



EESSI – CDM 4.4

S - Sickness

S_BUC_18 - v4.4.0

**Request for entitlement document for Former
Frontier Workers**

BUC Specifications

Document Control Information

Document Control	Value
Project Title	Electronic Exchange of Social Security Information (EESSI)
Document Name	S_BUC_18_Mainproc_Specification_v4.4.0.docx
Document Category	BUC Specifications
Document Version	v4.4.0
Revision	-
CDM Package	CDM 4.4.0 Package
Publication Date	06/12/2024
Document Status	Final
Sensitivity (TLP) Distribution terms	<p>Traffic Light Protocol (TLP) = "GREEN"</p> <div> <p>GREEN</p> <hr/> <p>Only share inside EESSI community See Author guidance before sharing</p> </div> <p>The distribution of this document is done strictly in line with the Traffic Light Protocol (TLP) established by the European Commission's note AC 790/15 REV for the EESSI project documentation.</p> <p>In line with the note AC 790/15 REV, this document is labelled as TLP = "Green". Therefore, it can be circulated widely within the EESSI community. However, the document or the information herein may not be published or posted on the Internet, nor released outside of the EESSI community.</p>
Connected/Embedded Files	None
Authors	European Commission, DG EMPL A4, EESSI BA
Revised by	European Commission, DG EMPL A4, EESSI BA
Approved by	European Commission, DG EMPL A4, EESSI PMO

Document history

Version	Date	Short Description of Changes
v0.1	11/01/2016	First draft of the document
v0.2.0	11/02/2016	<p>Comments received from Germany, UK and Belgium have been implemented</p> <p>Section 2.1 is renamed</p> <p>First paragraph has been reworked.</p> <p>Section 3 Actors and Roles</p> <p>Claimant added</p> <p>Description updated for Case Owner and Counterparty</p> <p>Section 4 RUP Table Representation</p> <p>Clamant is added</p> <p>Preconditions is reworked</p> <p>Branch 2 is added: Request for information about the person's status as a former frontier worker or family member of a former frontier worker</p> <p>Other branches have been renumbered</p> <p>Section 4.4 RUP UC Diagram Representation</p> <p>Claimant is added</p> <p>Section 5.1 Case Owner</p> <p>Claimant is added</p> <p>Version number of the document has been changed to be in line with the convention M.m.p where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M = Major version (e.g. Approved by AC) - m = Minor version (e.g. changes in the process) - p = Patch version (e.g. wording...any changes without any impact on the process itself)
v0.2.1	14/06/2016	<p>Document updated based on comments received from Finland.</p> <p>Section 4.1: RUP Table Description</p> <p>Branch 1: At [step 9] is replaced by At [step 3]</p>
v0.3.0	22/06/2016	Alignment to the standard description and layout of the BUC.
v0.3.1	20/09/2016	Comments and remarks received from AC review have been implemented.
v0.99.0	21/09/2016	<p>Candidate for AC approval.</p> <p>Remaining AC comments will be discussed during the AHG meeting the 4th October 2016.</p> <p>More details related to these comments can be found in section 6.1 of this document</p>

v0.99.1	23/11/2016	<p>Last comments received from Germany and agreed by AHG members have been accepted in the document.</p> <p>As agreed by AHG members</p> <p>"Reminder" has been added for Case Owner and Counterparty.</p> <p>Section 4.1 has been updated (Branch 6 and 7 added)</p> <p>Section 4.4 has been updated (Reminder is added)</p> <p>Section 4.5 SED and Sub-process Versioning (Reminder is added)</p> <p>Submitted for AC Approval</p>
v1.0.0	15/12/2016	AC Approved Version
v1.0.1	03/07/2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Included BPMN picture in section 5 - removed Use Case diagram
v1.0.2	09/06/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.1: as requested by the AHG, removed the references to the fields or sections of the SEDs - Section 3: Removed 'Claimant' from table of actors.
v4.1.0	09/08/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.4 merged 2 tables (for SED & for Subprocesses) into 1 BUC Artefact table." - Version adaptations to release 4.1.0.
v4.2.0	29/05/2019	Version adaptations to release 4.2.0.
v4.3.0	31/08/2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of Change request EESSI-5905: allow dispute on date for S130: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 2.2: S050 added in table - Section 4.1: Branch 3 added - Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4: S050 added in the tables - Section 5: update BPMN model - Version adaptations to release 4.3.0.
v4.4.0	06/12/2024	<p>Update <i>Branch 5 title</i> to allow the CO to use the H_BUC_01 sub-process also after sending S008 and before receiving the S130 OR after sending S006 and before receiving the S007, according to the EESSI-7337 CR.</p> <p>Update <i>2.1 Business Scenario, 3. Actor & Roles and 4.1 RUP Table</i> -> <i>Special Requirements SR0</i> sections to make it clear that this is a bi-lateral BUC, according to the EESSI-11092 CR.</p> <p>Update <i>Branch 3 Steps 1 and 4, Special Requirements SR1 for Branch 3</i> and the <i>BPMN diagram</i> to apply the corrections requested through the EESSI-11104 CR.</p>

