

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Workers' Compensation Programs
Division of Energy Employees Occupational
Illness Compensation
Washington, DC 20210



Date: June 9, 2022

Memorandum For: Christy Long
National Administrator for Field Operations, DEEOIC

Douglas Pennington
Deputy Director, DEEOIC

From: Rachel D. Pond
Director, DEEOIC

Subject: 2022 Payment Processing Review

This memorandum serves as the final notice to the district offices regarding the results of the 2022 Payment Processing Review. Following the preliminary findings, the National Administrator of Field Operations submitted comments for all district offices (DO) on May 16, 2022. The Payment Processing Review Team leaders reviewed those comments, modified scoring outcomes where appropriate and provided a written explanation of the amended findings. The National Office (NO) did not submit any comments in response to the preliminary findings. All scoring for the 2022 fiscal year Payment Processing Review is now final.

Attached to this memorandum are the final scores for each of the district offices for the three categories: Payment Processing, Payment Cancellations and Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities. Also attached is the final score for the category Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities. Overall, the offices performed exceptionally well and at an acceptable level for all categories. In almost all instances, the offices vastly exceeded the 90% threshold for acceptable performance and three district offices achieved scores of 100% in at least one category. I commend both you and your staff for attaining such outstanding scores which truly reflects all the offices' commitment to quality and producing accurate outcomes.

As the offices performed at an acceptable level in all four of the payment categories, no corrective action plans are required. My expectation is that the offices will continue to perform at this stellar level and take the necessary steps to correct the few identified areas of weakness.

I look forward to working with you to maintain and exceed our performance expectations for the upcoming fiscal year. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this memorandum or the attachments, please contact me at 202-354-9507.

cc: Christopher Godfrey, Director, OWCP
Annette Prindle, Deputy Administrator for Field Operations, DEEOIC
Cara Williams, Management Analyst, DEEOIC
Nicole Dennis, Performance Management Branch Chief, DEEOIC
Lance Lanier, Medical Benefits Branch Chief, DEEOIC
John Vance, Policy Branch Chief, DEEOIC
Amy DeRocher, Performance Auditing Unit Supervisor, DEEOIC
Victoria Lewis, Medical Bill Processing Unit Manager, DEEOIC
Charles Bogino, Policy Unit Supervisor, DEEOIC
Kristina Green, Policy Unit Supervisor, DEEOIC
Karen Spence, Director, Cleveland District Office
Michael Kaus, Assistant Director, Cleveland District Office
Ronnie Sanchez, Director, Denver District Office
Kathryn Smythe-Saunders, Assistant Director, Denver District Office
Julia Draper, Assistant Director, Jacksonville District Office
Joleen Smith, Director, Seattle District Office
Charles Elsen, Assistant Director, Seattle District Office

Enclosures: Overall Summary by Category for ALL District Offices
Overall Summary by Category for Each District Office
Final AR-1 by Category for ALL District Offices
Final AR-1 by Category for Each District Office

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 1: Payment Processing | 204 | 201 | 3 | 99.77 | 1300 | 3 | 533 | 1836 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 1: Payment Processing | 51 | 50 | 1 | 99.69 | 322 | 1 | 136 | 459 |

Overall Summary Report

Review: Payment Processing Review (2022)
Office: DEN

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 1: Payment Processing | 51 | 51 | 0 | 100.00 | 331 | 0 | 128 | 459 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 1: Payment Processing | 51 | 49 | 2 | 99.38 | 318 | 2 | 139 | 459 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 1: Payment Processing | 51 | 51 | 0 | 100.00 | 329 | 0 | 130 | 459 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 2: Payment Cancellation | 78 | 73 | 5 | 94.44 | 85 | 5 | 66 | 156 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 2: Payment Cancellation | 27 | 26 | 1 | 97.06 | 33 | 1 | 20 | 54 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 2: Payment Cancellation | 16 | 14 | 2 | 89.47 | 17 | 2 | 13 | 32 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 2: Payment Cancellation | 21 | 20 | 1 | 95.24 | 20 | 1 | 21 | 42 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 2: Payment Cancellation | 14 | 13 | 1 | 93.75 | 15 | 1 | 12 | 28 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments - DO Responsibilities | 164 | 163 | 1 | 99.88 | 851 | 1 | 132 | 984 |

