



Connecting members, advancing knowledge / Relier les membres, développer les connaissances

**AWCBC All Committees Meeting  
National Work Injury Statistics (NWISP) Committee  
Executive Sponsor: Kurt Dieckmann  
Chair/Co-Chair: Pieter Lambooy / Julius Veracion**

Data Submission and Analytics Subcommittee (DSAC) Chair/Co-Chair: Norm Samaroo / Ian Preston  
Coding Technical Committee (CTC) Chair/Co-Chair: Diane Baker / Wes Armstrong

## 2017 MINUTES

### DATE AND PLACE

As part of the AWCBC All Committees Meeting, the NWISP Committee met on May 17, 2017 and May 18, 2017 at the Omni King Edward Hotel in Toronto.

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Norm Samaroo (AB), Laura Lee MacEwen (PE), Sylvie Blouin (QC), Pieter Lambooy (AB), Diane Baker (NB), Eve Cyr (AB), Julius Veracion (ON), Ian Preston (AB), Joseph Wong (BC), Mike McCormick (YT), Wes Armstrong (ON), Sebastien Letourneau (NWT/NU), Michelle Beavington (AWCBC), Veronica Marshall (AB), Phil Traverse (NB), Miriam Bartholomew (ON), Doug Roberts (NS), Lynn Bourgeois (SK), Leanne Buckler (NWT/NU), Adrienne Kernested (MB), Kurt Dieckmann (YT)

### OPENING REMARKS/INTRODUCTIONS

Prior to the group dividing into breakout meetings, all members noted above introduced themselves and described their background.

### MEETING MINUTES WILL BE BROKEN DOWN AS FOLLOWS:

1. All members noted above present for:
  - a) Coding Technical Committee (CTC) Debrief – *Page 2*
  - b) Data Submission and Analytics Committee (DSAC) Debrief – *Page 2-3*
  - c) Other Group Discussions – *Page 3-4*
2. Coding Technical Committee Minutes (only CTC members present) – *Page 5-8*
3. Data Submission and Analytics Committee Minutes (only DSAC members present) – *Page 9-13*

## **1. a) Coding Technical Committee (CTC) Debrief**

### 2016 Coding Exercise

Scores and errors reviewed. The CTC will make 12 recommendations for additions to the Coding Manual (add examples/explanations).

### 2017 Coding Exercise

The CTC will request five sample scenarios from the jurisdictions (rather than the usual 10 samples). The dates will be the same as the 2016 Coding Exercise.

### Equivalent terms

Rather than populating the Equivalent Terms section, the CTC recommends adding the words where coders will be searching for them - in the Coding Manual Alfa Index. For example, adding "car" to the Alpha Index to bring up the code for "automobile."

### CTC resolutions – split decisions

Very few issues result in no consensus. If they do, the Chair can decide what is recommended. The CTC could also continue the discussion or recommend a new code.

### Top three items for CTC

1. Coding Exercise
2. Update Coder's Reference Manual (update resolved issues)
3. Online Coder Training (review content/recommend new content)

## **1. b) Data Submission and Analytics Committee (DSAC) Debrief**

### Industry and Occupation standards

Boards will not be asked to change their internal reporting. Current reporting will overlap with Stats Canada.

### Permanent Disability (PD) Claims

Will get feedback from jurisdictions regarding how they define PD Claims.

### IJA Claims

Jurisdictions may be capturing these twice if including in claims reimbursed and claims adjudicated. There are not a large number of IJA claims.

### No Lost Time Claims

Not quite an appetite yet to publish externally. Internally, survey the Boards and ask how they define No Lost Time Claims.

### Reaching out to other internal committees

Give other committees a brief background of our data and reporting. Ask for their feedback. Explore what can be done with the data, such as Predictive Analytics.

## **1. c) Other Group Discussions:**

### 5-Year Plan

Pieter reviewed the 5-year plan and advised we are on-track and meeting all objectives. Next year, there will be a lengthy discussion as to what our next 5-year plan will look like. Michelle noted the AWCBC's Online Data Community (AOC) will be reviewed in its entirety regarding maintenance and will assess if external provider (Inovex Inc.) is still the right fit. Resource-wise, may need a budget. Kurt advised our 5-year plan should align with the AWCBC's Executive. Where do they see us going?