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	6
1.1. Purpose	6
1.2. Scope	6
1.3. Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
1.4. References	6
1.5. Overview	7
2. Description	8
2.1. Business Scenario	8
2.2. Legal Base	8
3. Actors & Roles	9
4. Use Case	10
4.1. RUP Table Representation	10
4.2. Request – Reply SEDs	14
4.3. Attachments Allowed	14
4.4. Artefacts used	14
5. Business Processes	15
5.1. Case Owner and Counterparty	15
5.2. Sub Processes	15
6. Appendices	16
6.1. Issues	16

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to construct an external view of the 'EESSI business system' as described in EC Regulations 883/2004 [R1] and 987/2009 [R2]. The 'EESSI Business System' describes the business and expected business processes without consideration as to which part(s) may be realised by an IT System (i.e. the proposed EESSI IT System).

The external view comprises of models and descriptions of business use cases, the services of a business system offered to business actors: customers, business partners, or other business systems.

A business use case is described from an actor's perspective; it describes the interaction between an actor and the business system, meaning it describes the behaviours of the business system that the actor utilises. The Business Use Case includes Use Case Diagrams and Business Process Models.

Use case diagrams show actors, business use cases, and their relationships. Use case diagrams do not describe procedures. Alternative scenarios also remain hidden. These diagrams give a good overview of the behaviours of the EESSI business system which will direct and govern part of the expected behaviours and functionality delivered by the EESSI IT System.

1.2. Scope

This document is limited to the external view of the Sickness' sector process concerning the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers. The different elements use case description, business actors, and business process as well as supporting UML diagrams and BPMN models pertaining to the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers.

1.3. Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

Please see the EESSI Project Glossary [here](#).

1.4. References

#	Document Type	Document Name
R1	Basic Regulations EC (883/04)	Regulation EC No. 883/2004.pdf
R2	Implementing Regulations EC (987/09)	Regulation EC No. 987/2009.pdf

1.5. Overview

Chapter 1 introduces the external view on the business system under review and lists the elements of this specification.

Chapter 2 introduces the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers business process. This chapter gives a short and detailed description as well as a reference to the business process' legal base.

Chapter 3 lists the actors involved in the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers business process.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers business process based on the RUP use case template, as well as the relationship to other use cases.

Chapter 5 describes the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers business process using business process modelling notation (BPMN).

2. Description

2.1. Business Scenario

As the regulation dictates (Art. 28 of 883/04 [R1] and Art. 29 of 987/09 [R2]) a former frontier worker who has retired because of old-age or invalidity – and his/her family members or his/her survivors – shall, under certain conditions, be entitled to benefits in kind in the Member State in which she/he pursued such an activity as frontier worker.

This BUC allows the institution which has to bear the costs for the benefits in kind provided to the retired former frontier worker and his/her family members or to his/her survivors in their respective Member State of residence to obtain the necessary information from the former Member State of employment in order to issue or not to issue an entitlement document to the person concerned.

The reply from the institution of the former Member State of employment provides the competent institution with the information necessary to determine whether the person concerned is entitled to continue to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment.

The former frontier worker and – in countries which are not mentioned in Annex III of Regulation (EC) 883/04 [R1] – his/her family members can be entitled to the continuation of treatment in the Member State where he/she last worked preceding the effective date of old-age or invalidity pension if this treatment began in the later Member State.

