



be based on new exposure to employment factors or on the progression of an employment-related condition, without new exposure, resulting in greater permanent impairment.<sup>2</sup>

The Board finds that appellant has submitted new evidence in the form of the September 28, 2011 audiology report addressing a claim for an additional schedule award based on a progression of his employment-related condition rather than on the basis that the original schedule award was in error.<sup>3</sup> The Board has repeatedly held that a claimant may request a schedule award or increased schedule award based on evidence of a new exposure or medical evidence showing progression of an employment-related condition resulting in permanent impairment or increased impairment.<sup>4</sup> The Board finds, therefore, that OWCP erroneously issued a denial of appellant's request for reconsideration under the clear evidence of error standard. On remand, OWCP should review and develop the medical evidence and issue an appropriate decision regarding his request for an increased schedule award.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** the decision of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs dated January 24, 2012 is set aside and the case remanded for further development consistent with this order of the Board.

Issued: September 12, 2012  
Washington, DC

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

Colleen Duffy Kiko, Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

Patricia Howard Fitzgerald, Judge  
Employees' Compensation Appeals Board

---

<sup>2</sup> *R.L.*, Docket No. 09-1948 (issued June 29, 2010); *B.K.*, 59 ECAB 228 (2007); *Candace A. Karkoff*, 56 ECAB 622 (2005).

<sup>3</sup> *Rose V. Ford*, 55 ECAB 449 (2004).

<sup>4</sup> *See Linda T. Brown*, 51 ECAB 115 (1999); *Paul R. Reedy*, 45 ECAB 488 (1994); *see also B.K.*, *supra* note 2 (where it was evident that the claimant was seeking a schedule award based on new and current medical evidence, OWCP should have issued a merit decision on the schedule award claim rather than adjudicate an application for reconsideration).