

**Regulations Modernization Taskforce
Special Meeting
Friday, December 14, 2012
Room 410, Capitol Building**

Members Present: Chris Drake, Rich Hanratty, Dick Hemenway, Angela Taetz, Kendall Wiggin, Brenda Parrella, Denise Merrill, John Vittner

Members Absent: Bob Frankel

1. Call to order at 10:05am
2. Discussion and approval of scope document
 - a. Be more clear about where the process starts.
 - b. General discussion about project manager and who owns the application.
 - c. Hold approval until next meeting.
3. Discussion of Business Requirements (1st draft) – Changes to document were captured electronically by Krithika Deepa. – SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
4. Adjourn at 11:43am. Moved by Kendall Wiggin, Seconded by John Vittner. Approved unanimously.

12/14/13
MTG

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

Req Id	Requirement Description	Requirement Type	Capability	Sub Capability
<u>Work In Progress. The Following Requirements are for discussion purposes only. They are yet to be validated.</u>				
<i>The following represent the high level requirements for the modernization effort into the regulations for Connecticut. The requirements may change based on the approach taken to develop the solution and based on information gathered during the design phase.</i>				
1.0.0.0	System Administration			
1.0.0.1	The system shall support all aspects of storing and maintaining a regulation starting from its proposed stage to its final approval	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.2	The system shall perform pre-defined case management functions with respect to managing current and future amendments to the regulations	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.3	Prior versions of the regulations that are no longer current law shall be included in the system <i>(future?)</i>	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.4	The system shall be designed to assume that users have basic technical experience such as accessing websites and using search engines like Google and therefore the system should be as user friendly and easy to use as possible.	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5	The system shall be designed with a System Administration component that supports the maintenance of regulations	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5.1	The System Administration component of the system shall comprise the following aspects: - Persona / Profile Management - System Maintenance - System Security	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5.2	The Profile Management component shall support the configuration and maintenance of information about the actors of the system	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5.3	Actors of the system shall either be individual users of the system or an Agency or an Organization	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5.4	The System Maintenance component shall support the configuration and maintenance of business rules that are common to all system users	Functional	System Administration	General
1.0.0.5.5	The System Security component shall support role based access to system functionalities to maintain the integrity of business and system processes	Functional	System Administration	General

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

1.0.0.5.6	<p>Authorized are system administrators and must be affiliated with the single agency responsible for maintaining the data base. They shall have access to the System Administration Component via user interface(s) to facilitate all business aspects of system maintenance (e.g. update agency name, updates to business rules, system settings, etc.) with little to no IT development work effort</p>	Functional	System Administration	General
1.1.0.0	Persona / Profile Management			
1.1.0.1	<p>There shall be no restriction on the number of agencies and users that can be added to the system at a given point of time</p> <p>The system shall maintain the following profile groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency Profile (Should be defined. Is this one profile per Agency or should large agencies have multiple profiles for departments) - User Profile (Should be defined. Are users profiles for each individual in an agency who is authorized to access the data?) - Public Profile 	Functional	System Administration	Persona
1.1.0.2	<p>The Agency Profile shall consist of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agency Name - Agency Address (Street, City, State, Zip) <p>The Administrator Profile shall consist of the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Name - Last Name - Name Of Agency - Address (Street, City, State Zip) - Contact Phone - Contact Email 	Functional	System Administration	Persona
1.1.0.2.1	<p>Peter: What is the purpose of the Agency profile as opposed to the User profile that includes Agency information? Will one person at each agency be responsible for the Agency profile as well as a User profile? Will the AG's office/Gov's office/LCO be considered agencies?</p>			Persona
1.1.0.2.2		Functional	System Administration	Persona

⊗ Define Roles
 - System Administrator
 - Content Administrator
 - Agency Regs Coordinator