Exhibit 3
Overall Summary Report

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments - DO Responsibilities | 41 | 41 | 0 | 100.00 | 214 | 0 | 32 | 246 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments - DO Responsibilities | 41 | 41 | 0 | 100.00 | 210 | 0 | 36 | 246 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments - DO Responsibilities | 41 | 40 | 1 | 99.53 | 211 | 1 | 34 | 246 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments - DO Responsibilities | 41 | 41 | 0 | 100.00 | 216 | 0 | 30 | 246 |

| Categories | Cases Reviewed | Acceptable Cases | Unacceptable Cases | Category Score | Yes's | No's | N/A's | Filled Indicators |
|--|----------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|
| Category 4: Expedited and Exception Payments - NO Responsibilities | 164 | 163 | 1 | 99.70 | 327 | 1 | 0 | 328 |

AR-1

Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: All District Offices

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 28, 2022

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

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 204 |
| Acceptable rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 99.77% |

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 the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

Overall, a review of the sampled payments revealed outstanding performance in both the quantity and quality of the work.

The minimal deficiencies identified in this category are random in nature and do not represent any nationwide trend or pattern. All four of the District Offices processed the selected payments with very few errors, if any. All District Offices made payments to the correct payee account and in the amount specified in the final decision and the Form EN-20. The few errors found were related to typographical errors when indexing final payment documents in OIS or failure to document verification of bank routing numbers through the Federal Reserve Board website.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 10, 2022 |

AR-1

Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 28, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 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: | 99.69% |

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 the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

With respect to the Cleveland District Office, the reviewers identified one error. This error relates to lack of documentation of verification of the bank routing number through the Federal Reserve Board website. Despite this error, the District Office still performed admirably well with a final score of 99.69%.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 10, 2022 |

AR-1

Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 28, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 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: | 100% |

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 the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

With respect to the Denver District Office, the reviewers did not identify any errors or significant trends.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 10, 2022 |

AR-1

Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 28, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 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: | 99.38% |

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 the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

With respect to the Jacksonville District Office, the reviewers identified two errors. These errors relate to typographical errors in the proper payment description identifiers in the description field when indexing final payment documents in OIS. One error involves an incorrect first four letters of the payee’s last name and the other error involves an incorrect last four numbers of the payee SSN. Despite these errors, the District Office still performed admirably well with a final score of 99.38%.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 10, 2022 |

AR-1

Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Seattle District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 28, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 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: | 100% |

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 the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

With respect to the Seattle District Office, the reviewers did not identify any errors or significant trends.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 10, 2022 |

AR-1
Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: All District Offices

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 2: Payment Cancellation Element 1: Reason for Cancellation |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 78 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90 |
| Rating for Review: | 94.44 |

Describe Findings:

The Payment Cancellation category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments which were canceled within the review period and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the payments in a manner that ensures quality customer service. The payments issued after cancellation were monetarily accurate. As such, the deficiencies noted in this category are not a reflection of poor payment quality or control and did not negatively impact the amount of the eventual payments issued. Instead, the deficiencies noted in this category represent instances where avoidable delays occurred during payment issuance and indicate opportunities for improvement in how to ensure that claimants can receive the compensation to which they are entitled in a more prompt manner.

District Offices performed in accordance with the current procedures in 94.44% of the cases reviewed. Issues that resulted in payment cancellations include a data entry error and lack of clarification of account discrepancies between the most recently received EN-20 and any prior EN-20s of record.

In one case, the account information that the claims examiner and/or fiscal officer entered in the Energy Compensation System (ECS) did not match the data indicated on the verified EN-20. This data entry error resulted in payment cancellation. Correct payment ultimately issued with corrected data in ECS accurately after cancellation. Careful data entry in these cases would have eliminated the delayed compensation to the claimant.