### New codes

A survey asking if jurisdictions had the capability of adding new codes had positive feedback. Jurisdictions felt they could add new codes, as long as it was not changing the coding structure. The CTC will recommend new codes through the usual issue resolution process. Jurisdictions can also create a new AOC issue to request a new code be created. It was discussed that a general clean-up of the Coding Manual would be helpful (adding codes, inactivating codes, using common language, etc.) Michelle advised if new codes were agreed upon, they could be added in January. CTC was asked to hang onto the recommended new codes and present all recommended new codes to the NWISP Committee, rather than asking the NWISP Committee to review them one by one as they are discussed during the issue resolution process.

### Coding Standard

Now that the AWCBC owns the coding standard, there is an opportunity for greater coding consistency by updating the coding manual. Kurt advised maintaining a coding standard is a lot of work. To maintain a standard you need stakeholder input, you must be certified as a standard-setting body, etc. It was decided Z795 would be maintained as an internal document. We are the stakeholders. We can assist the public with data interpretation. A name will be chosen for the now-AWCBC coding standard.

### PTSD

Mike started the discussion regarding how PTSD claims can be identified. How are they coded? What if there are psychological injuries plus physical injuries? Some jurisdictions have two Nature of Injury fields and two Part of Body fields, so they can capture psychological and physical injuries separately. For jurisdictions with only one Nature of Injury field and one Part of Body field, some of those jurisdictions are only capturing the physical injury, while some are capturing the physical injury and then changing it to the psychological injury when that is confirmed on file. QC, MB, YT are not coding PTSD. NB and AB are recoding to capture PTSD. ON can code both, but

prioritize PTSD as #1. NS leans towards capturing the physical injury. The committee expressed the possibility of going back to re-code. The CTC has been asked to recommend possible new codes regarding PTSD/psychological injuries (possible Nature of Injury, Part of Body and Event or Exposure codes). It is noted there is no history when a new code is created, but stress claims are not being coded consistently across all jurisdictions at this time. Target date for CTC to have a list of recommended new codes to present to the NWISP Committee: end of September 2017.

#### [Working group governance \(Coding Technical Committee voting rights\)](#)

##### Current procedure:

- 1) Jurisdiction creates a new issue on the AOC.
- 2) CTC members discuss the issue.
- 3) Majority decision is presented to the NWISP Committee as a recommended resolution (BC, PE, YT do not have a CTC member).
- 4) All jurisdictions are represented on the NWISP Committee. They have two weeks to respond to CTC's recommended resolution.
- 5) After the two-week NWISP Committee review, the issue is sent to the AWCBC to be resolved.
- 6) The AWCBC resolves the issue and makes any changes required to the Coding Manual, etc. (adding examples, linking the issue to specific codes, etc.)

The history of CTC members has always been experience with NWISP coding. Our most important criteria are consistency and accuracy. NWISP knowledge is important. The CTC member must understand the rules and guidelines before making a decision and must know how a decision can affect previous resolved issues, rules, guidelines, etc. Experience with work injury claims is important, so we are up to date with changes in patterns, which can be brought forth to the remainder of the CTC. There was a concern that end-users would not have a say in the decision-making process. It was noted that end-users do get a say (the NWISP committee has two weeks to review a CTC recommendation). Pieter advised jurisdictions should get at least one vote. The CTC chair can be the tie-breaker for non-resolvable issues. A voting member must have at least two years' experience with NWISP coding or one year on the NWISP Committee. The current issue resolution process will be reviewed.

#### [NWISP presentation to Prevention Committee](#)

Miriam and Diane presented an overview of the NWISP program and challenges with capturing work injury data (coding). The presentation was well received. They are also interested in things we do not capture, such as whether the worker had training.

#### [What's the future of NWISP?](#)

Continue updating the Online Coder Training. Kurt noted our orientation material is well put together. We will reach out to other committees. How can our coding become more consistent? What can we do with our data? We have a message; who do we contact? There was question whether we should have two meetings per year.

