

Issue Resolution Request

IRR: CLM930
Received Date: 6/22/2022
Priority: High
Status: Pending Resolution
Requestor Name: Craig White
Phone Number: 334-956-4047
Email: craig.white@labor.alabama.gov

Business Requirement / Issue: What is the business requirement / issue? Cite any applicable statute/rules, and attach a copy, if desired.

The issue is not able to validate R22 benefit weeks, days, and amount paid due to cumulative totals when an employee is out of work due to intermittent dates.

1. Is the information currently being collected at this time by the submitter? If yes, detail current method of collecting the information. Yes

The submitter (the vendor or trading partner sending the EDI to the jurisdiction) has the detail information on their end. I'm guessing they summarize the detail transactions and send the cumulative totals in one record to the jurisdiction.

2. If the information is not currently being collected, what timeline does the submitter expect or require for implementation of the proposed change?

ASAP

3. What other methods of collection or reporting, if any, have been considered?

AWCD manually checks the current and previous totals, but the data coming from EDI is inaccurate most of the time.

Requester's Proposed Solution (optional):

Please see attached document (next page). If you have any questions please contact us.

Date: June 21, 2022

FROM: Alabama Worker's Compensation Department (AWCD)

RE: Claims EDI Cumulative Benefits Data (Release 3.0)

AWCD recently converted from using paper forms to EDI for Supplementary Reporting of Injury (SROI) in July of 2021. Overall, the EDI implementation has gone well considering some minor issues that we've been able to work around and get clarification and support.

There is one major issue that was not caught during testing. It seems the EDI standard for the **R22 Benefits Variable Segment that occurs 10 times** is restricted to cumulative totals only. AWCD policy is to validate the weeks, days, comp rate, and benefit amount paid when the employee is out of work.

Since the standards only allows for cumulative totals then there's no way to tell the actual start and end dates the employee is out if they are out multiple weeks and there are breaks in the weeks.

IAIABC EDI has a data element **NON-CONSECUTIVE PERIOD CODE – DN0212** that looks like it may have been created to identify cumulative and non-cumulative, but the definition only uses the word non-consecutive. The value "W" has the words **composed of intermittent dates**, but the value "B" does not mention intermittent dates.

PROPOSED SOLUTION

Update the data dictionary for EDI data element **NON-CONSECUTIVE PERIOD CODE – DN0212**

- a. Code **W** mentions "**composed of intermittent dates**", and code **B** mentions "**do not represent a continuous period**". Could the wording be updated to be consistent and clear for both codes (W & B) to indicate if they are composed of intermittent dates and if they indicate benefits paid, weeks, and days are cumulative or non-cumulative.
- b. If the current codes (W & B) are for cumulative only then add a new code **N (non-cumulative)** in order to not restrict the jurisdictions to cumulative only. This new code would also reduce errors and simplify processing for the vendors that are having issues properly accumulating previous and current totals. The new code would be restricted for MTC Sx transactions only to indicate valid start and end dates when the employee is out and not composed of intermittent dates. The vendors can omit any transactions with this code from their logic used to process cumulative weeks, days, and amount paid.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
AWCD Department

Written by: Bobby Kennedy – IT Contractor – bobby.kennedy@labor.alabama.gov