

IJA Claims - Summary of Responses

Issue:

AWCBC protocol is for jurisdictions to only submit those IJA claims in which they are adjudicating jurisdiction. There is considerable variability in the reporting of IJA claims across jurisdictions whereby double counting is likely occurring.

The majority (7) of jurisdictions include IJA claims that they both adjudicate on behalf of another Board and for which they are the reimbursing jurisdiction.

Resolve:

We would like to reach consensus as to the materiality of this issue and whether or not a recommendation to request alignment makes sense.

Action Item:

Can jurisdictions please provide, for the 2015 data submission, the number of IJA claims included and what percentage this represents of the total submission?

Summary of Responses:

Juris:	Response:
NL	<i>U/A</i>
PE	<i>U/A</i>
NS	In terms of IJA claims, we can only clearly identify the claims for NS workers that are being adjudicated in other provinces. Identifying the volume that we are adjudicating on behalf of other provinces (for their workers) is not easily doable / accurate on our system. The figure for the former population (adjudicated elsewhere) is 4 of the 6,056 time loss claims we reported in 2015. Or < 1%.
NB	<i>U/A</i>
QC	<i>U/A</i>
ON	<i>U/A</i>
MB	<i>U/A</i>
SK	Within our 2015 data submission, 23 claims were included that were adjudicated in Saskatchewan but with injuries that occurred elsewhere. This amounts to 0.3% of our total submission.

Juris:	Response:
AB	In Alberta, of the 26,325 lost-time claims submitted in 2015 only 0.3% are identified as IJA claims – this is considered immaterial.
BC	<i>U/A</i>
YT	<i>U/A</i>
NT/NU	Over the last 5 years we have had one IJA claim adjudicated in our jurisdiction that would be included in our submissions. Effectively 0%. We've adjusted our reporting to no longer include IJA claims entitled elsewhere.