

**AWCBC All Committees Meeting**  
**National Work Injury Statistics (NWISP) Committee**  
**Data Submission and Analytics Subcommittee (DSAC)**

**Agenda Items**

**1. Working Group Governance**

Issue: DSAC (the Committee) is comprised of data experts representing all 12 Boards and Commissions whose principal purpose is to provide a forum for jurisdictional partners to engage in discussions and knowledge sharing relating to the preparation, submission, and presentation of NWISP data. Additionally, the committee will strive to promote research and education focusing on matters of interest relating to workplace injuries and other emerging trends within the context of NWISP data content and usage.

In pursuit of its objectives, it is anticipated that the Committee will be required to reach jurisdictional consensus on matters relating to data submission protocols, data definitions, reporting standards, research directions, etc. As such, it is desirable that the Committee have in place an agreed upon voting framework that guides the decision making process.

Resolve: In cases where decisions are required of the Committee, it is agreed that:

- Each jurisdiction has a maximum of 2 voting rights.
- A voting right is held by Committee members with 2 or more years' experience working with NWISP and/or KSM data.
- A strong consensus of 8/12<sup>th</sup> (67%) will carry a motion.

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

Issue: 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.

Based on the NWISP Committee Survey results, most jurisdictions (7) include PD claims in their data submission, 4 do not.

Resolve: In keeping with our mandate of achieving consistency for National reporting and given that the majority of jurisdictions currently include PD claims in the annual data submission, it is desirable to have the 4 jurisdictions which currently do not submit PD claims to do so moving forward for AWCBC

reporting purposes. Additionally, would there be value in flagging these claims as PD in the data submission?

Are there any barriers (system or otherwise) that could potentially limit this goal? If achievable this would be on a move-forward basis with no adjustment to prior year data and preferably for the 2017 submission.

**Action Item:** Can jurisdictions please provide approximately how many Permanent Disability claims they had for 2015 to assess the magnitude of the non-reporting.

Please respond to Michelle and Norm by April 30.

### 3. IJA claims

**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.

In Alberta, of the **26,325** lost-time claims submitted in 2015 only **0.3%** are identified as IJA claims – this is considered immaterial.

**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.

Please respond to Michelle and Norm by April 30.

### 4. Lost Time Claims that become Fatalities

**Issue:** Whether or not to count lost-time claims which become accepted fatalities in both the lost-time and fatality submissions. A more formalized definition of what constitutes a fatality is to be discussed as well.

**Resolve:** To agree that the current reporting protocol is acceptable. Most jurisdictions (8) count both the lost-time claim and the fatality as per the current AWCBC protocol. Furthermore, the current record submission layout for lost-time claims has a field that indicates if the claim is also included in the fatal file for the year.

Our recommendation is to continue reporting as per the current standard and discuss the feasibility of non-standard reporting jurisdictions to convert to standard.

We would like to revisit and reconfirm understanding with all jurisdictions the AWCBC/NWISP definition of a compensable fatality, where a fatality 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).*"

### 5. Disallowed Claims

Issue: There currently is no explanation regarding “disallowed” or “not accepted” claims and how this is reflected in AWCBC reporting..

Resolve: That data submitted to the AWCBC is not to be restated to reflect changes in claim decision status subsequent to submission and that a footnote be added to all official AWCBC statistical reports stating such.

## 6. Standards and conversion tables

Issue: There are a number of acceptable reporting standards for Industry and Occupation. A consistent reporting framework across jurisdictions is desirable.

Resolve: To determine if there is an appetite and capacity for jurisdictions to move to a common standard for reporting.

*Industry*: Statistics Canada recently released NAICS 2017 as a more representative classification of industries across current North American economies. We would like to discuss the possibility of jurisdictions moving to the most recent iteration or the feasibility using concordance tables to facilitate a conversion to the one standard.

*Occupation*: Statistics Canada recently released NOC 2017 as a more representative classification of industries across current North American economies. We would like to discuss the possibility of jurisdictions moving to the most recent iteration or the feasibility using concordance tables to facilitate a conversion to the one standard.

## 6. Data presentation and interpretation

Issue: There is some variability in the standards to which jurisdictions report to. Perhaps we can enhance the “readability” of information published by the AWCBC through additional commentary footnotes provided to published reports.

Resolve: Arrive at consensus on if and what type of additional information should be provided in published reports to improve user readability and interpretation. Areas for discussion include:

- When jurisdictions code
- Which jurisdictions don't include PD claims (related: Item 1)
- Which Standards each jurisdiction code to (related: Item 5)
- How jurisdictions code IJA claims (related: Item 2)

As is, the statistical data lack context for an unfamiliar user. Highlighting differences in reporting standards will provide a starting point.

Moving forward vision: Incorporate context re: differences in key legislation effecting claims, variable economic conditions across jurisdictions, changing understanding of injury and disease may provide more value-added context.

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

Issue: A substantial amount of data is gathered each year by the AWCBC and many descriptive reports are published, formally and ad hoc. The value-added is in understanding what end-users are looking for and responding proactively to their needs through meaningful trend analysis

Resolve: Understand who the primary users of NWISP data are through a content-based evaluation of AWCBC Data Requests. Discuss if there is value in selecting various topics/research interests/etc., perhaps on a quarterly basis, that are thematically strong and recommend joint collaboration with jurisdictions to produce a “*National Trends*” research briefs that is based on NWISP data and potentially enhanced by incorporating additional jurisdictional information (such as return-to-work outcomes, cost benefits, risk populations, relationship to the economy, etc.).

**8. Work Plan 2017** – Committee deliverables for 2017 (TBD).

**Time permitting:**

**9. NWISP data usage**

Issue: Expanding NWISP borders.

Resolve: Review who the primary users of NWISP data are and if there are groups, organizations, firms, etc. who may benefit or find interest in our data and to whom we can reach out to. What mechanism(s) are in place to promote the NWISP and do we harness those mechanisms.

**10. No Time Loss (NTL) Claims**

Issue: NTL claims constitute the bulk of worker compensation claims. While these tend to be less costly than lost-time claims they are work-related injuries nonetheless that impact the worker and employer, the latter of who often implement modified work to limit the burden to the worker and employer premium rates resulting from a lost time incident.

Resolve: Discuss the value and feasibility of reporting NTL claims as part of the annual deliverable.