Further, the former frontier worker and his/her members of family and his/her survivors can be entitled to all benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment if in the five years preceding the effective date of his/her old-age or invalidity pension, the former frontier worker had been working as a frontier worker for at least two years. This only applies in cases where both the competent Member State and the former State of employment are listed in Annex V of Regulation (EC) 883/04 [R1]. These are currently: Belgium, Germany, Spain, France, Luxembourg, Austria and Portugal.

This BUC is bi-lateral. if there is a need to request the entitlement document for the former frontier worker from more than one former Member State of employment (as a Counterparty), then a dedicated case would be opened for each Counterparty.

2.2. Legal Base

This Business Use Case document's legal base is described in the following Regulations

- basic Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 [R1];
- implementing Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 [R2].

The following matrix specifies the SEDs that are used in this Business Use Case and documents the articles that provide the legal basis for each SED.

SED	Basic Reg (883/04)	Implementing Reg (987/09)
	28	29
S006	✓	✓
S007	✓	✓
S008	✓	✓
S130		✓
S050	✓	✓

Table 1: SED – Legal base relationship matrix

3. Actors & Roles

This chapter captures details of the actors which are important to understand the different types of system users. An actor is anyone or anything that exchanges data with the business system. An actor can be a user, external hardware or another system.

The overarching description of each actor described in this Business Use Case can be found in the Glossary. Below you will find a short description which provides further clarity of this actor within the context of this Business Use Case.

Actor name	Description
Case Owner	In this BUC the Case Owner is the Competent institution which has to bear the cost for the benefits in kind provided to a retired former frontier worker and his/her family members or to his/her survivors in their respective Member State of residence and has to obtain the necessary information in order to issue or not portable document S3 or SED S008 for the person concerned.
Counterparty	In this BUC the Counterparty is the Institution of a former Member State of employment which provides the competent institution with the information necessary to determine whether a retired former frontier worker and his/her family members or his/her survivors is/are entitled to continue to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment.

Table 2: Actors & Roles

4. Use Case

4.1. RUP Table Representation

Use Case ID:	S_BUC_18		
Use Case Name:	Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers		
Created By:	EESSI BA Team	Last Updated By:	EESSI BA Team
Date Created:	11/01/2016	Publication Date:	06/12/2024
Actors:	Case Owner Counterparty Claimant		
Description:	<p>This particular case deals with the situation where the competent institution which has to bear the costs for the benefits in kind provided to the retired former frontier worker and his/her family or to his/her survivors has to obtain the necessary information from a former Member State of employment to issue or not to issue a portable document S3 to the person concerned.</p> <p>The competent institution sends a request for information on the person's status as a former frontier worker or as a family member of a frontier worker to the institution of the Member State where the former frontier worker formerly pursued his/her activity as an employed or self-employed person.</p> <p>The reply from the institution of the former Member state of employment provides the competent institution with the information necessary to determine whether the person concerned is entitled to continue to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment.</p> <p>If the retired frontier worker and his/her family members or his/her survivors are entitled to benefits in kind in the retired frontier worker's former Member State of employment, the competent institution sends information concerning the entitlement to benefits in kind of the person concerned to the institution of the former Member State of employment or issues a portable document S3.</p> <p>When receiving the entitlement document, the institution of the former Member State of employment acknowledges receipt of the entitlement document sent by the competent institution.</p>		
Trigger:	The retired frontier worker and/or his/her family members or his/her survivors request a portable document S3 from the competent institution and the competent institution does not have the necessary information to decide whether the person concerned is entitled to benefits in kind under article 28 of Regulation (EC) 883/2004 [R1] or not.		
Preconditions:	<p>There are two different preconditions. In both cases, the concerned person claims to be a former frontier worker who has retired because of old-age or invalidity or a family member or a survivor of the former frontier worker. The person resides in a Member State other than the former Member State of employment of the former frontier worker.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuation of treatment: The concerned person wishes to continue a treatment that began in the former country of employment. - Entitlement to all benefits in kind in the former country of employment: The concerned person wishes an entitlement document for all benefits in kind in the former country of employment. 		

