Public Housing Administrative Reform Initiative  
July 12, 2007  

Systems Subgroup Meeting Notes  

I – Purpose  

- The purpose of the Systems focus group is to develop a list of recommendations for HUD’s computer systems which could be high level or feature specific to a system and then develop the recommendations into requirements.

II – “Bigger Picture” Questions discussed included:  

1) What is the purpose of each system?  
2) What is the actual data required to be reported versus what PHAs assume is required?  
3) Why were the systems created originally and is this reason still relevant today?  
4) If FHA/Multi-Family is the Asset Management Model, then what are the reporting requirements for FHA versus the current PHA model? The data submitted may be more streamlined than PIC but PIC may have a better interface.

III – Diagram of HUD’s Systems (refer to attached Power Point slide)  

1) Most of the systems in the attached diagram were developed very quickly. The physical database was developed first but now there are two databases with the same data (REAC database and physical database).  
2) HUD has found there is a gap between inventory management and other systems. Address and unit data from PIC is supposed to get transferred into the other systems.  
3) WASS is supposed to be the security for all systems but there are some stragglers such as VMS, the voucher management system.  
4) There is a proposal to replace RASS and MASS with “On-site Monitoring” called the Comprehensive Compliance & Monitoring System (CCMS).  
5) PAS – Program Accounting System started in the 1980’s.  
6) QASS – Quality Auditing System – the focus group requested that PHAs have access to user friendly audit reports.  
7) HUDCAPS – HUD’s general ledger system which originally started as a Section 8 system  
8) HUD is trying to develop an integrated database to capture all of this information from all of the front end systems.  
9) Questions raised during the discussion of the Systems Diagram included:
Why does HUD need all of this data if it is a burden to PHAs? HUD staff stated there may be issues with requests from Congress for information on programs.

Questions on the FHA minimum reporting requirements for Asset Management were also raised again. There may be issues with risk assessment and federal regulations for the reporting requirements.

**IV – Discussion of HUD’s Future Plans**

1) Starting in January 2008, HUD will review existing development information and synchronize AMP & development numbers. The AMP number will be the new development number.

2) There will be issues with blending DOFA dates for the Capital Fund due to the synchronization.

3) PHAs can start loading 50058 data with AMP numbers starting in January but the system will give PHAs a year to transition. The PIH notice regarding this issue is currently undergoing internal review within HUD.

4) Each AMP group will submit financial data into SAGIS electronically. It is not known at this time whether it can be done in a batch process.

5) RASS may go away under the new PHAS.

6) MASS – currently PHAs self-certify but in the future HUD field office staff will submit data through the new CCM that gets translated into a score. Field office staff is currently working on a lengthy checklist for CCM.

7) CCM will include a new component of PHAS – score for capital obligations. LOCCS will feed obligations from Capital to CCM which feeds MASS and goes into MASS score.

8) SAGIS will be new interface to HUD.gov portal for grants such as ROSS. There are issues with the vendor patches and it still runs on a separate system and needs to be migrated to the enterprise system. HUD is trying to get quick fixes for some issues. SAGIS goes into effect September 28th.

9) New proposed rules on PHAS and scoring will be published by the end of the summer.

10) Question was raised on what does HUD use to determine Risk Assessment.

**V- Next Meeting – July 24th at 9:30 AM in REAC Offices**

1) The focus group decided to solicit opinions, comments, and issues on HUD’s systems from our own PHA staff, neighboring PHAs and State agencies.

2) There will be two tracks of discussion for next meeting:
   a. What is the global vision of these systems – what is necessary by statute and what can be streamlined?
   b. What are the feature-specific changes that should be implemented for individual systems?
c. Based on these two tracks, the group will attempt to develop a short survey for PHAs on these systems to solicit their comments or suggestions.

3) Behind each of these systems there are IT systems, software vendors, contractors, and a business committee.
4) These information systems grew out of statutory requirements for monitoring and compliance.

5) Suggestions for next meeting:
   a. Item 1 on the Agenda should be that HUD and PHAs need process to communicate rolling out new systems.
   b. The Group needs more information on the data submitted on the 50059 form versus the 50058. Does the FHA model have parts that we can use?
   c. HOPE VI – internal system does calculations which takes the load off staff.
   d. Can group get list of data elements for each system? HUD stated we would get swamped and suggested we narrow our focus to where there is duplicate data or data we do not need to collect.
   e. PHAs should be able to complete certifications on-line for physical.
   f. PIC should be the source of unit data for all systems however what is the other unit data still being used by these systems and where is it coming from? For example, PASS relies on PIC to do physical inspections but it also still relies on data from last inspection rather than the most recent data in PIC. The same unit can be treated differently under several programs. HUD is struggling to define units.
   g. What does Congress ask HUD about in relation to the public housing and Section 8 programs? What is statutory, episodic, and research under HUD Policy Development and Research?
   h. How is Asset Management being done in private versus FHA and PHA that could clear out some of the layers of information required?
   i. If a system is not mandated and it is also a burden then we should get rid of it!
   j. HUD field office staff is spending more time dealing with system issues and less time on housing, resident and quality of life issues.
   k. The field office staff will be expected to do on-site monitoring in buildings but they are already dealing with PIC, SAGIS, FASS, etc.

6) Additional Comments on PIC and 50058
   a. The focus group discussed the ability of PIC to pre-populate data in the other HUD systems to reduce the work load on PHA staff. FASS, RASS, and CCM (on-site monitoring) will use PIC for building and unit data. However, there have been issues with the communication
between PIC and RASS. In theory, SAGIS will also pull in data from PIC.

b. 50058 form data – discussed feeding PASS data from the 50058 form for occupancy and ACC status. RASS currently used the mailing address data in the 50058 form for surveys. The 50058 form data may also be used to pre-populate occupancy data for CCM and SAGIS.

c. VMS – discussed the possibility of ditching this system once PIC is compliant and includes portability. There was a suggestion to do monthly audits of VMS.

d. PIC is also used to record administrative data on PHAs.

e. Risk Assessment Module – is used by field office staff to analyze PHAs for on-site monitoring. HUD is not sure about the future of this system with the implementation of Asset Management. The focus group recommended that HUD share the information in the Risk Assessment module such as its purposed and utility.

f. The focus group also recommended that HUD share IG reports on the systems with the group.