

## **Addendum A**

Under the terms of the contract for EAMS, DWC is limited to certain design changes. Instead of designing a system from the ground up, DWC purchased commercial off the shelf software (COTS) that provided the basic framework for the design of EAMS. In doing so, DWC started with in excess of 800 requirements that described the processes as well as listed the types of information that DWC must maintain. All software applications require a manner or method of inputting this information and DWC selected the two that best served our intent of being paperless: scanned in forms or electronically fillable forms. With this understanding EAMS design was based off of the COTS applications that were submitted as part of the contract.

The software applications that comprise the main EAMS interface take the information in a specific methodology, and although the computer form (OCR form) may appear to request more information than the current form, it does not. The only difference now is that the cover page allows parties to list up to 15 companion cases. Studies showed that a significant portion of each docket has companion cases for injured workers. The remaining portions of information on the OCR forms are identical to that contained on the current forms with few exceptions. The appearance of length is due to formatting changes, which is done for the ease of inputting the information into EAMS.

The parameters of a computer system mandate that the form be easily readable by the optical scanning software. However, “one size does not fit all” in this case. While some cases have a single injury, others have continuing trauma. The forms which are used by both types of injured worker or employer will allow EAMS to capture the necessary information and will reduce the total number of forms as opposed to having separate forms for each type of case.

The new EAMS forms allow the automation process to push the documents into the appropriate “inbox” that creates tasks for the automated system. An example is whether an application is new or whether it is an amended application. There are two paths that the form takes right at the outset – whether a new case number gets assigned or not. This simple task is something that the clerical staff would have to do research on to determine whether there is an existing case and then to assign a new number which requires additional clerical work. This example of a “check box” on the application demonstrates how the same electronic form is used in two distinctly different manners – having two different flows of work emanate from the submission of one form – and the sole reason the workflow is changed is based upon whether a box was checked at the top of the page.

There are a number of other changes to the format to reflect the distinction of the legal entities involved in the dispute resolution process. Although workers’ compensation professionals frequently use a nomenclature they are familiar with, injured workers and some staff elements within the workers’ compensation professionals’ offices are unfamiliar with the terms used by the workers’ compensation professionals as well as the distinctions in the terms. An example is that the filing of a Petition is what people refer to as with “the board.” However, many practitioners refer to the local DWC district offices as “the board” as well. The EAMS regulations address this distinction. After all, EAMS and DWC are mainly about providing a service to two stakeholders – the injured workers and the employers. The confusion does not run

only to the injured workers and the small employers – even the governmental entities that are employers have mistakenly confused the two entities and misfiled documents with a district office when it should have gone to the commissioners at the WCAB. By articulating whether a document is to go to the Appeals Board or to a DWC District Office, the confusion is removed – there is only one Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board – they are located in San Francisco and have seven appointed commissioners, yet there are 24 DWC District Offices where the hearings are held by Workers’ Compensation Administrative Law Judges – not commissioners.

Lastly, the forms are intertwined with software programming. The movement of the various fields at this stage is not possible because software programmers would be required to change the software code that is already in place. In future iterations of EAMS and EAMS forms, it may be possible to move various fields around the form to be more aesthetically pleasing, but at this stage it would not be prudent to move fields or insert additional information fields. DWC was required to finalize the forms at least a month in advance of the go-live date in order to allow Deloitte and their sub-contractors to have adequate time to adjust forms readability for the capture of the pertinent information. DWC has continuously sought the input of people that are external users in the process. Since November, 2007 and throughout 2008, a number of workers’ compensation professionals have been involved in providing guidance, suggestions and input to DWC about a host of issues. This collaborative effort will continue and new forms ideas will be reviewed and acted upon as appropriate.