

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 1, 2020 – June 5, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 1: Payment Processing Element 1: Form EN-20 and AOP Receipt Date
-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of Cases Reviewed:	51
Acceptable Rating:	90%
Rating for Review:	99%

Describe Findings:

The Payment Processing category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments processed within the review period and evaluates whether the district offices processed those payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

With respect to the Jacksonville District Office, the reviewer identified only one error within this category. In that case, the district office received a valid EN-20, date stamped by the mail room on 1/22/20. According to a Payment Memorandum in the file, the EN-20 could not be processed due to an error in the payment coding completed by the Final Adjudication Branch (FAB.) FAB corrected the error on 2/7/20, and the district office then re-stamped the EN-20 with that date. Energy Tech Support and the Policy Branch have a process for the immediate processing of ECS data correction requests. This process was not followed in this case, thus resulting in a 15 day delay in the payment.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
David Evans, Amy Derocher, Amrene Smith, Steven Smith, Carrie Heavrin, William Pridy, Daniel Divittorio, Paula Heidel, Lisa Rasmussen, Darius Radvila, Traci Murphy	June 5, 2020

AR-1
Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 1, 2020 – June 5, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 2: Part B Recommended Decisions Element 1: Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of Cases Reviewed	44
Rating for Element 1:	93%
Acceptable Rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	93%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

The results of our review revealed that the Jacksonville District Office is performing above the acceptable rating in this category, which judges the outcome and written quality of a sample of Part B Recommended Decisions (RDs). Of the 44 cases reviewed, the review team identified 19 total deficiencies.

With regard to whether the factual information was correct and consistent throughout the RD, the team identified one error due to an incorrect address, specifically an incorrect zip code.

The majority of deficiencies within this category were identified in the indicator questions looking at the sufficiency of the Statement of the Case (SOC). Eight errors involved RDs that either were missing the date of filing or provided an incorrect medical benefits acceptance date. Two additional errors identified within the SOC portion of the RDs included findings that the SOC was not in chronological order or included irrelevant information.

In the indicator questions pertaining to the Explanation of Findings (EOF), the team identified two deficiencies. One RD was identified in which the employment information discussed in the EOF did not match the employment previously discussed in the SOC, and the other excluded relevant information regarding several claimants who had filed a claim for survivor benefits.

The remaining seven errors varied throughout the seven indicator questions, but included RDs which either did not communicate information in an understandable manner, contained substantial grammatical or typographical errors, excluded any reference to conditions that were

being deferred, and one case in which the RD did not explain that a claim was being denied because the maximum payable benefits had already been awarded.

Overall, the Jacksonville District office performed well under this category.

AR TEAM REVIEWER(S):	DATE:
Amy Derocher, Amrene Smith, Steven Smith, Carrie Heavrin, William Pridy, Daniel Divittorio, Paula Heidel, Lisa Rasmussen, Darius Radvila, Traci Murphy	June 5, 2020

AR-1

Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 1, 2020 – June 5, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 3: Part E Causation Claims Element 1: Development and Causation Assessment Element 2: Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of Cases Reviewed	43
Rating for Element 1:	91%
Rating for Element 2:	96%
Acceptable Rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	94%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

This category focuses on the development, causation assessment, and Recommended Decisions (RDs) issued during the rating period in a sample of Part E claims. The Jacksonville District Office exceeded the acceptable rating in this category, with an overall score of 94%.

With regard to Element 1: Development and Causation Assessment, the review team identified 16 deficiencies. Within these, a few trends were identified. These included claims that were found to be underdeveloped, such as cases in which the CE did not develop for exposure and causation when necessary; employment histories and/or medical diagnoses that were inaccurately described in development correspondence; Industrial Hygienist (IH) referrals and related Statement of Accepted Facts (SOAFs) that were inadequately completed and/or asked incorrect questions; and several instances where causation presumption standards were not properly applied, especially in relation to the claimed condition of asthma.

For Element 2: Outcome and Written Quality, the review team identified 14 deficiencies, noting two specific trends. First, the team noted several RDs that were missing attachments, specifically, recommended denials that did not include all necessary documents which are to be included with the RD. The second issue noted among the RDs reviewed was an issue with regard to Explanation of Findings (EOF), which were found to include incorrect information when discussing the pertinent evidence and/or did not include sufficient written narrative to clearly explain their interpretation of case evidence in justifying the decision outcome.

Overall, the Jacksonville District Office performed exceedingly well under this category.

REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Amy Derocher, Amrene Smith, Steven Smith, Carrie Heavrin, William Pridy, Daniel Divittorio, Paula Heidel, Lisa Rasmussen, Darius Radvila, Traci Murphy	June 5, 2020

AR-1
Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 1, 2020 – June 5, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 4: OIS Indexing Element 1: Incoming Correspondence Element 2: Outgoing Correspondence
------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of Cases Reviewed	50
Rating for Element 1:	99%
Rating for Element 2:	100%
Acceptable Rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	99%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

In this category, the review team evaluated imaged correspondence received and created by the district office for clarity and appropriate classification based on pre-determined categories and subjects. The review also ensured that the imaged document reviewed was associated with the correct case file. The Jacksonville district office performed exceptionally well in this category.

A total of one (1) error was identified in this category within Element #1, involving a document which required separation to allow for classification into distinct category/subject combinations. No errors were identified within Element #2.