## 2. CODING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE (CTC) MINUTES

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Laura Lee MacEwen (PE), Diane Baker (NB), Eve Cyr (AB), Julius Veracion (ON), Joseph Wong (BC), Wes Armstrong (ON), Veronica Marshall (AB), Doug Roberts (NS), Lynn Bourgeois (SK), Leanne Buckler (NWT/NU), Adrienne Kernested (MB)

### 2016 Coding Exercise

Newfoundland was not able to participate. Overall scores were from 50% to 93%. National scores by variable were: Nature of Injury 87%, Part of Body 91%, Source of Injury 78%, Event or Exposure 77% and Secondary Source 78%. Cases where four or more jurisdictions scored less than 80% on the specific case: Case 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9.

BC had questions regarding Case 2, 6 and 9.

#### Case 2:

They questioned why the scenario was not coded so that Event would be 05900 Rubbed or abraded by friction or pressure, n.e.c. The CTC advised that we are capturing the fact that the worker suffered the avulsion while caught between the sliding van and the unspecified ground surface (and therefore Event is 03200 Compressed or pinched by rolling, sliding, or shifting objects).

#### Case 6:

They questioned why "co-worker, John" not was coded as an unspecified co-worker, since John could have been a supervisor. The CTC advised that the information on file noted that John was a co-worker and this co-worker could be identified (and therefore it would be coded as co-worker, n.e.c.)

#### Case 9:

They questioned why the severe laceration to the face would not be considered more severe than a fractured tooth. The CTC advised that fracture is in NOI Guideline (c) as a severe injury. In the scenario, the log would have hit the worker with a great force (log struck by Jet Boat, came through windshield and struck worker), so we know it was not just a chipped tooth.

Based on the 2016 Coding Exercise errors, the CTC will recommend the following additions to the Coding Manual (Diane will create a new AOC issue):

- 1) Degloving injury should be added as an Includes to NOI 03300 Avulsions.
- 2) Explanation should be added to NOI Guideline (c) to state different severity of one injury (e.g., burns) is captured in NOI Guideline (a).
- 3) Explanation should be added to Source Guideline (g) to state it excludes when the worker contacts more than one object, but the diagnosis is clearly caused by one of the objects - and therefore goes into Source Guideline (a).
- 4) Explanation should be added to 80000 Vehicle, uns to state it includes an unspecified vehicle when it is not known which Major Group it belongs in (highway, air, water, etc.)

- 5) Add includes “when co-worker cannot be identified” to Source 57200 Co-worker, former co-worker of injured or ill worker, uns. Add “when co-worker can be identified” to Source 57209 Co-worker, former co-worker of injured or ill worker, n.e.c.
- 6) Float plane should be added to Source 81120 Propeller-driven aircraft.
- 7) Explanation should be added to Event 21200 Sudden reaction when surprised, frightened, startled to explain it excludes a worker being surprised/frightened/ startled, but only being injured by a conscious action of moving their body (e.g., raising their arm to protect their head).
- 8) Add broken tooth, fractured tooth as Includes to NOI 01200 Fractures.
- 9) On the Coding Exercise, the correct answer for Jet Boat was 88900 Water Vehicle, n.e.c. in absence of it having its own code. CTC recommends changing the tile of 88300 Jet Skis to 88300 Jet skis, jet boats.
- 10) Add Includes to Event 45100 Collision – water vehicle accident to include collision with objects.
- 11) Add Includes to Event 22900 Overexertion, n.e.c. to include the multiple actions involved in moving, transferring, assisting.
- 12) Add example to Secondary Source Rule (I) to explain that when overexertion is to an object that is not a container, not attached to anything, etc., the SS is 99990 Unknown.

#### 2017 Coding Exercise

Since it is a lot of work for the jurisdictions to prepare 10 sample scenarios for CTC review and since the CTC may only choose one of their samples, the CTC will ask for five sample cases from each jurisdiction. The CTC will focus on scenarios that have not been chosen before or scenarios where jurisdictions had trouble on past exercises.

#### 2017 Coding Exercise dates:

Request sample cases by September 30, 2017

Start date: December 1, 2017

Completion date: March 30, 2018

Evaluation report distributed by April 30, 2018

#### Working Group Governance

Refer to Page 4.

#### PTSD Claims

Refer to Page 3.

### Possible New Codes

Refer to Page 3.

### Review old issues to determine validity of data

Diane and Michelle continue to work on this. Diane is reviewing the issues. Michelle is making any changes required (e.g., archiving issue no longer valid, updating coding manual, adding Includes list to coding manual, etc.). This will be ongoing for quite some time (nearly 700 issues in Reference Manual).