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

<p>1.1.0.2.3</p> <p>The Public Profile shall consist of the following attributes: (if this applies to the general public, you must get a ruling form FOI on this. An agency may not require an individual seeking information to supply any identification! If this does not apply to the general public, then it should be renamed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Name - Last Name - Address (Street, City, State Zip) - Contact Phone - Contact Email 	<p style="text-align: center;">⊗ later phase</p>	<p>Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>Persona</p>
<p>1.1.0.2.4</p> <p>The system shall not be required to perform validation of addresses put into the system</p>		<p>Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>Persona</p>
<p>1.2.0.0</p> <p>System Maintenance</p>		
<p>1.2.0.1</p> <p>The "Regulations Coordinator" shall be defined by the system as the Business administrator</p>		<p>Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>System Maintenance</p>
<p>1.2.0.2</p> <p>The following elements shall be configurable in system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authorized Entities Defined for a regulation making process - Regulation Making Work flow - Time Frames 		<p>Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>System Maintenance</p>
<p>1.2.0.3</p> <p>The following time frames shall be configurable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30 Day Comment Period - 30 Day Approval Period By AG - 180 Day timeframe for Mandatory Regs - 20 day period after OTG approval that 17b-10 become effective - 120 Day effective period after OTG for emergency regs - 60 Day period of 1st extension of emergency reg - 60 day period of 2nd extension of emergency reg for DEEP 	<p><i>Expedited Implementation</i></p> <p><i>#3 are defaults</i></p>	<p>Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>System Maintenance</p>
<p>1.3.0.0</p> <p>System Security</p>		
<p>1.3.1.0</p> <p>General</p>		
<p>1.3.1.1</p> <p>The public shall have read only access to the system</p>	<p><i>regulations + regulations system</i></p>	<p>Non Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>System Security</p>
<p>1.3.1.2</p> <p>The system shall provide agencies and other authorized users access to the system through a secured login id and password (Shouldn't each authorized individual within an agency have a login id for tracking purposes?)</p>		<p>Non Functional</p> <p>System Administration</p> <p>System Security</p>

⊗ online notification system

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

1.3.1.3	The system shall not take any security measures to scan and verify the validity of documents being uploaded to the system. All such precautionary measure shall be taken by the agencies before uploading the documents into the system. i.e. The agencies shall be responsible to ensure that documents uploaded to the system do not contain virus or other inappropriate content	Non Functional	System Administration	System Security
1.3.1.4	More requirements for security shall be detailed after JAD sessions with the security administrators	Non Functional	System Administration	System Security
1.3.2.0	Audit Trail			
1.3.2.1	The system shall capture audit information for each regulation and its associated documents involved in the regulation making workflow	Non Functional	Security	Audit Trail
1.3.2.2	The audit information shall consist of the following attributes: - Last Modified By - Last Modified Date (MM/DD/YYYY) - Identification of the document being modified	Non Functional	Security	Audit Trail
1.3.2.3	The last modified by data element shall consist of the user id of the person who processed the latest change to a regulation	Peter: Will this be a public component? Is it necessary to determine that now?	Security	Audit Trail
1.3.2.4	The system shall not allow any user irrespective of their role to modify information captured for the audit	Non Functional	Security	Audit Trail
2.0.0.0	Regulations			
2.1.0.0	General			
2.1.0.1	The system shall define a regulation as the outcome of an agency's compliance with a legal statutory authority (for the layman, this should some how communicate that a regulation is a form of law as opposed to an internal guideline or rule) <i>what is a regulation?</i>	Functional	Regulations	General
2.1.0.2	Regulations proposed in the system shall have the following attribute groups: - Structure Of Regulation (Mandatory) - Type of Regulation (Mandatory) - Sub-type Of Regulation (Mandatory) - Other (17b-10 Indicator & Notes (SOP)) -Optional	Functional	Regulations	General
2.1.0.3	The structure of a regulations shall consist of the following attributes: - Title Number with Title Heading - Chapter Number - Section Number with Section Heading <i>certification issues</i>	Peter: Do we want to talk here or elsewhere about how section number will be further subdivided? (Subsection, subdivision, subparagraph, etc.) Ideally the format below the section level will also be consistent going forward (something the Regs Coordinator could be responsible for). Peter: Do we need to say that regulations may be added to an existing structure?	Regulations	General

Also I think it would be very desirable to have a template document be able to be a part of this --