Post Conditions:	The institution of the former Member State of employment acknowledges receipt of the entitlement document for the concerned person to the competent institution.
Main Scenario:	<p>Identify Participants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Case Owner (competent institution) identifies the former Member State of employment where the former frontier worker pursued his/her activity as an employed or self-employed person; 2. The Case Owner then identifies the correct institution (Institution in the former Member State of employment). There will be only one counterparty. The Case Owner and the Counterparty are herein collectively referred to as the Participants. <p>Process Receive Information of Status & Send Entitlement Document</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Case Owner fills in the "Entitlement document – Former Frontier Worker or Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S008) by entering the requested information; 4. The Case Owner sends S008 to the Counterparty. <p>Process Receive Entitlement Document and Send Acknowledgment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The Counterparty receives the S008; 6. The Counterparty fills in the "Acknowledgement of receipt of entitlement document – former frontier worker" SED (S130) to inform the competent Member State about the receipt of the entitlement document; 7. The Counterparty sends the S130 to the Case Owner; 8. The Case Owner receives the "Acknowledgment of receipt of entitlement document – former frontier worker" SED (S130); 9. This use case ends here.
Alternative Scenarios:	<p><i>Branch 1: At [step 3] if the insured person does not have the status of a former frontier worker or a family member of a former frontier worker, the Case Owner does not send a S008 or a portable document.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [This Branch] Ends. <p><i>Branch 2: At [step 3] The Case Owner may optionally choose to request from the Counterparty Information about the person's status as a former frontier worker or family member of a former frontier worker</i></p> <p>Process to request for information about the person's status as a former frontier worker or family member of a former frontier worker</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Case Owner fills in the "Request for Information of Status – Former Frontier Worker – Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S006) by entering requested information concerning the person's status as a former frontier worker or as a family member or as a survivor of the frontier worker; 2. The Case Owner sends the S006 to the Counterparty. <p>Process Request & Send Information of Status</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Counterparty receives the S006; 4. The Counterparty fills in the "Information of status – Former Frontier Worker or Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S007) to provide the competent institution with the necessary information so as to allow the competent institution to determine whether the person concerned is entitled (to continue) to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment; 5. The Counterparty sends the S007 to the Case Owner; 6. The Case Owner receives the "Information of status – Former Frontier Worker – Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S007) containing the information about the status of the former frontier worker or his/her family member; 7. [This Branch] Ends.
	<p><u>Branch 3: At [step 8] the Case Owner may optionally choose to fill in and send a Dispute Registration Date (S050).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Case Owner fills in a Dispute of Date SED (S050) where they express a dispute concerning the start date of entitlement indicated in the section 4 of SED S130; 2. The Case Owner sends the S050 to the Counterparty; 3. The Counterparty receives the S050; 4. The Counterparty fills in the S130 by entering the new date of entitlement or the original date of entitlement; 5. The Counterparty sends the S130 to the Case Owner; 6. [This Branch] Ends.
	<p><u>The Following Branches Determine the use of Horizontally Defined Sub Processes within this Business Process</u></p>
	<p><u>Branch 4: At any step after [step 5] or Branch 2 [step 3] the Counterparty may optionally choose to request AdHoc Information from Case Owner.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Counterparty executes business use case <i>H_BUC_01 – Adhoc Exchange of Info;</i> 2. [This Branch] Ends.
	<p><u>Branch 5: At any step after [step 4] or Branch 2 [Step 2], the Case Owner may optionally choose to request AdHoc Information from Counterparty.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Case Owner executes business use case <i>H_BUC_01 – Adhoc Exchange of Info;</i> 2. [This Branch] Ends.
	<p><u>The Following Branches Determine the use of Administrative Defined Sub Processes within this Business Process</u></p>
	<p><u>Branch 6: At [step 5] or Branch 2 [step 3] the Counterparty may optionally choose to Forward this Business Process to another Competent Institution within its MS who assumes responsibility for handling it.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Counterparty executes business use case <i>AD_BUC_05 –</i>

