragraph (a) only apply to new software applications and new
1.20 software application functionality where local units of government or agents of, or contractors

</div>

1.21   working on behalf of, local units of government will be primary users, as determined by
1.22   the relevant agency head in consultation with representatives of local units of government
1.23   and the chief information officer. The requirements in paragraph (a) do not apply to routine
2.1   software upgrades or application changes that are primarily intended to comply with federal
2.2   law, rules, or regulations.

2.3   Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 2018, section 168.33, is amended by adding a subdivision to
2.4   read:

2.5   Subd. 7a. **User acceptance testing.** (a) An agency implementing a new information
2.6   technology business software application or new business software application functionality
2.7   that significantly impacts the operations of deputy registrars must provide opportunities for
2.8   deputy registrars to be involved in user acceptance testing, unless the testing is deemed not
2.9   feasible or necessary by the relevant agency commissioner, in consultation with
2.10   representatives of deputy registrars and the chief information officer.

2.11   (b) The requirements in paragraph (a) only apply to new software applications and new
2.12   software application functionality where deputy registrars will be primary users, as
2.13   determined by the relevant agency head in consultation with representatives of deputy
2.14   registrars and the chief information officer. The requirements in paragraph (a) do not apply
2.15   to routine software upgrades or application changes that are primarily intended to comply
2.16   with federal law, rules, or regulations.

2.17   (c) For purposes of this subdivision, "agency" means any state officer, employee, board,
2.18   commission, authority, department, entity, or organization of the executive branch of state
2.19   government, including the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

2.20   Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 2018, section 171.061, is amended by adding a subdivision to
2.21   read:

2.22   Subd. 7. **User acceptance testing.** (a) An agency implementing a new information
2.23   technology business software application or new business software application functionality
2.24   that significantly impacts the operations of driver's license agents must provide opportunities
2.25   for driver's license agents to be involved in user acceptance testing, unless the testing is
2.26   deemed not feasible or necessary by the relevant agency commissioner, in consultation with
2.27   representatives of driver's license agents and the chief information officer.

2.28   (b) The requirements in paragraph (a) only apply to new software applications and new
2.29   software application functionality where driver's license agents will be primary users, as
2.30   determined by the relevant agency head in consultation with representatives of driver's
2.31   license agents and the chief information officer. The requirements in paragraph (a) do not
2.32   apply to routine software upgrades or application changes that are primarily intended to
2.33   comply with federal law, rules, or regulations.

3.1   (c) For purposes of this subdivision, "agency" means any state officer, employee, board,
3.2   commission, authority, department, entity, or organization of the executive branch of state
3.3   government, including the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.