select

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

	Functional	Regulations	General
2.1.0.4	While proposing a regulation in the system, agencies shall be required to choose the structure for the regulation		
2.1.0.5	A regulation at a given point of time shall only be related to a single title		
2.1.0.6	The title number and title heading shall correspond to the title number and title heading contained in the Connecticut General Statutes		
2.1.0.7	Refer to "Regulations Structure" tab for more details on the structure of a regulation		
2.1.0.8	<p>In the event an agency uploads a regulation and accompanying documents for proposal, the initiating agency shall be required to choose the type of regulation as either:</p> <p><i>Mandatory</i> → <i>Mandated by state law</i></p> <p>Or</p> <p>Permissive</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Emergency</p>		
2.1.0.9	<p>Only with respect to the Department of Social Services, for mandatory and permissive regulations, the system shall provide the agency with the option to choose the "17b-10" indicator, if needed</p> <p><i>expedited implementation</i></p>		
2.1.0.10	<p>Based on the type and sub type of regulation chosen, the rules for the regulation making process for that regulations varies. Refer to the "Regulations Making Process" section for more details</p> <p><i>expedited implementation</i></p>		
2.1.0.11	The system shall provide agencies with an extension date element for emergency regulations that have been approved by LRRC		
2.1.0.12	<p>Each regulation section shall contain the following attributes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulation section text - Amendment history 		
2.1.0.13	<p>In the event an agency uploads a regulation and accompanying documents for proposal, and if the system finds the section(s) to be existing in the system as an effective regulation(s) then the system shall record that the regulations being proposed are amendments to regulations in effect</p>		
2.1.0.14	The amendment history shall be displayed underneath the regulation section text		
2.1.0.15	The amendment history shall be displayed in different font and color from the regulation text		

Peter: Do we need to say that regulations may be added to an existing structure:

Also, I think it would be very desirable to have a template document be able to be a part of this -- a standardized document that pre-builds the structure. LCO has several templates for statute drafting that help ensure uniformity. This could be something that the Regulations Coordinator is responsible for developing and maintaining.

Peter: Much later on in this document, the categorization of "mandatory" triggers a 180 day limit on how long the agency has to send a proposed reg to the LRRC. The 180 day limit only applies to mandatory adoption under **state** public acts. This should be made clearer because sometimes agencies are acting under mandatory **federal** acts, but those shouldn't trigger 180 days letters if they are late.

Peter: DSS can also implement policies while in the process of adopting a regulation pursuant to 17b-105c and other sections. So 17b-10 doesn't really capture all the possibilities, though I think it would all be the same process. Not sure if other agencies also have this authority?

other way to separate

the system shall

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

	Functional	Regulations	General
2.1.0.16			General
2.1.0.17	Functional	Regulations	General
2.1.0.18			General
2.2.0.0	<p>Browse Regulations</p> <p>For purposes of clarity, the system shall categorize the regulations under the following sub-groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Effect Regulations (i.e., "Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies") - Proposed Regulations - Emergency Regulations 		
2.2.0.1	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.2	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.3	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.4	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.5	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.6	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.7	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations

Peter:
Will there be a link from the amendment history to the entire record of a particular amendment (including draft versions), or will it just be the regulation text as it was before the subsequent amendment?

Peter:
What happens with regulations that are not in the RCSA format (like DSS's UPM)? Is this all contingent on those regulations being converted into RCSA format? Are chapter headings going to be required, or just Title-->Section?

Peter:
How will we account for 17b-10 type regulations that have effect while in progress? May need another "status" category.

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

		Peter: How will we account for 17b-10 type regulations that have effect while in progress? May need another "status" category.		
2.2.0.8	The proposed regulations sub-type shall contain regulations that have the following statuses: - In Progress (In the regulations making process) - Denied - Withdrawn	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.9	Regulations that are in the regulations making process shall display a status of "In Progress"	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.10	Regulations that were in the regulations making process and are denied shall display a status of "Denied , " <Name of authorizing entity that denied the regulation> "on" <date the regulation was denied (mm/dd/yyyy) format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.11	Regulations that were in the regulations making process and are withdrawn by the agency shall display a status of "Withdrawn By " <Name of the initiating agency> "on" <date the regulation was withdrawn (mm/dd/yyyy) format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.12	In the event a regulation is approved, the system shall remove the display of the regulation from the "Proposed Regulations" sub-group	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.13	Regulations in progress that are approved, shall be displayed under the RCSA sub-type under the corresponding title	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14	Emergency regulations shall be defined by the system as regulations that an expedited regulations making process	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.1	The "Emergency Regulations" sub-type shall have the following attributes: - Title Number - Title Heading - Section(s) - Status - File Date	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.2	The emergency regulations sub-type shall contain only one row for each regulation that is in the regulation making process and after: i.e. The system shall write only one row for each tracking number. The system shall replace the status of the corresponding regulation as and when it goes through the authorized entities that are a part of the regulation making process	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.3	An Emergency regulation that is in the regulations making process shall reflect a status of "In Progress" until it is approved or denied by the OTG	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.2.0.14.4	An emergency regulation that is approved by the OTG shall display a status of "Effective Until" <120 days + date approved by OTG in mm/dd/yyyy format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.5	An emergency regulation that is denied by the OTG shall display a status of "Denied By OTG On" <date denied by OTG in mm/dd/yyyy format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.6	An emergency regulation that has been extended for the first time shall depict a status of "Extended Until" <extended date in mm/dd/yyyy format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.14.7	An emergency regulation that has been extended for the second time shall depict a status of "Extended Until" <extended date in mm/dd/yyyy format>	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.22	For each sub-type of the regulations, in the event a title has no regulation associated to it, the corresponding title shall not display in the list	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.23	The default sort for the list of regulations under each sub group shall be in ascending order on the title number	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.24	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall not have the ability to change the sort order on the Title Number	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.25	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall not have the ability to change the sort order on the Title Heading	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.26	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall have the ability to change the sort order on the file date	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.27	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall have the ability to change the sort order on the status of the regulations	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.28	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall have the ability to select any title number / title heading to be brought to a list of all chapters within that title	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.2.0.29	For each sub-type of the regulations, users shall have the ability to select any chapter to be brought to a list of all sections within that chapter	Functional	Regulations	Browse Regulations
2.3.0.0	Regulation Making Process			
2.3.1.0	General			
2.3.1.1	The "Regulation-Making Process" shall be defined by the system to include all of the mandatory rules that an agency must follow to adopt a regulation as specified in Chapter 54, Sections 4-166 through 4-174 inclusive of the General Statutes	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.2	Time-limitations to various stages in the regulation-making process shall not be imposed unless stated otherwise	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.3	Please refer to the "Proposed RegulationsMakingProcess" tab for the work flow	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.3.1.4	The system shall assign a unique tracking number to each regulation making process upon uploading the initiating documents into the system for the work flow	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.4.1	The tracking number shall be in the format <Current Year-next number in whole number series>. For e.g. 2013-1, 2013-2, 2013-3...etc.	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.4.2	The unique digit(s) in the tracking number shall be reset for every calendar year starting from 1	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.4.3	The system shall assign the tracking number based on first come first serve basis	Functional	Regulation Making Process	General
2.3.1.8	The documents produced during the regulation-making process and identified in section 4-168b of the General Statutes, as amended, shall be referred to as the "Regulation Making Record"	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.9	The system shall display the entire regulation-making record with respect to each regulation submitted through the regulation-making process under the heading "Regulation-Making Record"	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.10	The regulation making record shall be displayed using the following attributes: Regulation Tracking Number Title Number Chapter & Section(s) - Serial Id - Date Submitted - Submitted By (Name Of The Authorizing Entity) - Action Taken (By Authorizing Entity) - Notes (optional) (e.g., Revised Regulation Text following public comment) - Some method to view - The list of documents routed for the corresponding stage - The version of the documents - Links to the actual documents	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.11	To support the creation of the regulation making record, the system shall provide agencies with the ability to upload documents into the system. (This requirement may change based on the solution opted for the project)	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.12	Documents related to the regulation making-process shall consist of text and/or Illustrations and/or Forms	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.3.1.13	All authorized users shall have the ability to view the documents that comprise the regulation-making record as it is developed through the regulation-making process	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.14	The general public shall have the ability to only view documents that are public from the regulation-making record as it is developed through the regulation-making process	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.15	The regulation making record shall be sorted in descending order on the date submitted	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.16	The system shall allow the users to change the sort order on the regulation making record by clicking on any of the attributes	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.17	To sort the docket in ascending order on a selected regulation making record data element, the users shall use a single click	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.18	To sort the docket in descending order on a selected regulation making record data element, the users shall use the double click option	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulation Making Record
2.3.1.19	<p>The following entities ("authorized entities") shall be a part of the regulation-making process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agencies - OPM - Governor's Office - Attorney General - Legislative Regulations Review Committee - Legislative Commissioner's Office - Office of Fiscal Analysis - Office of the Regulations Coordinator 	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Authorized Entities
2.3.1.20	<p>Authorized entities shall have the ability to take one of the following actions to the information routed in the regulation making process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approve - Deny - Request Change 	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Process Actions
2.3.1.21	Authorized entities shall have the ability also do nothing or take no action to the information routed in the regulation making process	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Process Actions

