



Independent
Review Office

IRO Regional Seminars

Wagga Wagga

May 2022

IRO acknowledges traditional owners



We acknowledge the Wiradjuri People as the Traditional Custodians of the land we are meeting on today, and part of the oldest surviving continuous culture in the world. We recognise their continuing connection to Country and thank them for protecting this land and its ecosystems since time immemorial.

We pay our respects to Elders past and present, and extend that respect to all First Nations people present today



Agenda

- IRO Update
- Solutions
- ILARS
- Schedule 5 inquiries
- Substantive Law Update – review of recent decisions under section 60 *Workers Compensation Act 1987*
- Questions



Independent
Review Office

IRO Update

Simon Cohen

Independent Review Officer

IRO Update

- Establishing the Independent Review Office under Schedule 5 of the *Personal Injury Commission Act 2020* from 1 March 2021
- Focusing on the needs of those using IRO services
 - External Assessment of IRO services
 - IRO Direction
 - Business Process Review
 - User Experience Survey
 - ILARS Review 2022

Schedule 5 to the PIC Act

- IRO established by Schedule 5 to PIC Act
- Deals with complaints about insurers under WC and MAI legislation
- Administers the Independent Legal Assistance and Review Service
- Inquires into matters arising in connection with the operation of enabling legislation

Establishing the IRO

- Commenced from 1 March 2021
- Key changes include:
 - IRO as a separate public sector agency
 - Range of new reporting and governance requirements
 - New Complaints Handling Protocol
 - Revised ILARS Guidelines



External Assessment of IRO Services

- Conducted by Nous Group and reported in September 2020
- Assessed services against benchmarks of accessibility, efficiency, effectiveness, fairness and accountability
- Found stakeholders value IRO services and our expert team
- Recommended improvements:
 - to increase our impact in improving the WC system
 - to increase our engagement with workers, lawyers and others
 - to continuously improve the quality of our work
 - to improve our business processes.



IRO Direction 2020-22

- Responds to PIC Act and Nous Assessment
- Establishes our Mission:
The IRO helps persons who are injured at work or in motor accidents and insurers find fair solutions to complaints and claims, and recommends improvements to the statutory compensation schemes for workers compensation and motor accident injuries.
- Sets our Priorities
 - Early solutions
 - Improving the WC System
 - Wellbeing and development of IRO team
 - Efficient and Effective IRO operations
- Success measures: user satisfaction; high performance; staff engagement.

Key projects to improve IRO services UX program



- User Experience (UX) project
- Responds to Nous Assessment recommendation
- Baseline measurement of experience of those who use our services
 - Injured persons with Solutions – understanding; communication; responsiveness; focus on solutions; **expertise**; fairness
 - Insurers with Solutions: communication; responsiveness; consistency; **expertise**; transparency; focus on solutions
 - Approved Lawyers with ILARS – efficiency; **expertise**; effectiveness; consistency
 - Injured workers with Approved Lawyers – **expertise**; clarity; honesty; responsiveness; focus on solutions.





Key projects to improve IRO services

Business Process Review

- Review of all Solutions and ILARS business processes
- Problem: Internal processes have been added to over time; more complex; lot of manual work; not always fit for purpose
- Goals: Right first time; reduced manual effort to administer cases; more transparent case management
- Benefits: Consistency; responsiveness; efficiency; staff satisfaction
- Improvements:
 - More templates/improved workflows (*consistency/efficiency*)
 - Increased automation (e.g., web forms; AL portal) (*responsiveness/efficiency*)
 - Systems integration (*responsiveness/efficiency*)



Key projects to improve IRO services

ILARS Review 2022

- ILARS established in 2012 and as IRO statutory function in 2021
- First comprehensive review since establishment
- Key questions:
 - How well does ILARS meet statutory purpose?
 - How effectively does ILARS promote WC system objectives?
- Expert Review Committee
- Cross-sector Reference Group
- Issues paper in May 2022
- Final Report in October 2022



Independent
Review Office

Overview of IRO Solutions

Jeffrey Gabriel
Director Solutions

IRO Complaints Overview

- 1 March 2021 – 28 February 2022:
 - 6995 WC complaints
 - 866 CTP complaints
- Most common workers compensation issues
 - Delay in determining liability – 28%
 - Delay in payments – 22%
- WC complaints. We resolve about 85% of matters with a benefit (payments or reimbursement); Action (E.g. change rehab provider or cancel IME); or information (e.g. explaining an insurer's position)
- 97% of complaints finalised within 15 calendar days

All About Solutions

- Local Stats: 1 March 2021 – 28 February 2022
- Riverina + Murray + ACT + Victoria – 206 complaints + 129 enquiries across both jurisdictions
- Likely greater numbers. For one-third of complainants, we do not have their residential addresses.



