## PIC-NG User Acceptance Testing Questions and Answers 10/29/2020 DRAFT

- **Q** To avoid vendors using the same PH units for testing, will it be possible for each vendor to be assigned a specific PHA available in the demo environment?
- **A** The Development Team will work with all Vendors participating in the UAT to assign a PHA Code with building and unit data. All PHA codes are being given unique public housing inventory and the instructions on how to access it are in the UAT Test Plan.
- **Q** To test portability will it be possible to dedicate 2 PHA Codes to each vendor?
- **A** On request, the Development Team will assign a second PHA Code to a vendor so that the vendor can test portability.
- **Q** -Is PH inventory management part of this first round of UAT testing or is the focus only 50058 data, using the existing inventory available?
- **A** -While each PHA code assigned to a vendor in the UAT environment will be prepopulated with building and unit data, the UAT is not designed to test the functionality to maintain the building and unit data in PIC-NG: the focus at this time is on 50058 testing (so the building and unit data is present only to facilitate 50058 submissions in public housing that rely on building and unit data being in the system). In other words, this UAT will not focus on adding (or removing) developments/buildings/units nor on changing the status of units (e.g. taking it offline because the unit is being used as administrative space, etc.). The functionality to maintain building and unit data is present in the UAT environment, but testing of that functionality will come later.
- **Q** Is MTW Expansion part of the initial testing? Since no Technical Reference Guide (TRG) has been shared and the 50058 is still only available as a draft we have not yet implemented new fields in our vendor system.

Example: the MTW Expansion 50058 has checkboxes for alternate rent type. PH program will continue to use the renttype json object. Under current 50058 TRG, "I" is submitted for Income-based and "F" is submitted for Flat. Section 8 programs will use new mtwAltRentType json object. There is no legend on the MTW Expansion 50058 and no TRG of values to submit based on option checked on the form.

izaj. i ioralcu	TIME TO OWNER. 12K HILLIUS	izai. ii izai is negative, put izk		- 4	120].
12ak. MTW spe	ecific alternate rent type:	[ ] MTW alternative gross income	[ ] MTW Stepped rent	[ ] MTW Tierd	ed rent
		[ ] MTW alternative adjusted income	[ ] Other MTW alternative rent		
Line 12ak:	The second secon	alternate rent type the family's rent is de	etermined by if the family's rent i	s not calculated	d using the
	standard prorated rent cal	culation detailed on this form.			

Most other new fields with multiple options have a legend of value to enter on the 50058 form (which would also be submitted value)

```
3r. Average number of hours worked per week codes:

1 = 0 hours

2 = 1-10 hours/week

3 = 11- 20 hours/week

4 = 21-30 hours/week

5 = 31-40 hours/week

6 = More than 40 hours/week

3s. Work requirement compliance codes:

1 = In compliance

2 = Exempt

3 = Receiving a hardship

4 = Not in compliance, in probationary period and not subject to penalties

5 = Not in compliance, subject to penalties

6 = Not applicable, no work requirement policy
```

**A** - As noted in the Vendor call on 10/22/20, the focus of this window of testing is on MTW Expansion. Vendors can also test regular Housing Choice Voucher and public housing 50058 functionality as well, but the focal point is testing MTW Expansion at this time. The TRG that has now been provided to the vendors and is posted to the <u>PIC-NG Developer Information page</u> contains any codes that are needed to submit values for each line of the HUD-50058 MTW Expansion, including line 12ak.

## **Questions and Answers not directly related to UAT**

- **Q** Where are we at with security and certificates (this hasn't been discussed over the last few calls)? Similar to initial demo testing, I assume that I will need to log in to PIC so my connection is in the background when calling demo environment web services?
- **A** As explained during the 10/22/20 UAT meeting, it is our goal to revamp HUD's authentication system so we can use a PHA-wide account and a modern authentication protocol; however at this time the system will require conventional individual user authentication (i.e "M" number and password). This will be true both for UAT and for the initial deployment of PIC-NG in January. Vendors working with MTW Expansion agencies that will start using PIC-NG in January/February, should identify an individual and a backup to be the persons who actually use their credentials to interact with PIC-NG.
- **Q** Open issue for MTW 50058 (not Expansion) json: The MTW 50058 (at this time) can be an FSS program or a MTWSS program. The json was designed with all fields using the fss object. Now that the MTW Expansion 50058 allows concurrent FSS and MTWSS participation a new mtwss json object was added. Which of the below should we follow for submission of the MTW 50058? 2 or 3 would be easier for us because then we don't have different rules for MTW 50058 and MTW Expansion 50058, but it isn't a huge deal to handle them separately.
  - 1. The mtwss object cannot be used for Section 23 of the MTW 50058. Use fss object only.
  - 2. Vendors can use either fss or mtwss for section 23 of the MTW 50058 if the selected 23a program is MTWSS (always use the fss object if the selected program is FSS)
  - 3. Use mtwss object if 23a is MTWSS and use FSS object is 23a is FSS

**A** - HUD-50058 MTW (i.e. the form used by the legacy 39 designated MTW PHAs as opposed to the MTW Expansion 50058 being implemented in PIC-NG) has not yet been developed in PIC-NG (some pieces have been but not the entire form), therefore that data cannot be submitted at this time. It is anticipated once that development is completed that we will try as much as possible to make the rules the same for the HUD-50058 MTW and HUD-50058 MTW Expansion for Section 23. At this time, if the HUD-50058 MTW was in PIC-NG, the current form says it is one or the other so the system would be coded that way, but the MTW program office is looking to possibly update this on the OMB approved form so that the rules would be the same for both.

**Q** - When we get a new client they produce historical MTCS ASCII files and our conversion process is built around an import of the flat file. What kind of data exports will be available to clients from PIC-NG? Will they be able to dump an ASCII format flat file? Or dump an XML file of detailed 50058 history?

**A** - This information is not needed for UAT since the vendor will be assigned a PHA code with no existing 50058 data and building and unit data that consists of units that are vacant and available for lease up.

With respect to the larger question of migrating data for new clients, this should be a topic for further discussion prior to transitioning MTW Expansion agencies to PIC-NG in the new year. The initial deployment of PIC-NG is designed to be able to migrate the most current PHA, 50058 and building and unit information from IMS/PIC to PIC-NG in such a way that PHAs transitioning from IMS/PIC to PIC-NG should be able to switch from using IMS/PIC to PIC-NG relatively seamlessly. The initial deployment of PIC-NG is not designed to functionally support the production of historical MTCS ASCII files, but PIH may be able to support such a need through an exchange of data in some other way. Another way that this could be approached in the short run is for the transition of the vendor's new client to happen utilizing existing IMS/PIC functionality prior to the vendor's client starting the transition from IMS/PIC to PIC-NG.

- **Q** Will error messages that are noted as being relaxed or removed for the MTW Expansion submission type be triggered during UAT?
- A We are currently working to try to implement the relaxing or removing of these error codes in the demo environment, we will update this question further in a later posting of this document.
- **Q** The submission for line 3k, Race, has changed from a single field with a number value to multiple fields with a Y/N value. It does not appear that the validation is currently supportive of the submission formatting outlined in the TRG. Please let us know if we should be doing something different. If this is correct, are there any other fields REAC is currently aware of where the validation has not yet been updated to meet the TRG requirements?
- **A** This has been corrected and the new JSON mapping reflects the correction.