



Date: February 8, 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR: RACHEL P. LEITON  
Director  
Division of Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation  
Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

THROUGH: JOHN VANCE  
Chief, Branch of Policy  
Division of Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation  
Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

FROM: CHRISTOPHER R. ARMSTRONG, MD, MPH, FACPM, FAsMA  
Medical Director  
Division of Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation  
Office of Workers' Compensation Programs

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C.R. Armstrong", is written over the "FROM:" section of the memorandum.

SUBJECT: Audit of Third Quarter (FY 2016) Contract Medical Consultant  
(CMC) Reports

I conducted an audit of contract medical consultant (CMC) reports completed during the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2016 to ensure that appropriate medical specialists are being assigned to advise the Government, and that the reports we receive are well-reasoned, complete, and responsive to the needs of our claims examiners. My audit included a review of 42 randomly selected CMC reports for four distinct services: causation file reviews, impairment ratings, second opinions, and supplemental file reviews. I used a checklist to assess the reports for adherence to contract requirements and program policies promulgated in the *Procedure Manual* and in the *Medical Consultant Handbook*.

The audit included 15 causation file reviews, 11 impairment ratings, four second opinions, and 12 supplemental file reviews (clarification of diagnosis, treatment, or test results).

Four of the 42 reports clearly exceeded expectations. They were thorough, well-reasoned, informative, helpful and, in the case of the reports written by [REDACTED], MD, scholarly. Thirty of the reports met expectations. Eight of the reports need improvement, including three, which demonstrated inappropriate use of the tables in *AMA Guides™ to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, Fifth Edition* or a lack of understanding of our policy on apportionment; two, which failed to apply the "as likely as not" standard; two, which failed to address all of the

questions posed by the claims examiner; and one, which included conditions in addition to those we accepted in the claimant's impairment rating. Only one of the eight reports that need improvement might have resulted in an impairment rating, which was adverse to the claimant.

#### Follow-Up Action Plan

Dionne Perry, the Contracting Officer's Representative, will notify the Contractor of the reports assessed as exceeding expectations and the deficiencies in the reports assessed as needing improvement. The Contractor will be given the opportunity to respond, in writing, to each deficiency.