AR TEAM REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Curtis Johnson, Angela Eaddy	June 5, 2020

AR-1
Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 15, 2020 - June 19, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 — March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 5: Post Remand/Reopening Adjudication
	Element 1: Post Remand/ Reopening Development
	Element 2: Recommended Decisions – Outcome and Written Quality

Number of cases reviewed	49
Rating for Element 1:	91%
Rating for Element 2:	95%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	94%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

This Category assesses whether the claims examiner (CE) conducted appropriate actions following a Remand Order or a Director’s Order that reopened a claim. Overall, the Jacksonville District Office performed well in this category. The team reviewed two elements in this category:

The reviewers identified ten deficiencies within the development element. Five of the ten deficiencies (concentrated within three cases) related to situations where the claims examiner should have sent the case to a Contract Medical Consultant (CMC) because the opinion of the treating physician was insufficient. Two errors involved situations where the claims examiner should have requested further clarification from the treating physician. The remaining three errors resulted from improper development taken following the issuance of a Director’s Order. In one instance, the claim required an IH referral that did not occur. In other instances there was unnecessary development taken given the existence of a causation presumption.

With respect to the outcome and written quality of recommended decisions, the reviewers identified 16 deficiencies. Four of the errors (concentrated within only two cases) related to inconsistencies with regard to whether the claim was recommended for acceptance or denial, or whether the denial was only under one part type versus both part types. Four errors (concentrated within two cases) related to a lack of clarity as to how the claims examiner reached findings and determinations. Two errors involved not attaching relevant documents (CMC, IH, TOX reports) to the RD. Two errors involved an incomplete history in the statement of the case section. The remaining four errors involved a range of issues including an incorrect authorized representative

indicated in the RD; lack of justification for a finding; a recommendation to deny a claim for neuropathy without properly considering lead exposure; and a situation where the reviewer noted that certain sections of the RD contained poor wording.

AR TEAM REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Karoline Anders, Kristina Green, Susan Kellner, Angela Wellborn, Deborah Howard, Carrie Turjan, Valerie Whittaker, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, William Pridy, Dante Silveri, Edith Adekoya, Towanda Tunsil	June 19, 2020

AR-1
Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: Jun 15, 2020 – June 19, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 – March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 6: ECS Coding Element 1: Recommended Decision Coding Element 2: Accepted Medical Condition Coding Element 3: Causation Path Coding
------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of cases reviewed	52
Rating for Element 1:	97%
Rating for Element 2:	97%
Rating for Element 3:	94%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	96%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

The results of this review revealed that the Jacksonville District Office is performing above the acceptable rating in this category, which judges the accuracy of Energy Compensation System (ECS) coding as it relates to Division of Energy Employee Occupational Illness Compensation (DEEOIC) District Office ECS actions. Of the 52 cases reviewed, the review team identified 11 total deficiencies.

Overall, the Jacksonville District Office exceeded the acceptable rating in this category, with an overall score of 96%.

The review team identified five deficiencies in recommended decision coding. Within the found deficiencies, the one trend identified includes ECS Coding reflecting different employment verification dates versus those identified within the written RD. An additional error found involved ECS Coding that did not match the outcome in the RD. In this instance, the district office recommended denying the medical condition due to negative causation. However, the claim examiner did not record a negative causation path in ECS. Instead, the claims examiner coded it as “reduce medical benefits on accepted condition”.

Within Accepted Medical Condition Coding, the reviewer noted a deficiency that applied to both indicator questions. For this case, the claims examiner coded the medical eligibility date in ECS as month later than the actual medical eligibility date. As a result, this error applies to both indicator questions because the medical condition was not coded correctly *and* the eligibility date is invalid.

All five deficiencies found under the causation path-coding element relate to missing causation paths. Four of the five were missing Part E causation paths and one was missing a Part B causation path.

Summarize Other Significant Findings:

The team noted no other significant findings.

AR TEAM REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Karoline Anders, Kristina Green, Susan Kellner, Angela Wellborn, Deborah Howard, Carrie Turjan, Valerie Whittaker, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, William Pridy, Dante Silveri, Edith Adekoya, Towanda Tunsil	June 19, 2020

AR-1
Accountability Review Findings

Dates of Review: June 15, 2020 - June 19, 2020

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2019 — March 31, 2020

Standard:	Category 7: Consequential Illness Acceptances Element 1: Development Element 2: Consequential Illness Letter/RD – Outcome and Written Quality
------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Number of cases reviewed	43
Rating for Element 1:	97%
Rating for Element 2:	91%
Acceptable rating:	90%
Overall Category Rating:	95%

Summarize Category (or Element) Findings:

The results of our review revealed that the Jacksonville District Office is performing above the acceptable rating in this category, which judges the outcome and written quality of a sample of Consequential Illness Letter Decisions. Of the 43 cases reviewed, the review team identified 10 total deficiencies.

The reviewers identified two deficiencies with respect to claim development and eight pertaining to outcome and written quality of decisions. Because there were so few deficiencies identified and those deficiencies varied, there were no discernable trends. The team noted three cases in which the Letter Decision accepting the consequential conditions did not contain two signature blocks as required by the Procedure Manual and two cases that contained typographical errors in the Letter Decision. Additionally, in one case the Claims Examiner solicited for, and accepted, a claim for conditions that were signs and symptoms of the accepted condition rather than separate medical conditions.

Summarize Other Significant Findings:

No other significant findings.

AR TEAM REVIEWER(s):	DATE:
Karoline Anders, Kristina Green, Susan Kellner, Angie Wellborn, Debra Howard, Carrie Turjan, Valarie Whittaker, Bernadette DeHerrera, Daniel Divittorio, William Pridy, Dante Silveri, Edith Adekoya, Towanda Tunsil	June 19, 2020