

simply made a claim for a schedule award. He was not in receipt of schedule award benefits nor was OWCP attempting to terminate benefits. Appellant had no vested right to a schedule award under the fifth edition of the A.M.A., *Guides*. In *Harry D. Butler*,³ the Board noted that Congress delegated authority to the Director of OWCP regarding the specific methods by which permanent impairment is to be rated. Pursuant to this authority, the Director adopted the A.M.A., *Guides* as a uniform standard applicable to all claimants and the Board has concurred in the adoption.⁴ On March 15, 2009 he exercised authority to advise that as of May 1, 2009 all schedule award decisions of OWCP should reflect use of the sixth edition of the A.M.A., *Guides*.⁵ The applicable date of the sixth edition is as of the date the schedule award decision reached. It is not determined by either the date of maximum medical improvement or when the claim for such award was filed. Accordingly, the Board will affirm OWCP's December 27, 2010 decision.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the December 27, 2010 decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs is affirmed.

Issued: March 26, 2012
Washington, DC

Richard J. Daschbach, Chief Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Alec J. Koromilas, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

³ 43 ECAB 859 (1992).

⁴ *Id.* at 866.

⁵ FECA Bulletin No. 09-03 (issued March 15, 2009). The FECA Bulletin was incorporated in the Federal (FECA) Procedure Manual, Part 2 -- Claims, *Schedule Awards & Permanent Disability Claims*, Chapter 2.808.6(a) (January 2010).