

# IRR CLM952 Voting Results

Jurisdiction/Organization:	Should the proposed resolution for this IRR be approved?	Please provide any supporting comments ("No" votes MUST provide supporting comments.)	Should the proposed implementation timeline be adopted?	Please provide any supporting comments ("No" votes MUST provide supporting comments.)
Aerie EDI Group	Abstain		Abstain	
Alaska Workers' Compensation	Yes		Yes	
Arch Insurance	Yes		Yes	
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	Yes		Yes	
EMC Insurance	No	<p>I think the proposed changes are confusing and not consistently written. The definition should not change based on the MTC. The definition should be something like this: "The date the payment is surrendered to a letter delivery organization, is available for in-person pickup, or when the funds are transferred via electronic funds transfer (EFT) to any type of financial institution (i.e.: banks, third-party vendors like Venmo or Zelle, etc.)." The rest of the "definition" is just explaining which payment you should be pulling the date from - the first payment or the last payment. Probably should be part of the DP Rule instead of the definition. "If an IP, AP, PY, RB, CA, or CB rejects and a subsequent payment is issued, the Benefit Payment Issue Date will be the date of the most recent payment for that Benefit Type. For CO transactions to an MTC of IP, AP, PY, RB, CA, or CB, the Benefit Payment Issue Date should be the date from the original transaction and not a more recent date if subsequent payments have been issued. For SX MTCs, the Benefit Payment Issue Date should be from the last payment for that Benefit Type."</p> <p>Similar feedback for the Payment Issue Date definition. The MTCs aren't necessary as they shouldn't change the definition of the data element. Definition should be something like this: "The date the payment is surrendered to a letter delivery organization, is available for in-person pickup, or when the funds are transferred via electronic funds transfer (EFT) to any type of financial institution (i.e.: banks, third-party vendors like Venmo or Zelle, etc.)." This sentence does not make sense to me: "Third-party vendors (e.g. Venmo or Zelle, etc.) may be strictly limited by the jurisdiction and may not be allowed as the payment/benefit payment issue date." I understand that third party vendors may not be allowed in certain jurisdictions but this is saying that the vendors aren't allow to be the "payment/benefit payment issue date" - that doesn't make sense. How is a vendor used as a date? What does this line mean from a practical perspective? Can jurisdictions set their own definitions for these data elements based upon their statues? "Note: Jurisdictional statutes may supersede this definition and should be reviewed as applicable."</p>	Yes	
Enlyte	Yes		Yes	
Great American Insurance Company	Yes		Yes	
Idaho Industrial Commission	Yes		Yes	
Kansas	Yes		Yes	
Kentucky	Yes		Yes	
Liberty Mutual	Yes		Yes	
Minnesota	Yes		Yes	
MWCIA / WCIO	Abstain		Abstain	
NCCI	Abstain		Abstain	
Origami Risk	Yes		Yes	
Rhode Island Department of Labor and Training	Yes		Yes	
Riskconnect	Abstain		Abstain	
The Hartford Insurance Group	Yes		Yes	I am no seeing a timeline in what is written above, but the change should not be a problem, regardless of timeline.
Verisk	Yes		Yes	
Virginia	Yes		Yes	