The reviewers also identified 4 cases in which correct payments may have been issued to the claimant more expeditiously if checking and/or savings account numbers or type errors on the EN-20 had been identified and remedied by executing a comparison to previous payment data prior to issuing the payment. In these cases, cancellation may have

been avoided had the DEEOIC personnel contacted the payee to clarify the discrepant account information and/or obtained a corrected EN-20 prior to payment authorization.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1
Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Standard: | Category 2: Payment Cancellation Element 1: Reason for Cancellation |
|-----------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 27 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 97.06% |

Describe Findings:

The Payment Cancellation category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments canceled within the review period and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the payments in a manner that ensures quality customer service. The payments issued after cancellation were monetarily accurate. As such, the deficiency noted in this category is not a reflection of poor payment quality or control and did not negatively impact the amount of the eventual payments issued. Instead, the deficiency noted in this category represents an instance where an avoidable delay occurred during payment issuance and indicates opportunity for improvement in how to ensure that claimants can receive the compensation to which they are entitled in a prompt manner.

The Cleveland District Office performed in accordance with the current procedures in 97.06% of the cases reviewed. The payment cancellation was due to a lack of clarification of account discrepancies between the most recently received EN-20 and any prior EN-20s of record.

The reviewers identified one case in which correct payment may have been issued to the claimant more expeditiously if checking and/or savings account numbers or type errors on the EN-20 had been identified and remedied by executing a comparison to previous payment data prior to issuing the payment. In this case, cancellation may have been avoided had the DEEOIC personnel contacted the payee to clarify the discrepant account information and/or obtained a corrected EN-20 prior to payment authorization.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1
Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 2: Payment Cancellation Element 1: Reason for Cancellation |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 16 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 89.47% |

Describe Findings:

The Payment Cancellation category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments which were canceled within the review period and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the payments in a manner that ensures quality customer service. The payments issued after cancellation were monetarily accurate. As such, the deficiencies noted in this category are not a reflection of poor payment quality or control and did not negatively impact the amount of the eventual payments issued. Instead, the deficiencies noted in this category represent instances where avoidable delays occurred during payment issuance and indicate opportunities for improvement in how to ensure that claimants can receive the compensation to which they are entitled in a more prompt manner.

The Denver District Office performed in accordance with the current procedures in 89.47% of the cases reviewed. Both payment cancellations were due to a lack of clarification of account discrepancies between the most recently received EN-20 and any prior EN-20s of record.

The reviewers identified two cases in which correct payments may have been issued to the claimant more expeditiously if checking and/or savings account numbers or type errors on the EN-20 had been identified and remedied by executing a comparison to previous payment data prior to issuing the payment. In these cases, cancellation may have been avoided had the DEEOIC personnel contacted the payee to clarify the discrepant account information and/or obtained a corrected EN-20 prior to payment authorization.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1
Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 2: Payment Cancellation Element 1: Reason for Cancellation |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 21 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 95.24% |

Describe Findings:

The Payment Cancellation category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments which were canceled within the review period and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the payments in a manner that ensures quality customer service. The payments issued after cancellation were monetarily accurate. As such, the deficiencies noted in this category are not a reflection of poor payment quality or control and did not negatively impact the amount of the eventual payments issued. Instead, the deficiencies noted in this category represent instances where avoidable delays occurred during payment issuance and indicate opportunities for improvement in how to ensure that claimants can receive the compensation to which they are entitled in a more prompt manner.

The Jacksonville District Office performed in accordance with the current procedures in 95.24% of the cases reviewed. In one case, the account information that the claims examiner and/or fiscal officer entered in the Energy Compensation System (ECS) did not match the data indicated on the verified EN-20. This data entry error resulted in payment cancellation. Correct payment was ultimately issued when the data was corrected and entered in the ECS accurately after cancellation. Careful data entry in this case would have eliminated the delayed compensation to the claimant.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1
Payment Processing Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Seattle District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 2: Payment Cancellation Element 1: Reason for Cancellation |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 14 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 93.75% |

Describe Findings:

The Payment Cancellation category identifies a random sampling of compensation payments which were canceled within the review period and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the payments in a manner that ensures quality customer service. The payments issued after cancellation were monetarily accurate. As such, the deficiencies noted in this category are not a reflection of poor payment quality or control and did not negatively impact the amount of the eventual payments issued. Instead, the deficiencies noted in this category represent instances where avoidable delays occurred during payment issuance and indicate opportunities for improvement in how to ensure that claimants can receive the compensation to which they are entitled in a more prompt manner.