### New issues in progress

The CTC should document their rationale/research in their discussion threads for NWISP Committee review.

### CTC reviewed the following issues in progress:

ON201700 - PTSD from being trapped in an elevator.

The NWISP Committee has asked the CTC to recommend new codes for PTSD/stress claims. This issue will be put on hold until then.

NB201704 – Vanadium Exposure, only symptoms diagnosed.

If there was a diagnosis (e.g., bronchitis, migraine), the diagnosis would be coded. If there was a diagnosis such as “vanadium poisoning,” “toxic inhalation,” etc., it would go into 09590 Other poisoning and toxic effects, n.e.c. Since the only diagnosis on the medical is a symptom (hemoptysis), the CTC will recommend coding the symptom.

MB201702 – Inner ear effusion from coughing.

The police only arrived after the bear mace had already been dispersed; it therefore does not meet the criteria to be included in the violent act codes. CTC will recommend NOI be coded as 12650 Otitis media, POB 02003 Inner ear(s), Source 09220 Tear gas, mace. We will also recommend that bear mace be added as an Includes to Source 09220 Tear gas, mace. Event will be inhalation in confined space (as noted in the scenario).

### AOC system improvements

The CTC will continue to advise the AWCBC of suggested improvements. Things already changed include larger discussion boxes, the Issues open at the Resolution tab, so coders see the final documents (rather than any initial documents that were added to the Issue tab).

### Equivalent Terms

Refer to Page 2.

### CTC Recommended Resolution when decision is split

See Working Group Governance, Page 4.



### AOC Coder Training

Michelle and Amanda Banewski did the initial clean-up. Eve and Diane are currently reviewing the content. The CTC should start thinking of new content (coding exercise cases, PTSD scenarios, violence scenarios, etc.)

### Question brought forth to CTC

MB advised that once you complete the coding exercise and want to print your answers, you have to print page by page. Diane will ask the AWCBC if the whole exercise can be printed as one document.

MB asked if the CTC could review the wording under Event 11540 Fall from roof edge. Diane will create an issue for CTC review.

SK asked if 03200 title "Animal or insect bites" can have "human" added to the title. Diane will create an issue for CTC review.

### CTC workplan (processes and timelines)

#### ◦ 2017 Coding Exercise

*(Sample cases are required by September 30, 2017)*

- Diane - Request samples from jurisdictions in mid-July.  
Send reminders at the beginning and near the end of September.
- Diane – At the beginning of October, ask CTC to add suggested cases into the coding exercise section.
- Diane/CTC – Mid-October, have conference call to choose the 12 coding exercise cases.
- Diane/CTC – Have conference call in November to discuss the Answer Key.
- Diane – Prepare draft Answer Key and Rationale document for CTC review.
- CTC – Suggest changes to answer key by end of November.

*(Coding Exercise Start Date December 1, 2017)*

- Diane – Send email to Coding Exercise Admins asking they invite their coders.
- Diane – Enter the Answer Key and Rationale onto the AOC before end date.
- Diane – Send Coding Exercise End Date reminder first of February 2018.

*(Coding Exercise End Date March 30, 2018)*

- Diane – Distribute the evaluation reports/scores by April 30, 2018.

#### ◦ Review of old issues to determine validity of data

- Diane and Michelle – This is ongoing. Diane is reviewing the scenarios. The issues that are straightforward are sent to Michelle and she is making updates to the coding manual, etc. Some issues may require CTC review.

#### ◦ New Issues In Progress

- The CTC doesn't always meet the two-week turnaround time for a recommended resolution for new issues. Continue striving for a two-week turnaround?
- At times, a new question is added during the discussions. CTC members who have already responded to the issue must review the issue again and respond to the new question. Should another two weeks be given to respond to new questions?

*(2011 Meeting minutes says we are asked to have a recommended resolution in two weeks' time, but there is not set timeline).*



### 3. DATA SUBMISSION AND ANALYTICS COMMITTEE (DSAC) MINUTES

#### 1. Working Group Governance

Discussions took place regarding the Committee voting structure and voting rights in cases where decisions are required of the Committee. It was agreed that:

- Each jurisdiction holds **2** voting rights.
- A voting right is held by Committee members with **2 or more** years of experience working with NWISP and/or KSM data.
- A strong consensus of **2/3 (67%)** among those jurisdictions which submit votes will carry a motion. Jurisdictions who do not vote on first ballot will be polled a second time; thereafter, voting jurisdictions will pass/fail a motion.

