# IT INVESTMENT CAPITAL FUND
# PROJECT CLOSE OUT REPORT

**To:** Information Technology Strategy and Investment Committee
John Vittner, Office of Policy & Management

**FROM:** **Kristin Karr, Administrative Law Information Systems Manager**

**AGENCY/PROJECT NAME: Secretary of the State, Regulations Modernization Project (eRegulations)**

**PROJECT MANAGER: Kristin Karr**

**Project Start Date:** Jan 2013 **Project End Date:** August 31, 2016

**Total IT Capital Funds Allocated:** $ 1,758,583

**Total IT Capital Fund Expenditures:** $ 1,758,541.13

**Brief Project Description/Summary:**
The Regulations Modernization Project (eRegs) was designed to manage the regulation content throughout the State's regulatory content lifecycle (the "regulation-making process"), and to publish the content in html and pdf formats. The purpose of the project is to make the regulation content and the regulation-making process accessible and transparent to the public.

**List Project Goals and Deliverables Completed:**
(*Please provide a brief summary goals and deliverables of the project that were implemented. Please reference your IT Capital Investment Brief for the initial goals of the project)*

**Desired outcome #1: Dramatic increase in the accessibility of effective regulations and transparency of the regulation-making process.**

***This goal has been achieved.*** All regulatory activity and content from all state agencies making regulations is now posted in real-time on the public access portal at https://eregulations.ct.gov/eRegsPortal/.
In addition, the public may also:

- Sign-up for email alerts to track regulatory progress
- Submit comments online
- Search and browse all public notices and regulation -making records from March 23, 2015 onward, and all codified regulations from January 2013 onward.

The website receives approximately 350 unique visitors per day (about 2,000 page views). Approximately ___ people subscribe to the e-alert feature.

**Desired outcome #2: Decreased time from proposed regulation to final approval due to automation of the process and elimination of the Connecticut Law Journal and its associated printing schedule** – this is particularly important with respect to regulations that agencies are mandated to adopt by state and/or federal law.

***This goal is being achieved.*** The average in-progress time for regulations started between 2010 and 2015 was **310 days**. While we still have a relatively small sample set (total of 13), regulations completed in the eRegulations System have taken an average of only **151 days** (approx. 5 months) from proposed regulation to posting of the final approval. This means we've cut process time in half, from almost a year to less than half a year.

**Desired outcome #3: Uniformity of the documents created during the regulation-making process.**

***This goal has been achieved.*** All agency regulations must now be written using a special drafting software based on XML. The structured XML enforces uniformity and enables automation of codified regulations after final approval. The drafting software and training has been successfully distributed to agency drafters across the state and automated codification is performing as hoped.

**Desired outcome #4: Make the regulation promulgation process easier for all agencies, but particularly those that have little or no legal staff.**

***This goal is being achieved.*** The drafting software is not as easy to use as we had hoped, particularly for users working on large documents. However, the embedded schema does provide guidance and require uniformity for staff who are not as familiar with regulation-writing requirements. In addition, once the regulation starts the approval process, the workflow process built into the system guides the users to upload required documentation and makes sure the regulation gets acted on by the appropriate party at appropriate time. Users are notified immediately when approval actions take place. Forms are provided within the system. Also, now that the regulatory process is centralized within the eRegulations system, the Secretary of the State's office has been able to provide general guidance to new agency regulation writers, coordinate activity among users, including reviewing entities, and is in a position to help identify issues and procedures in the overall process that might need clarification or could be simplified.

**Project Replication Opportunities:**
*(Are there opportunities to repeat or leverage the project solution by other state agencies? Please provide a brief explanation)*

The back-end content management system (IBM FileNet) is already used by a number of state applications, and was one factor in our choice of design. The unique drafting, workflow and publication processes of the eRegulations System could also be replicated individually or as a complete system. For example, the eRegs project uses IBM Case Manager to manage regulation documents and route them through a predetermined workflow. A similar structure could be used for other applications, without the need for a drafting tool. In fact, the Secretary of the State's office is looking to expand the system to include Administrative Decisions. Our automated archival process setup with the Connecticut Digital Archives at UConn and under the guidance of the State Library is already being considered as a template for other state digital archive processes.

**Key Lessons Learned:**
*(Provide any lessons learned experienced during this project that may be helpful to other agencies starting a similar project)*

The drafting software has not proven as easy to use, or as flexible as we had hoped. This was a difficult product to test ahead of time, and there were not a lot of other options available. The product also depends on Microsoft Word and requires local installation, both of which present difficulties. Agency users have multiple versions of Word and the product works differently in and is not always compatible with each one. We also have some concern that the product will not keep pace with future Word versions. Local installation has also proven difficult from the standpoint of license tracking and the fact that users have varying degrees of authorization to download and install third-party software. In retrospect, a web-based tool that is not dependent on other software would be preferable.