

MARSS Requirements Refinement for Working Group

Below is a listing of areas in the MARSS requirements that will need the most input and/or clarification from the working group. Along with these areas, the working group should review and evaluate the entire list of requirements defined in the Pilot Project and other documentation completed during the pilot.

Requirements Area	Description
General	Prioritize list of requirements into must haves, nice to haves, future considerations, and unnecessary.
Required Data	Define and agree upon the required data of a rulemaking record. Assess if agencies can opt out of supplying required data – pilot requirements indicated they can – and when/if in the process all required data must be supplied. Opt outs will impact and limit the alerts, controls and workflow capabilities of the system.
Mobile Device Support	This was identified as a “bells and whistles” requirement and not heavily defined. However, requests for mobile friendly websites are consistently increasing.
“The Docket”	There was a lot of conversation about this during the pilot project. Clarification as to whether or not the docket must be supported is needed.
House and Senate Committees	Linking a rulemaking proceeding to a committee is a requirement of the system. However, it was never fleshed out how the committee information would be populated in the MARSS system. Will MARSS need to support users in maintaining the committee information in the system via maintenance screens? Will MARSS read the information from Revisor data? House and Senate data? IRC data? Other system integration?
Configurable Aspects	Further clarification and examples of configuration is needed in relation to the requirements surrounding the capabilities for managing dates, rulemaking timelines, deadlines, alerts, review processes and other workflows.
Electronic Signatures	Is there a place for this technology in MARSS? Are there legal requirements for electronic signatures that we need to accommodate with MARSS? Can OAH integrate with electronic signatures?
File Types	Formats the system must support needs to be agreed to. Audio and video needs – requirements currently do not specify support of video.
ADA Compliance	Current requirements assume that agencies will be required to submit rulemaking items in formats that satisfy the accessibility requirements of the executive branch. As it is currently understood, the executive branch and legislative branch fall under slightly different accessibility requirements. With this system being designed to be implemented by the legislative branch to store official records for the executive branch, what requirements will the searching and reporting screens that are tools for accessing the permanent rulemaking records need to adhere to?
Supplemental Files	Agencies often have supplemental information that they provide to the public in relation to a rulemaking that is not an official record item. From

	<p>the public's perspective it would be nice for all documentation – including supplemental materials – on a rulemaking to be available in a single repository. Requirements of the system in relation to supplemental files needs clarification. We understand that some agencies maintain rulemaking content on their respective websites as well, which is a consideration.</p>
Data Practice/Records Retention	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensitive data (e.g. addresses under safe @ home) – will the system store the non-redacted versions of the rulemaking files that contain sensitive data? If so, do specific requirements exist for how such data needs to be stored or the security surrounding how the non-redacted content can be accessed? Requirements already assume that if non-redacted content is stored in the system, it shall not be publicly accessible. 2. Retention schedules – adopted rulemakings are permanent in nature. Abandoned or withdrawn rules are not required to be kept by the agencies. During the pilot discussions with agency personnel about retention schedules, it was determined that each agency will define their own retention for these abandoned records. Some retention schedules can define that the data has to be deleted after a certain amount of time. More clarification is needed to determine if a) the MARSS system will have to adhere to each individual agency's retention schedules and b) if the deletion dates in a retention schedule have legal significance to when the data needs to be deleted. The system could simply allow deletion of rulemaking records that have not been adopted and the agencies can be left to make sure the data is deleted in accordance to the retention schedule. However, Revisor systems typically perform a logical delete and still retain a copy of the data, but it is no longer accessible to users or the public. Some retention schedules may mandate the permanent deletion of the data, which would be something the system would need to accommodate. 3. Change history – requirements for tracking change history such as creation dates, update dates, deletion dates, and dates of record expungement as they relate to retention schedules is needed. 4. Any other requirements/considerations to adhere to the executive branch data practices/retention schedules that are currently unknown (agency or MN.IT requirements).
Pre-defined Searches/Reports	<p>Requirements list that the system must be capable of supporting this concept. While there is a working group formed, it might be nice to get further definition on what will be needed in these reports as some could impact technology decisions and the data collection or generation necessary to provide the report's data.</p>
Additional Requirements	<p>Identify and define any missing requirements or areas of the system.</p>