

IRR CLM960 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	No	It's not clear what "issue" this proposal is trying to correct but it contradicts the definition of DN0412 - Change Data Element/Segment Number in the dictionary. The DP Rule specifically indicates to use the DN of the element being changed - no reference to any other exception. Applying this exception is a slippery slope because the design of the O2 solution is to indicate WHICH DN is changing - not multiple DNs	No	It doesn't support the 3.1 standard
Alaska Workers' Compensation	Yes		Yes	
Arch Insurance Group	Yes		Yes	
Commonwealth of PA	Abstain	Not using 3.1 and we know that, with 4.0, there won't be a 2ndary address field.	Abstain	
Florida/Division of Workers' Compensation	Yes		Yes	
Kansas	Yes		Yes	
Kentucky	Yes		Yes	
Liberty Mutual	Yes		Yes	
Louisiana Works - OWC	Yes		Yes	
NJCRI	Abstain		Abstain	
Origami Risk	Yes		Yes	
Rhode Island Department of Labor and Training	Yes		Yes	
Riskconnect	Yes		Yes	
State of Michigan	No	This change would not be in the best interest for the State of Michigan.	Abstain	
The Hartford Insurance Group	Yes		Yes	
Verisk	Yes		Yes	
Virginia	Yes		Abstain	I do not see a proposed implementation timeline
Walmart Claims Services, Inc.	Yes		Abstain	