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

<p>2.3.1.22</p> <p>In the event, an authorized entity approves the information routed to it during the regulation making process, the entity shall choose one of the following as the reason for the approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approved with technical changes - Approved with no changes - Approved - Other (Provision to enter some comments) 	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Process Actions</p>
<p>2.3.1.23</p> <p>In the event, an authorized entity denies the information routed to it during the regulation making process, the entity shall choose one of the following as the reason for the denial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denied - Denied without prejudice to refiling 	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Process Actions</p>
<p>2.3.1.24</p> <p>The "initiating agency" shall be defined by the system to mean the agency initiating the regulation-making process</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Regulation Making Record</p>
<p>2.3.1.25</p> <p>The initiating agency shall be required to upload the following documents to begin the regulation-making process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed regulation with statement of purpose (RSOP) (C.G.S. § 4-170(B)(3)) - Notice Of Intent(NOI) (C.G.S. § 4-168(a)) - Small Business Impact Statement with regulatory flexibility analysis, if necessary (SBIS) (C.G.S. § 4-168a(b)) - Fiscal Note(FN) (C.G.S. § 4-168(a)(5)) <p>The above-referenced documents shall be defined by the system as the "initiating documents."</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.26</p> <p>Only the initiating agency and the regulations coordinator shall have the ability to edit or make changes to the information on the regulation</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.27</p> <p>The following documents shall not be viewable by the general public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OPM Comments / Technical Corrections - Governor's Office Comments / Technical Corrections - Attorney General's Office Advice / Comments 	<p>Peter: What about the initial draft of the regulation before OPM/Gov approval and the draft of the NOI? Not sure we want to make those public. Just because something can be obtained under FOIA doesn't necessarily mean we should post. it.</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.28</p> <p>The initiating agency shall have the ability to submit subsequent drafts of each document comprising the regulation-making record at any time in the regulation-making process</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>Peter: In the scenario, would OTG also have access to the original?</p>			

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

<p>2.3.1.129</p> <p>Throughout a regulation making process, the system shall route the latest versions of each document associated in the workflow, from the notifying entity to the receiving entity.</p> <p>For e.g. Consider a scenario where an agency uploads the proposed regulation (version v1) and the notice of intent (v1) and routes it to OPM. OPM proposes changes to the regulation and uploads the document v2 and approves the documents, then the OTG shall receive v2 of the proposed regulation and v1 of the notice of intent since the notice of intent incurred no change.</p>	<p>Peter: In the scenario, would OTG also have access to the original?</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.130</p> <p>For each stage within the record making process, the system shall provide authorized entities the ability to send system notifications via email to other authorized users defined within the regulation making process</p>	<p>Peter: Would those emails be public records? Would it depend on the person doing the sending (i.e., attorneys at OPM/OTG/AGO)?</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.131</p> <p>The initiating agency shall trigger a system notification to the Office Of Policy Management once the initiating documents are uploaded into the system</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>Initiating Agency</p>
<p>2.3.1.132</p> <p>If OPM approves the regulation and accompanying documents, or approves the regulation subject to technical changes, the system shall send a notification to the Office of the Governor</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OPM</p>
<p>2.3.1.133</p> <p>The system shall require OPM to confirm review and certify approval before routing the approval notification to the Office Of The Governor ("OTG").</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OPM</p>
<p>2.3.1.134</p> <p>If OPM approves the regulation and accompanying documents in whole or approves the regulation and accompanying documents subject to technical changes, the system shall route all documents, including the technical changes required by OPM, if any, to the OTG.</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OPM</p>
<p>2.3.1.135</p> <p>If OPM denies the regulation and/or the accompanying documents, the system shall send a system notification to the initiating agency and the regulation-making record shall be closed</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OPM</p>
<p>2.3.1.136</p> <p>If OTG approves the regulation and accompanying documents, or approves the regulation subject to technical changes, the system shall send a notification to the initiating agency</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OTG</p>
<p>2.3.1.137</p> <p>The system shall require OTG to confirm review and certify approval before routing the approval notification to the initiating agency</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OTG</p>
<p>2.3.1.138</p> <p>If OTG approves the regulation and accompanying documents in whole or approves the regulation and accompanying document subject to technical changes, the system shall route all documents, including the technical changes required by OPM & OTG, if any, to the initiating agency</p>		<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulation Making Process</p>	<p>OTG</p>

