

Exercise: DTR Behaviors

Unless otherwise noted, all labs are implemented in the Workers Comp LOB.

Exercise 1: W3C XPath support

1. Add a precondition to make all Account Record fields on the Billing/Contact Information required when three or more Rating Classifications are selected.
2. Add a precondition to make all Inspection fields on the Billing/Audit Information required when the total of all Rating Classification exposures exceeds \$1M.
3. Implement these using W3C XPaths in behavior XML only.

Q: How would these be implemented if W3C XPaths weren't available?

A:

Exercise 2: Behavior Precedence

Add a behavior that uses custom precedence to exclude all "Experience Mod" fields when Employers Liability Limit values all exceed \$1M (1000000).

Assumptions:

1. This exercise assumes you have completed the Views lab to properly store the Employers Liability Limit data
2. This exercise assumes you have completed the Option Lists lab to expand the options to include > 1M; if not, use another numeric threshold satisfied by the available list, such as \$500K (500000)

Q: How would this be implemented purely in behavior XML if this feature were not available?

A:

Exercise 3: Behaviors Targeted by Class

1. Disable the behaviors that control include/exclude of the MA (Massachusetts) section on the State Rating factors page. Verify the section is always shown regardless of whether a MA location exists in the quote.
2. Add a behavior and update the page/section/field as necessary to include/exclude the MA section on the State Rating factors page by class rather than uniqueId/ field Id.

Q: How does this potentially improve your ability to maintain and update the state-specific rating factor pages/sections/input fields and associated behaviors?

A:

Q: How would a change in requirements, including new state-specific rating factor TDF elements, be addressed under the old vs. new implementation?

A:

Exercise 4: Default / Global PreConditions

In the Personal Auto LOB:

1. Disable all include/exclude behaviors that reference the “IsThereACoApplicant” precondition or “CoApp” fields. Verify the CoApplicant fields are always shown regardless of the answer to the “Is there a co-applicant” input field before moving on to the next step.
2. Add a new behavior file that implements the equivalent of the conditions disabled in the prior step, but instead uses a global IsThereACoApplicant precondition. Test to verify the CoApplicant sections/fields are back to conditionally show based on the answer to

the “Is there a co-applicant” input field before moving on to the next step.

3. Add a new precondition in the new behavior file created in the previous step to make the CoApplicant Work Phone Number required when the Controlling State is MA. Test to verify.

Q: What are the potential benefits to using this feature? Are there any potential drawbacks?

A:

If you were also tasked with adding a precondition to make the Applicant Work Phone Number required when the Controlling State is MA, where would this go? Would you consider changing how the equivalent CoApplicant behavior was implemented a) if both requirements were provided together b) if one of these was added after the first had already been implemented and tested?

Exercise 5: Logical OR'd PreConditions

In the Workers Comp LOB:

On the Policy Information page, make the “Dividend Plan / Safety Group” field required if the Controlling State is MA or RI or the SIC Code indicates “Mining”.

Q: How would this be implemented if this feature weren't available?

A: