

## DATA SUBMISSION AND ANALYTICS COMMITTEE MINUTES

### 1. Inter-committee outreach

This agenda item was addressed through 2: Communications Committee guest appearance

### 2. Guest appearance: Communications Committee

Andrew from the communications subcommittee came to speak with DSAC.

He spoke about the importance of the data that AWCBC collects and how the data has the potential to be really powerful and we need to tell the story in the data before someone else does because we will correctly interpret the data. The place for the NWISP committee in this is to make sure data is clean and we understand it – NWISP needs to produce good data to tell a story that makes a difference.

We discussed PTSD claims and how they don't always come through the door that way, coding is done right away but PTSD isn't always right away. It is difficult to compare PTSD claims as different occupations have different coverages between provinces.

The idea of making AOC data self-serve was discussed as open data is becoming the norm, it could be bad for AWCBC if we do not release. Risks of opening up the data were discussed and included the risk of misinterpretation, there would be so many caveats around the data that may get ignored, privacy and FOIP issues, AWCBC data is all of Canada and is not broken down jurisdictionally. There was an idea to create a limited pool of data that was very aggregated with only a few fields, if the requestor wanted anything more specific or further they would have to request it.

### 3. Follow up: PD Claims

The committee discussed the issue of inconsistent reporting of permanent disability (PD) claims, which was a follow up from last year. 3 jurisdictions that did not previously report PD claims now do (PE, NS, SK), ON to find out if they do and follow up.

The goal last year was to include PD claims, now we would like to identify them by flagging them. Further discussion included the possibility of adding a new field to the data, adding a new PD table, or the possibility of using the fatal flag field to identify. Adding a new field would take about 15-20 hours from the AOC developers (Jilal to follow up on the exact cost). Adding a new PD table was determined to be unnecessary.

AWCBC NWISP Committee 2018 Minutes  
May 16, 2018 and May 17, 2018

If the fatal flag column was used to identify PD claims (currently 0 represents a lost time claim and 8 represents a fatal claim), another number could be used to represent a PD claim. Need to deliberate further as to what the PD flag would mean: would it be a PD claim with lost time or just PD claims with no lost time.

Action Items:

- ON to follow up on whether or not they include PD claims in AWCBC submission.
- Discuss and agree on whether we will use a new field of use existing fatal flag field, as well as agree on a definition of the PD claims that will be flagged.
- AWCBC to investigate on cost of adding a new field or using existing field.

4. Follow up: IJA claims

From last meeting, 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). PEI and BC will now submit as agreed.

Action Item:

- ON will look into how they submit IJA claims.

5. Follow up: LTCs that become fatalities

Most jurisdictions count a fatality which occurs in the reference year as both a lost-time claim and a fatal claim. As of last year, three jurisdictions (NL, NB, NWT/NU) counted the claim only once according to the claim status at the time of reporting. From last meeting, 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 year in both submissions. This year NWT/NU now includes them in their submission and NL and NB will follow up.

Action Item:

- NL and NB to look into if/when they can include lost-time claims that become fatalities in the reference year in both submissions.

6. Follow up: Disallowed claims, Data presentation and interpretation, YoY threshold to data check

As of last year, there was no explanation on the AWCBC website regarding “disallowed” or “not accepted” claims and how this was reflected in AWCBC reporting as past data is not restated to reflect changes in claim decisions. This year, it was confirmed that AWCBC added a note to NWISP protocol and data interpretation noting that adjustments are not made to prior year data and that NWISP data may differ from jurisdictionally published reports.

AWCBC added a note specifically regarding definition of PD, IJA and Disallowed claims and AWCBC added year-over-year threshold comparisons to data check and NWISP submission summaries to ensure data is correct.

## 7. Standards and Conversion tables

At last year's meeting, it was generally agreed that it would be desirable for AWCBC to update the classification structures used for industrial and occupational classifications. Current reporting is done in SIC 1980 and NOC 2006 and the goal is to move to something more current. Internal coding will not be changing, however it was decided that NWISP submissions will align with Statistics Canada's coding standards.

Part of this process is the production and acceptance of concordance tables between the existing reporting structure and the new one. Ian built the concordance tables and they will be reviewed by Mike and David. 2018 will be reported using the new standards. Currently there are no footnotes on what the conversions happening in NWISP data and we should include a foot note.

### Action Items:

- Mike and David to review Ian's concordance.
- Upon completion of review final concordance tables will be sent to AWCBC and committee members for reference
- Add a footnote to NWISP data noting that different jurisdictions report differently and codes are converted to one standard.
- When Statistics Canada starts reporting in a new standard, so should AWCBC.

## 8. Follow up: NTL claims

Last year, the committee resolved to take preliminary steps towards a formal definition of no time loss (NTL) claims and to determine the feasibility of recording them on the AWCBC site.

Significant discussion was had around the definition of an NTL claims. Some boards do not code NTL claims and do not have a way to easily identify them. How would claims with no time loss but modified work be coded? This question lead to a discussion on lost time claims and who is including claims with modified work in their lost time claim count. It was determined that the jurisdiction may not have a consistent definition of a lost time claim in regards to the claim receiving modified work. It is needed to determine exactly how each jurisdiction flags a lost time claim.

AWCBC NWISP Committee 2018 Minutes  
May 16, 2018 and May 17, 2018

Regarding the possibility of report NLT claims to AWCBC, it was decided that there was not much value in this as NTL are rarely coded and the data would be too spotty to be of value.

Action Items:

- Each jurisdiction to clarify how they flag LTC claims and how they are counting MW— Survey of jurisdictions to be completed by Alberta for next year.

9. Ergonomic MSI coding

We discussed the results of the survey of how each jurisdiction reports on ergonomic MSIs. Jurisdictions report on MSIs more broadly in ways that do not necessarily align with this specific interpretation of an ergonomic MSI. Concluded that there wasn't an issue with an organization creating their own definition of ergonomic MSIs, and if requested individual jurisdictions could report according to that classification, while still using their own definitions of MSI more generally for their own purposes.