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

	Functional	Regulation Making Process	OTG
2.3.1.39	Functional	Regulation Making Process	OTG
2.3.1.40	<p>Peter: Not sure this is desirable. Sometimes the changes by OPM and the OTG are imperfect (I know, shocking!). Also, sometimes the agency needs to make minor conforming changes (renumbering, etc.) that shouldn't require resubmission to OPM/OTG. There are sometimes changes that also need to be made because the regulation has languished with OPM/OTG. There should be a method for confirming receipt of OPM/OTG changes; but, I think the agency should retain authority to make alternations before immediately making the regulation public after OPM/OTG changes.</p>	Regulation Making Process	OTG
2.3.1.41	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Comment Period
2.3.1.42	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Comment Period
2.3.1.43	<p>Peter: Agency needs to be able to submit Response to Comments document at this stage.</p>	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.44	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.45	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.46	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.47	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.48	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.49	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.3.1.50	If AG approves the regulation and accompanying documents in whole the system shall route all documents and notify the Legislative Regulations Review Committee that the regulation is ready for review	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.51	If the Attorney General approves the regulation, the system shall notify the Legislative Regulations Review Committee that the regulation is ready for review and send notification to the initiating agency that the regulation has been submitted to the Legislative Regulations Review Committee	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.52	If the Attorney General denies the regulation, the system shall send a notification to the initiating agency that the regulation has been denied by the Attorney General and provide the initiating agency with the option to close the regulation-making record or to resubmit the regulation to the Attorney General	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.53	In the event, the AG has taken no action on the regulation and accompanying documents within 30 days of receipt, the system shall denote the status of the regulation as approved by the AG and route the same versions of the regulation and accompanying documents to LRRC	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.54	If a proposed regulation is mandatory and more than 180 days have elapsed since the agency has opened the regulation for public comment (see line 132), then the system shall prevent submission to the LRRC until the agency uploads a 180 day letter in accordance with section 4-168(b) of the General Statutes	Functional	Regulation Making Process	AG
2.3.1.55	The system shall not be designed to incorporate the legislative branch work flow of the regulation making process. However, this stated, the system shall be designed to allow for future additions of the legislative regulations making process workflow into the system	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.56	Requirement detailed under section <> from <> to <> represent the business work flow of the legislative branch once a regulation and accompanying documents get approved by the AG	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.57	The Legislative Regulations Review Committee shall have the ability to upload the Legislative Commissioner's Office Report into the system	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.58	The Office of Fiscal Analysis shall have the ability to upload the Fiscal Analysis into the system	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC

Peter:

Minor quibble -- it is the publication of notice that triggers the time, not the opening of public comment. That said, they are in effect the same date unless an agency can declare a comment period within the notice that is in the future (I don't know the answer to that).

I might also suggest that instead of building in a blocker to submission, at the 180 day mark the system could send a notice to the agency to complete a standardized letter to the committee (the letter could be the same for all agencies, just leaving a blank for why it is late). Standardizing the system and reducing agency work seems preferable to me.

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.3.1.59	<i>The Legislative Regulations Review Committee shall have the ability to notify the agency that the regulation has been approved, approved with technical corrections, recommended to the General Assembly for denial, or denied without prejudice.</i>	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.60	<i>If the Legislative Regulations Review Committee approves the regulation, then the system shall notify the Regulations Coordinator that the regulation has received final approval.</i>	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.61	<i>If the Regulations Coordinator receives notification that the regulation has received final approval, then the Regulations Coordinator shall be permitted by the system to upload the final approved regulation into the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies</i>	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.62	<i>If the Legislative Regulations Review Committee approves the regulation with technical corrections, the system shall notify the initiating agency</i>	Functional	Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.63	<i>If the Legislative Regulations Review Committee denies the regulation without prejudice, the system shall trigger a notification to the initiating agency and the initiating agency shall be provided with an option to close the Regulation-Making Record or resubmit to the LRRC</i>		Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.64	In order to incorporate the continuity to the regulations making process, the system shall use any real-time input received from the legislative branch with respect to the regulations making process actions occurring on their system For each action taken on the legislative website the following information shall be required to feed the regulation making record on the system: (Details requested may change based on interfacing solution adopted)		Regulation Making Process	LRRC
2.3.1.65	Regulation Tracking Number Title Number Chapter & Section(s) - Unique row id - Date Submitted - Submitted By (Name Of The Authorizing Entity) - Action Taken (By Authorizing Entity) - Notes (optional) (e.g., Revised Regulation Text following public comment) - Documents routed	Functional	Regulation Making Process	Regulations Coordinator