	<p>Forward Case:</p> <p>2. [This Branch] Ends.</p>
	<p>Branch 7: After Branch 3 [step 1] the Counterparty may optionally choose to send a reminder in order to receive the answer to Ad Hoc Information expected and not yet received.</p> <p>1. The Counterparty executes business use case AD_BUC_07_ - _Reminder;</p> <p>2. [This Branch] Ends</p>
	<p>Branch 8: At any step after [step 4] or Branch 2 [Step 2] or Branch 4 [step 1] the Case Owner may optionally choose to send a reminder in order to receive Information expected and not yet received.</p> <p>1. The Case Owner executes business use case AD_BUC_07_ - _Reminder;</p> <p>2. [This Branch] Ends</p>
Exceptions:	None
Includes:	See diagram at 4.4
Special Requirements:	<p>SR0: General Rule As the request for an entitlement document for a former frontier worker or his/her family member is individualised the case can concern only one person. This BUC is bi-lateral. If there is a need to request the entitlement document for the former frontier worker from more than one former Member State of employment (as a Counterparty), then a dedicated case would be opened for each Counterparty.</p> <p>S006 should not be available when the S008 has been sent by the Case Owner to the Counterparty.</p> <p>SR1: Rules about invoking of Branches:</p> <p>[Branch 1] – May be invoked once. [Branch 2] – May be invoked once. [Branch 3] – May be invoked more than once.</p> <p><u>Horizontal</u> [Branch 4] – May be invoked more than once. [Branch 5] – May be invoked more than once</p> <p><u>Administrative</u> [Branch 6] – May be invoked once only when the first SED is received by Counterparty and before sending the Acknowledgment of receipt of S008. [Branch 7] – May be invoked more than once. [Branch 8] – May be invoked more than once.</p>
Assumptions:	N/A
Notes and Issues:	N/A

4.2. Request – Reply SEDs

The following table specifies the SEDs that have a logical pairing to one another, usually this is known as a request-reply pair.

REQUEST SED	REPLY SED(s)
S006	S007
S008	S130
S050	S130

4.3. Attachments Allowed

The following table specifies whether attachments are permitted to be included when sending a SED type.

SED	Attachments
S006	Allowed
S007	Allowed
S008	Allowed
S050	Allowed
S130	Allowed

4.4. Artefacts used

The following table specifies the version of the SED that are used in this Business Use Case.

SED	Version
S006	SED
S007	SED
S008	SED
S050	SED
S130	SED
H_BUC_01_Subprocess	BUC
AD_BUC_05_Subprocess – Forward Case	BUC
AD_BUC_07_Subprocess – Reminder	BUC
AD_BUC_11_Subprocess – Business Exception	BUC
AD_BUC_12_Subprocess – Change of Participant	BUC

5. Business Processes

This chapter describes the Business Use Case about the Request for entitlement document for Former Frontier Workers using BPMN 2.0.

5.1. Case Owner and Counterparty




Figure 1: depicts the use case end-to-end, from a high level, using the BPMN 2.0 collaboration diagram

5.2. Sub Processes

Not applicable.

6. Appendices

6.1. Issues

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Resolution	Close date
1	11/01/2016	<p>Section 2.1 Detailed Description, last sentence "...if the former Member State of employment and the Member State which bears the financial cost of benefits in kind...are Belgium, Germany, Spain, France, Luxembourg, Austria and Portugal".</p> <p>Does it mean that an additional check has to be implemented when the Case Owner selects the country of the Counterparty, and should be limited to the countries as described in the Regulation?</p> <p>Does it mean that this BUC will not be available for other countries?</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>No because the BUC applies also for Art. 28 par. 1 cases, and these are Not restricted to the member states listed in Annex V.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>* with regard to article 28(1) of R.883, this BUC applies to all MS</p> <p>* with regard to article 28(2) of R.883, the SEDs S006 and S007 apply to all MS, but SED S008 (or PD S3) applies only to MS mentioned in Annex V of R.883.</p>	No action required	11/02/2016
2	11/01/2016	<p>Section 3: Actors and Roles</p> <p>Is it interesting to add the "Claimant" as an external actor of the system while the trigger to start this BUC is when the Claimant requests from competent Member State a portable document?</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>M. Weyres agrees on your proposal under Nr. 4</p>	Document is updated according to this approval	11/02/2016
3	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 RUP Table Description (Main Scenario – step 3)</p> <p>In the BPMN describes in the guideline, the first part of the process (sending S006 and receiving S007) is "optional" because if the case owner has all the information to send the entitlement document, no additional information is requested from the counterparty.</p> <p>Does it mean that at the beginning of the process</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>Exactly, at the beginning of the process, both SED S006 and SED S008 should be available for the clerk.</p> <p>I think indeed that it is logical for the BUC to withdraw SED S006 once an SED S008 has been sent. If the CO wishes more information, he can start a new case again with SED S006.</p> <p>Additional comment</p>	A branch has been added	11/02/2016

