

Appendix A

MARSS Project

Scope of Requirements Refinement Effort

Of the MARSS Working Group

Draft updated December 5, 2017

Intentions

The intentions behind the MARSS Working Group's requirement refinement work are:

Contribution to End Results

We will know we are done with the requirements refinement work when:

- At the completion of the requirements refinement effort for the MARSS project, the following items will be produced to the satisfaction of the MARSS working group:
 - Validated and agreed upon **solution** requirements
 - The solution requirements will detail the **functional and non-functional** (system quality attributes) requirements which will establish the expectations for behaviors and characteristics of the solution.
 - The requirements will be parsed to phases of delivery if there are more than one phase.
 - The combination of diagrammatic and textual representations of the requirements will be refined according to the workgroup's decisions for use by technical staff/contractors/vendors who will deliver the system.

Expected End Results

The above work will ultimately contribute to the completion of these next steps:

- Finalize the solution components needed to support the requirements.
- Determine build or buy direction.
- Refine cost estimates.
- Have a full picture of the requirements, solution components, and associated costs for use in securing funding.

Values

We will stay true to these guiding principles or values as the work is completed:

- We must meet the requirements of 2017 First Special Session, Chapter 4, Article 2, Section 60.

- We must clearly identify the elements that will meet the basic requirements and those that are desirable additions.
- We must strike the appropriate balance between recommending a more robust and comprehensive informational system and cost containment. We want to evaluate the cost of an informational system, and maintain flexibility for future expansion to the extent possible for a reasonable price. We need to evaluate the on-going cost of using the system (efficiency).
- We value executive branch control over MARSS data without the concerns raised by permission-controlled, co-mingled legislative and executive branch data. In other words, the system must segregate MARSS data from legislative branch data.
- We value compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for website design, which is a requirement of executive branch websites.
- We want to proceed in the most efficient and time-saving manner possible without compromising the completion of the planned work. To this end, we support measures such as pre-work, off-line work, smaller groups for some topics, and the like.
- We seek efficiencies that will draw on resources and expertise already created within the Revisor's Office for planning, implementation, and maintenance.
- The system should have a consistent format for information presented to the public.

Focus

Aspects of the domain to focus on and not to focus on.

- **Breadth**
 - In scope:
 - The scope of an informational system is described in 2017 First Special Session, Chapter 4, Article 2, Section 60. Additional functionality may be provided over time in phases and, therefore, long-range requirements are also included (see pilot project deliverables that relay both initial and possible future requirements). All pilot requirements require validation, with possible removals, additions or changes.
 - From the pilot, a list of refinement areas was identified. These refinement areas will be considered and will be resolved if resolution is needed to meet the functional requirements determined by the working group.
 - System components. This list will be refined based on the refinement of requirements.
 - Centralized Public Access
 - Authentication of Records
 - Centralized Preservation
 - Comprehensive Security Features
 - Search Capabilities
 - Other components may be added depending on projected cost.
 - Out of scope:
 - Support for the drafting of rules and other rulemaking documents is out of scope.

- **Depth**
 - Sufficient detail is needed to identify the components needed for the MARSS system. It is expected that further elaboration and detailing will be needed during development and/or configuration.
 - If the direction is a build, some requirement detail can be deferred for refinement during the build.
 - If the direction is to buy, more detail is needed to test products for fit and to ensure future capabilities, if more than one phase is planned, will be supported.
- **Emphasized Perspectives**
 - Input from Working Group subject matter experts is likely to represent the range of needs. Input from all state agencies affected is not critical as those selected for participation are representative of the agencies.
- **Universality**
 - This body of requirements is intended to apply to all Minnesota state agencies granted rule-making authority.
 - Scalability is important to keep in mind and care should be taken to define requirements with this aim (e.g. identifying repeatable patterns).
 - The ultimate MARSS system is intended to be maintained for a significant length of time – 10 or more years.
- **Scope of Integration**
 - MARSS will replace the Revisor BETA system.
 - Note: Not all agencies are using our BETA system.
 - https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/rule_search.php
 - BETA data will be migrated.
 - Agencies should be provided with interfaces (web services ...) as needed.

Context

Understandings, facts, constraints and risks to be mindful of as analysis work is conducted.

- **Understandings:**
 - The system might impact the overall process and Statutes.
 - It is the agency's responsibility to maintain the rule making record, per uploads of items in the form required by the Revisor.
 - The system may ultimately be built in-house, may be a COTS product, or may be a combination of these.
 - We have already developed some understandings about the components of the system and the logical allocations to phases. Business decisions and technical knowledge can leverage and refine these understandings as we proceed.
- **Constraints:**
 - The requirements must align and be in compliance with statutes, rules and law that govern the rule-making process, with the caveat that discoveries may point to reasons to change the law.
 - Data must be retained forever.

- **Facts:**
 - Currently, agencies do things differently and have different forms (although MDH does have suggested templates).
 - OAH has forms that are largely used.
 - Electronic docs can be accepted by the Revisor and OAH if in a format approved by the Revisor/OAH (in law).
 - The DNR has exempt emergency rulemaking (84.027, subd. 13 and 13a) that no one else has, which need special consideration, with AG involvement (include in first iteration, big gain for public access).
 - Format requirements will be varied:
 - Formats of public comment and exhibits (e.g. photos)
 - A video might be part of rule-making record.
- **Deadline**
 - A final report is due by February 1, 2018. Sufficient time to address funding decisions must be saved for the November/December timeframe. Therefore, requirements refinement should be finalized by the end of October.