Peter:
Would it be preferable to have the Regulations Coordinator make the technical changes? Or are we thinking that the Regs Coordinator would just review the agency amendments for consistency with the LRRC's corrections? Might a step

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

	<p>Peter: Would it be preferable to have the Regulations Coordinator make the technical changes? Or are we thinking that the Regs Coordinator would just review the agency amendments for consistency with the LRRC's corrections? Might a step that could be eliminated here.</p>	<p>Regulations Coordinator</p>	<p>Regulations Coordinator</p>
2.3.1.66	Upon notification of approval from LRRC, the initiating agency shall be permitted by the system to trigger a notification to the Regulations Coordinator that the agency has made the technical corrections required by the Legislative Regulations Review Committee and that the regulation, as amended, has received final approval.	Functional	Regulation Making Process
2.3.1.67	Upon such notification, the Regulations Coordinator shall be permitted by the system to upload the final approved regulation reflecting the technical changes made by the Legislative Regulations Review Committee, to the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies	Functional	Regulation Making Process
2.3.1.68	If the Legislative Regulations Review Committee recommends denial of the regulation to the General Assembly, the Regulation-Making Record shall be closed	Functional	Regulation Making Process
2.3.2.0	Emergency Regulations	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.1	Emergency regulations shall following a different regulations making process as compared	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.2	The system shall route all documents proposed initially by the agency to the OTG	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.3	If OTG approves the regulation and accompanying documents the system shall send a notification to LRRC for review	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.4	The LRRC shall be permitted to approve or deny the emergency regulation	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.5	The system shall change the status of the regulation from In Progress to "Effective Until" <120 days+date approved by OTG>	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.6	The system shall require OTG to confirm review and certify approval before routing the approval notification to the initiating agency	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.7	If OTG approves the regulation and accompanying documents the system shall route all documents to LRRC	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.8	If OTG denies the regulation and/or the accompanying documents, the system shall send a system notification to the initiating agency and the regulation-making record shall be closed	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.9	The system shall permit the agency to make any changes to the proposed regulation and accompanying documents required by the OTG	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.10	If OTG denies the regulation, the system shall change the status of the regulation to	Functional	Regulation Making Record
2.3.2.11	The system shall route the regulation and accompanying documents approved by OTG to LRRC for review	Functional	Regulation Making Record

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.12	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.13	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.14	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.15	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.16	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.17	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.2.18	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.1	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.0.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.1.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.1	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.0.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.1.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.1	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.0.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.1.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.1	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.0.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.1.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.3.4.1	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.0.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations
2.4.1.0	Functional	Regulation Making Record	Emergency Regulations

Peter:
 This is actually backwards. The policy may be in effect 20 days *before* notice is provided (and the timing is based on notice, not the beginning of the comment period, though those two things generally, if not always, mean the same date).
 From 17b-10(b): "the department may operate under such policy while it is in the process of adopting the policy as a regulation **provided** the Department of Social Services **prints notice** of intent to adopt the regulation in the Connecticut Law Journal within **twenty days after** adopting the policy."

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

<p>2.4.1.1</p> <p>The following parameters shall be used as search criteria for the regulations search:</p> <p>Primary Parameters - Regulation Section Number (Exact)</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Secondary Parameters - Keyword (Exact / Wildcard)</p> <p>Additional Parameters - Agency Name - Effective Date Range - Document Type - RCSA - Regulation Making Record - Emergency Regulations</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.2</p> <p>The system shall require users to choose a Primary or Secondary parameter to search for regulation(s)</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.3</p> <p>The primary parameter shall be used by itself for searching for regulations</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.4</p> <p>The secondary parameter shall be used by itself or in conjunction with the other secondary parameter</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.5</p> <p>The system shall require the user to choose additional parameter(s) while searching using a secondary parameter</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.6</p> <p>The system shall default the Effective Date Range to current date +30 days</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.7</p> <p>Hint text shall be provided for each search parameter to assist the user in understanding the nature of the parameter</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.1.8</p> <p>In the event the search routine returns more than 100 results for the search, the system shall provide the user with a message that more than 100 results were returned and to narrow the criteria and search again</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Criteria</p>
<p>2.4.2.0</p> <p>Search - Results</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.1</p> <p>Presentation of the search results - pending technical solution (table format or Google results format)</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>

Peter:
 Maybe this is encompassed by the "presentation of search results" but I think that showing a few lines of the regulation text with the search results would be very helpful.