The Seattle District Office performed in accordance with the current procedures in 93.75% of the cases reviewed. In one case, the account information that the claims examiner and/or fiscal officer entered in the Energy Compensation System (ECS) did not match the data indicated on the verified EN-20. This data entry error resulted in payment cancellation. Correct payment was ultimately issued when the data was corrected and entered in the ECS accurately after cancellation. Careful data entry in this case would have eliminated the delayed compensation to the claimant.

| REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – DO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: All District Offices

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Standard: | Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments-DO Responsibilities Element 1: Form EN-20 Accuracy |
|-----------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 164 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 99.88% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment to the National Office for processing of the payment and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the referral in accordance with established policy and procedures. The sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities and the sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities is identical.

Overall, a review of the sampled payments authorized by the District Offices and referred to the National Office for processing demonstrated an outstanding performance in this category.

All four of the District Offices referred the selected expedited or exception payments properly and in accordance with procedure with only one error noted.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – DO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Cleveland District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Standard: | Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments-DO Responsibilities Element 1: Form EN-20 Accuracy |
|-----------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 41 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 100% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment to the National Office for processing of the payment and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the referral in accordance with established policy and procedures. The sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities and the sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities is identical.

With respect to the Cleveland District Office, the reviewers did not identify any errors or significant trends

| | |
|---|--------------|
| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(S): | DATE: |
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – DO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Denver District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Standard: | Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments-DO Responsibilities Element 1: Form EN-20 Accuracy |
|-----------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 41 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 100% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment to the National Office for processing of the payment and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the referral in accordance with established policy and procedures. The sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities and the sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities is identical.

With respect to the Denver District Office, the reviewers did not identify any errors or significant trends

| | |
|---|--------------|
| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – DO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Jacksonville District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments-DO Responsibilities Element 1: Form EN-20 Accuracy |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 41 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 99.52% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment to the National Office for processing of the payment and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the referral in accordance with established policy and procedures. The sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities and the sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities is identical.

Overall, the Jacksonville District Office authorized expedited and exception payments and referred these payments to the NO properly. The reviewers identified one error in which the DO completed the EPPTF with the incorrect account type selecting “checking” while the claimant indicated “savings” on the EN-20.

The reviewers did not identify any other errors or significant trends.

| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – DO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: Seattle District Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 3: Expedited and Exception Payments-DO Responsibilities Element 1: Form EN-20 Accuracy |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 41 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 100% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment to the National Office for processing of the payment and evaluates whether the District Offices processed the referral in accordance with established policy and procedures. The sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – DO Responsibilities and the sample for Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities is identical.

With respect to the Seattle District Office, the reviewers did not identify any errors or significant trends

| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |

AR-1

Expedited and Exception Payment Processing – NO Responsibilities Review Findings

Dates of Review: May 3, 2022 – May 6, 2022

Office Reviewed: National Office

Review Period: April 1, 2021 – March 31, 2022

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Standard: | Category 4: Expedited and Exception Payments-NO Responsibilities Element 1: NO processing of expedited and exception payment requests |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Number of Cases Reviewed: | 164 |
| Acceptable Rating: | 90% |
| Rating for Review: | 99.70% |

Describe Findings:

The Expedited and Exception Payments – NO Responsibilities category identifies cases during the review period where the District Office referred an expedited or exception payment request to the National Office (NO) which was paid by the NO within the review period and evaluates whether the NO processed the payments in accordance with established policy and procedures.

Overall, the NO processed the expedited and exception payments in accordance with the current procedures with only one error identified, which was the result of not entering the final payment documents in OIS.

| PAYMENT PROCESSING TEAM REVIEWER(s): | DATE: |
|---|--------------|
| Jennifer Pouliot, Teresa Barrington, Daniel Divittorio, Melvin Teal and Solomon Toweh | May 6, 2022 |