#### 2. Permanent Disability (PD) Claims

The definition of a Permanent Disability (PD) claim from an AWCBC reporting perspective was reviewed and clarified. We reviewed which jurisdictions include PD claims in their submissions and discussed the feasibility non-reporting jurisdictions to do so.

For reporting purposes, AWCBC defines a Lost-Time Claim as “*any injury or occupational disease wherein a worker is compensated for a loss of wages or receives compensation for a permanent disability with or without any lost time in employment*”, whereby a PD claim “*is one in which there may be no time lost from work but the injury/condition significantly impacts a worker’s quality of life*”. Hearing loss claims are the most common example no lost-time PD claims.

Based on the survey results four jurisdictions identified as not including claims PD claims (PE, NS, ON, SK). SK agreed that it will include PD claims in its 2016 NWISP data submission. Ontario agreed to look into the matter and indicated that it should be able to include PD claims in its 2016 submission. They will confirm with the AWCBC in June. Subsequent to the May meeting, NS indicated that it will include PD claims in its 2016 submission.

Further discussion revolved around the feasibility of including a new data field in the NWISP record layout to flag PD claims. AWCBC indicated that this would likely require significant system changes and will follow-up with the AOC developers to determine cost and timeline. It was indicated that this would be an initiative for the 2017 submission.

#### Action Items:

- SK will include PDs in its 2016 submission.

- ON will look into include PDs and indicated that it should be able to for 2016 data.
- The Committee will follow up with PEI to see if they will be able to include PDs in their 2016 submissions.
- AWCBC will secure a quote from the AOC developers for adding a PD flag in the Lost-Time claim record layout.

### 3. IJA claims

Most jurisdictions include IJA claims that they both adjudicate and reimburse. The NWISP definition calls for IJA claims to be submitted by the adjudicating jurisdiction, not the reimbursing jurisdiction. As such, there is some double counting in the NWISP submissions. The number of IJA claims is very small and materially insignificant in relation to the overall volume of claims submitted.

The cost/benefits of having jurisdictions flag IJA claims and remove reimbursed claims from the annual submission was discussed and it was agreed that jurisdictions that can differentiate between IJA claims reimbursed vs adjudicated will only include IJA claims that they adjudicate in their NWISP submission (per definition). Jurisdictions that are unable to do so will indicate in their submission that IJAs are not reported as per definition. A footnote should be added in the data interpretation indicating which jurisdictions double count IJA claims and that the numbers are statistically insignificant.

#### Action Items:

- SK and QC can identify IJA claims that they reimburse and should be able to submit 2016 according to the definition.
- ON and NB will look into whether they can distinguish between adjudicated and reimbursed IJA claims.
- NL, PEI, NS, MD, BC, NWT/NU will be contacted to see if they can exclude IJA claims they reimburse in their 2016 submissions.
- AWCBC will add a footnote in the data interpretation.

### 4. Lost Time Claims that become Fatalities

The definition of an NWISP fatality was reviewed and re-confirmed as one that is *"recorded during the year when the death was accepted by a Board/Commission as compensable, not the year when the incident causing the death occurred. Note: This is consistent with the definition used for the National Work Injuries Statistics Program (NWISP)."*

Further discussion centered on whether or not we continue to count lost-time claims which become accepted fatalities in both the lost-time and fatality submissions. Most jurisdictions count a fatality which occurs in the reference year as both a lost-time claim and a fatal claim, including both delayed fatalities, where death occurs after initial injury/exposure, and claims where the date of death occurs on the date of injury (i.e. in Alberta a fatal claim is automatically a lost-time claim). These are flagged accordingly in the lost-time submission. Three jurisdictions (NL, NB, NWT/NU) count the claim only once according to the claim status at the time of reporting. It was agreed that we continue reporting as per the current standard and that NL, NB, and NWT/NU will attempt to include lost-time claims that become fatalities in the reference in both submissions.

**Action Item:**

- NL, NB, NWT/NU will be contacted to see if they can include both claims in their submissions.