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

<p>2.4.2.2</p>	<p>The following elements shall be returned in the search results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tracking Number - Regulation Number - Title Number / Title Heading - Chapter Number - Regulation Section Number - Effective Date - Prior Regulation Versions (future phase) 	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.3</p>	<p>The system shall display a maximum of <=> results in the results window</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.4</p>	<p>In the event the search results exceed more than <> results are returned, the system shall display the first <> results and shall prompt the user to input additional parameters to narrow the search for more results</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.5</p>	<p>The search results shall be sorted in ascending order by title number</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.6</p>	<p>In the event the search finds more than one regulation matching the criteria entered by the user, the results shall be displayed first by title number than by section number in ascending order</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.7</p>	<p>If the system finds no results matching the search criteria, the system shall provide the user with a message that no results were found</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.4.2.8</p>	<p>The system shall permit access into the details of a regulation</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.5.0.0</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Search Results</p>
<p>2.5.0.1</p>	<p>The System shall allow for the publication of public comments received during the appropriate public comment period</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>
<p>2.5.0.2</p>	<p>The version of the regulation published by the agency within the 'Regulation Making Record' workflow after the approval by OPM and The Governor's office shall be the version that is open for public comments</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>
<p>2.5.0.3</p>	<p>The time period for the public to put in their comments shall be pre-defined, set at the agency level, with the agency having the ability to override the preset value as needed (Usually 30 or 45 days)</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>
<p>2.5.0.4</p>	<p>The system shall provide access to the public to email their comments to the agencies directly</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>
<p>2.5.0.5</p>	<p>Comments shall be in the form of text or shall be in the form of document(s) emailed by the public to the agency</p>	<p>Functional</p>	<p>Regulations</p>	<p>Comments Forum</p>

Peter:
 Maybe this is encompassed by the "presentation of search results" but I think that showing a few lines of the regulation text with the search results would be very helpful.

Peter:
 Do we want to limit ourselves to this? Would it not be preferable to have the option for some type of "smart" result sorting if technically possible? i.e. -- if you search for "Medicaid" you would get results where the regulation in which the term is used most often is at the top of the search results, not just every regulation where it is mentioned in ascending order?

Peter:
 The length of the comment period is established in the notice of intent. That said, if we want to close the comment period access through the system, that should be fine too.

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

2.5.0.6	The system shall provide means for the public to see - Published Comments - Agency Responses	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.7	The system shall not publish comments provided by the public directly on the website	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.8	Agencies shall have the ability to publish the comments sent to them by the public after review of the contents	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.9	The system shall not provide the ability to detect malicious viruses or obscene or profane or confidential information sent by the public. This shall be left to the discretion of the individual agencies to detect, remove and redact such threats and then post the comment on the website	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.10	Agencies shall be able to publish a response for a single comment	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.11	Agencies shall be able to publish a response for a group of comments	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.5.0.12	The system shall not link agency responses with the public comments	Functional	Regulations	Comments Forum
2.6.0.0	Reports			
2.6.0.1	The system shall have the provision to define and customize reports as an enhancement to be considered for a future release of the website	Functional	Regulations	Reports
2.6.0.2	The system shall accommodate real-time and pre-scheduled reports	Functional	Regulations	Reports
3.0.0.0	External Interfaces			
3.1.0.0	Microsoft Outlook			
3.1.0.1	The system shall interface with Microsoft outlook to generate email notifications	Functional	External Interface	Microsoft Outlook
3.1.0.2	The notifications shall be generated to inform a user or a group of users of an action that has taken place in the system or of an action that needs to be taken by the notification recipient(s) An email notification shall consist of the following attributes - Date Of Generation - Name Of Generating Task - Generated By (First Name Last Name) - Entity Or Agency Of The Person Generating The Item - Assigned To / Owner(s) - Link to documents requiring action on website	Functional	External Interface	Microsoft Outlook
3.1.0.3		Functional	External Interface	Microsoft Outlook
3.2.0.0	LRRC Website			
3.2.0.1	The system shall interface with the legislative website to include the legislative portion of the regulations making process	Functional	External Interface	LRRC Website

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements

3.2.0.2	More details of the interfacing needs shall be documented during the JAD sessions	Functional	External Interface	LRRC Website
---------	---	------------	--------------------	--------------

Connecticut eRegulations Requirements