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Resolution	Close date
		<p>both SEDS (S006 and S008) should be available for the clerk?</p> <p>What happened if the clerk selects at the beginning of the process S008 and not S006? Does it mean that S006 cannot be sent anymore?</p>	<p>received from Germany</p> <p>The main scenario should make clearer that the BUC can directly start with SED S008. Indeed, in many cases, the case owner already has the necessary information and will not use SED S006.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>I would assume that if the clerk has all the necessary information, he/she will issue a PD S3 rather than send a S008. Hence, why would we still need to send a SED S006?</p>		
4	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 RUP Table Description (Main Scenario – step 6)</p> <p>In the guidelines, it is mentioned 4.1.2 instead of 4.2.1, what is the section which should be completed?</p> <p>If it is the section 4.2.1, the guidelines should be updated according to the right number of the section to be completed.</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>4.2.1 is right.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>Correct, reference in guidelines should be 4.2.1 instead 4.1.2.</p>	Page 39 of the Guidelines should be changed.	11/02/2016
5	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 – RUP Table Description (Main scenario – step 6).</p> <p>Additional checks should probably be added;</p> <p>If a checkbox is selected in section 4.2.2, no other checkbox can be selected in other sections.</p> <p>Same control for all the section 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>Your proposal in comment Nr. 12 is a good idea. The Counterparty has to choose a legal basis for entitlement or not. Clicking too fields within this section would not be helpful.</p>	<p>The conditional formatting will be handled with the version 4.0 of the SED.</p> <p>A Jira ticket has been declared according to the check to be added.</p>	11/02/2016
6	11/01/2016	Section 4.1 – RUP Table Description (Main scenario – step 6).	Answer received from Germany	The conditional formatting	11/02/2016

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Resolution	Close date
		<p>"If the insured person is not entitled to continue the treatment, MS of employment may indicate the reason ...either by completing section 4.2.3.2 if the reason "other" was previously selected"</p> <p>Do we have to implement this additional check?</p> <p>If the checkbox "other" is selected in section 4.2.3, the field 4.2.3.1 "Reasons" should be completed?</p>	<p>I agree with your proposal.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>will be handled with the version 4.0 of the SED.</p> <p>A Jira ticket has been declared according to the check to be added.</p>	
7	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 RUP Table Description (Main Scenario – step 9)</p> <p>Filling in the section 5.2 SED S008 as described in the document is an extract of the guidelines, but in the SED, section 5.2 SED S008 must be completed if a checkbox has been selected in the section 5.1 and not a specific one.</p> <p>What is the correct one?</p> <p>Check hereafter the extract of the paper SED S008 (section 5)</p> <div> <p>5. The person mentioned above is entitled to *</p> <p>5.1 Entitled to*</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> continuation of treatment that began in former Member State of work</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> benefits in kind in former Member State of work</p> <p>Please fill in the following if "Entitled to" = "continuation of treatment that began in former Member State of work" or "Entitled to" = "benefits in kind in former Member State of work":</p> <p>5.2 Nature of treatment / illness [255]</p> </div>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>I confirm the version of the guidelines. Information under 5.2 is only relevant if the person is entitled to continuation of treatment.</p> <p>I could not see any information about field 5.2 being mandatory in SED S008. We need to discuss it in the AHG.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>Section 5.2 should only be filled in when the box "continuation of treatment" has been ticked in section 5.1. In that case the nature of the treatment (to be continued) should be mentioned in section 5.2.</p>	<p>SED S008 should be changed according to this information</p> <p>A Jira ticket has been declared to change this part of the SED;</p>	11/02/2016
8	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 RUP Table Description (Main Scenario – step 12)</p> <p>In the guideline, it is mentioned "the former MS of employment acknowledges the receipt of the entitlement document SED S008 or portable document S3"</p> <p>What about the portable document S3, is it out of</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>PD S3 is not an attachment to SED S008. The case owner issues it to the applicant once it checked that all conditions are met. The applicant can then go the counterparty and submit the document in order to prove his/ her entitlement. The counterparty then fills</p>	No action required	11/02/2016