## 5. Disallowed Claims

There currently is no explanation regarding “disallowed” or “not accepted” claims and how this is reflected in AWCBC reporting. It was agreed that NWISP submissions will not be restated to reflect changes in claim decision status subsequent to submission and that a note be added to NWISP protocols and to the data interpretation narrative indicating no adjustment is made to reflect subsequently disallowed claims. Also to be highlighted in the data interpretation is that NWISP data may not directly match information provided by individual jurisdictions in their Annual Reports, Statistical Supplements, etc. given that for jurisdictional purposes data definitions may not match those used by the AWCBC.

**Action Item:**

- AWCBC will add a note to NWISP protocol and data interpretation noting that adjustments are not made to prior year data to capture changes in claim decision status and that NWISP data may differ from jurisdictionally published reports as different data definitions may be used.

## 6. Standards and conversion tables

Significant discussion was had regarding industry and occupational standards used by various jurisdictions and that reported by the AWCBC. It was generally agreed that it would be desirable for jurisdictions move to one common standard for submission purposes. This does not entail that internal system changes be made by each jurisdiction, but that the Committee provide concordance to one industry and one occupational standard based on each individual jurisdictions current coding standard. The most recent Statistics Canada standards are NOC 2016 and NAICS 2017, though it was agreed that we do not necessarily need to keep pace with Statistics Canada. It was agreed that we attempt to move all jurisdictions to NOC 2011 and NAICS 2017 ideally for the 2017 data submission. This will require a significant

amount of work on behalf of the Committee in setting up conversion tables for each jurisdiction, and feedback will be sought on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis to reach agreement that concordances are appropriate and reasonable.

**Action Item:**

- Alberta will spearhead the development work with a timeline for completion in April 2018.

## **7. Data presentation and interpretation**

It was agreed that we highlight to users of publically available AWCBC statistical reports and publication tables that data may vary from that published by individual jurisdictions given that due to the requirements of individual jurisdictions, definitions may vary from that used by the AWCBC.

**Action Item:**

- AWCBC will add a note to NWISP protocol and data interpretation that jurisdictional reporting may vary from AWCBC reporting and that this could impact comparability, notably differences in jurisdictional definitions and reporting of Permanent Disability, IJA, and Disallowed claims.

## **8. Data “analysis” – Where do we start? What does that look like?**

Preliminary discussion was had on moving the Committee forward in terms of providing more advanced value-added analysis with the intent of hoping to answer the “why” and not just the “what”. Kirk noted that from a prevention perspective, there is particular interest. However, it was generally agreed that the current data is somewhat restrictive in terms of what can be done and that we first understand what other members want and need before expending resources to provide analysis that may not be of interest or use. The Committee will touch base with other AWCBC committees and report back by the May 2018 meeting.

Furthermore, the types of meaningful analytics that may be requested most likely would require the incorporation of supplemental information (i.e. cost, duration, location of incident, return-to-work outcomes, sociodemographic data, etc.) and it was recognized that AWCBC Board of Directors approval would be required should the Committee endeavor to head down that road.

**Action Item:**

- The Committee will follow up with each AWCBC Committee informing them of types of information and data NWISP has available and to consult on what would be of value and importance from their perspective(s). Norm will work with the AWCBC on drafting an information package to be reviewed by the NWISP Chairs and Executive Sponsor prior to circulating.

## 9. No Time Loss (NTL) Claims

There was a discussion on No Lost-Time Claims (NTL). Only a handful of jurisdictions code these types of claims, and for those that do it was agreed that it may be beneficial to share results with the rest of the Committee to initiate conversations about whether NWISP data should be expanded to include NTLs. Different jurisdictions also have different interpretations of what constitutes an NTL claim.

### Action Items:

- Norm will work with Sebastian to establish a draft National definition of what comprises an NTL claim and will follow-up with the jurisdictions that code these types of claims to understand how they are defined.
- For those jurisdictions that do code NTL claims, the Committee will follow-up and see if we can compile data for 2016 and forward on an “informal/off-line” and begin to look the potential value in possibly expanding NWISP to include these for official reporting.
- AWCBC will secure a quote from AOC developers for adding (but not publishing) NTLs on the AOC.

## 10. Other

### Action Item:

- AWCBC to investigate adding year-over-year threshold comparisons to Data check, as well as NWISP Submission Summaries.