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Resolution	Close date
		scope? or is it an attachment to the SED S008?	<p>in SED S130 to inform the case owner that it was submitted a PD S3.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>This BUC shows again the complication caused by the existence of parallel flows on paper (PD S3) and SEDs.</p> <p>In my view, the Case Owner can decide to issue a PD S3 after receiving the SED S007 instead of sending a SED S008.</p> <p>However, the Case Owner can decide to send a SED S008 and may opt to attach a copy of the PD S3 or not.</p> <p>In particular, in the situation of "continuation of treatment", it might be practical – from the insured person's point of view – to issue a PD S3 rather than send a SED S008.</p> <p>There is also the question that in case the Competent Institution has all the information and issues a PD S3, can the BUC then start and finish by the SES S130?</p>		
9	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.1 RUP Table Description (Branch 1)</p> <p>How does the case is closed if the insured person is not a "former frontier worker" or a "family member of a frontier worker"?</p> <p>S008 and S130 are not used and exchanged between Member States?</p>	<p>Answer received from Germany</p> <p>We need the option "close case" for the Case owner after receiving an SED S007. In the guidelines, I understand the graphic at p. 36 accordingly. If the status as frontier worker is not given, then the case ends.</p> <p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>If, on the basis of the answer of the counterparty, the conclusion is that the person concerned does not meet to criteria to be entitled to benefits under</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>It has been decided by the AHG members that the "Close" option is not added to the BUC.</p>	11/02/2016

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Resolution	Close date
			<p>article 28 of R.883, this BUC ends with the sending of the SED S007.</p> <p>But, as mentioned before, it might also be that in case the person is entitled to benefits under article 28 of R.883 further to the reply of the Counterparty in SED S007, this BUC ends after this SED S007. In my view there is no absolute obligation that the former frontier worker "returns" to the health care fund of his former MS of employment where in order to be entitled to benefits in kind under article 28 of R.883.</p>		
10	11/01/2016	<p>Section 4.3 Attachments allowed</p> <p>Could you confirm the SED on which some attachments can be linked?</p> <p>I am not sure for S130 while it is only an acknowledgment of the receipt.</p>	<p>Comment received from Belgium</p> <p>If my memory serves me well, it was decided once that we should keep the option of allowing attachments to all SEDs.</p>	No action required	09/02/2016
11	09/02/2016	<p>Section 2.2 Legal Base</p> <p>Remark received from Belgium</p> <p>If one upholds a strict interpretation, article 29 of R.987 can only be a reference to the SED S008. However, I do agree to maintain the reference to article 29 of R.987 in the other SEDs.</p> <p><u>Attention:</u> there is no legal base for the SED S130. However, the AHG decided in the past that – from a business point of view – it would be useful for the CMS to be informed that the former MS of employment acknowledges the receipt of the document S3 or S008.</p>		No action required	09/02/2016

#	Issue date	Description	Replies	Action/Re solution	Close date
12	21/09/2016	<p>page 13, alternative scenarios, branch 1</p> <p>We are not sure if any step should be mentioned here ("at step 3 if the insured person). If the person concerned does not have the status of former frontier worker or a family member of a former frontier worker the Article 28 of the Basic Regulation does not simply apply, i.e. there is no need to fill in SED S008 and then not send the SED S008. The SED S008 should not be filled in if there is a doubt concerning the status of the person concerned. Firstly, the status must be proved and then the SED S008 filled in.</p>	<p>AHG members suggest keeping this branch 1, while this BUC can start by sending a S006 or S008.</p> <p>If the Competent Institution has enough information and if the insured person is a former frontier worker, the S008 should be sent.</p> <p>If the Competent Institution does not have all the information, the Case Owner sends a S006 in order to receive the requested information.</p>	Not change	23/11/2016
13	23/11/2016	<p>BPMN diagrams will be updated.</p> <p>"Reminder" will be added for Case Owner and Counterparty</p>		Scheduled for update	