Solicitors and Complaints

- In around 60% of IRO complaints – the injured person's first referral to our office was from a solicitor
- We can add value and resolve side issues while you proceed with substantive case
- For example, IRO can ask deal with a complaint about a missing travel reimbursement while you move on with preparing application to Commission
- Insurers often respond to IRO faster than they respond to lawyers

What's New In Solutions

- **The IRO Complaint Handling Protocol**
 - Defines how and which matters we deal with
 - Consultation with industry participant.
 - Complaints outcome seeking response that is “fair and reasonable”
 - What complaints we may not deal with?
 - Matters the subject of the PIC
 - Where no attempt to resolve with insurer

IRO Investigations

- More substantial method of dealing with complaints
- Can lead to publication of reports with recommendations
 - Case Study – Investigation
 - After IRO complaint, insurer says worker is owed \$40k.
 - Soon after they write back to say error and demand reimbursement within 2 days.
 - IRO investigation
 - Insurer could not substantiate overpayment
 - Annual Leave, Matching Payslips, Excel Override
 - Standard of Practice 23
 - Requirement to pay back was waived



IRO Early Solutions

- Specifically called put in PIC Act
- No Response to Claim (NRTC)
- TIP: If NRTC – carefully check timelines and check with insurer before seeking Stage 3 funding
- Case Study
- Other early solutions

What IRO Values in a Complaint

- A good chronology
- Evidence of trying to resolve things with the insurer
- A paper trail. E.g. the email evidencing a request was made
- A suggested solution or solutions that you seek
 - (Remember - IRO cannot adjudicate disputes)

How Complaints Add Value

MOU with SIRA

- Operationalising PIC Act provision for information sharing
- Periodic reports
- Notification of significant matters
- Case Study – CTP Notifications Aug 2021 – Jan 2022
 - 14 Regulatory Notices
 - 4 Remediation Plans
 - 4 Referrals to Enforcement and Prosecutions

How Complaints Add Value

Meetings with Icare

- To discuss observations and drive improvement
- Case Study – Section 38A payments and *Hee*
 - IRO complaint about indexation
 - Identified possible Section 38A entitlement
 - Questions asked of Icare about broader claims
 - 136 claims across NI and TMF. Payments around \$3m



How Complaints Add Value

Meetings with CTP Insurers

- To establish a relationship and report observations
- Case study – back pay after PIC decisions on non-minor injuries.
(This case was referred to us by a solicitor)



Independent
Review Office

Overview of ILARS

Simon Cohen

Independent Review Officer



All About ILARS

- ILARS by the numbers – key statistics
- ILARS Funding Guidelines – 2021 Reforms
- Applications and invoices – tips and tricks

Grant Management


Grants Management - Applications Received Jan 21 - Dec 21

	All Firms
Applications Received Jan 21 to Dec 21	20,639
Received Grants Approved Jan 21 to Dec 21	20,587
Received Grants Declined Jan 21 to Dec 21	52
Average Days to Approve Grants Jan 21 to Dec 21	4
% of Grants Approved Jan 21 to Dec 21	99.7%
Requisitions Raised Jan 21 to Dec 21 Grants	1,639
% of Approved Grants with a requisition raised	8%
Average No. of Requisitions Per Approved Lawyer	3.0




Applications Approved

Riverina and Murray




All Firms




Closed Cases

Riverina and Murray



All Firms



Duration of Grants Closed

		Less than 3 mths	3 to 6 mths	6 to 12 mths	12 to 18 mths	18 to 24 mths	24 to 36 months	Over 36 months	Grand Total
Riverina and Murray	2019	7%	16%	21%	21%	15%	11%	8%	155
	2020	15%	14%	26%	18%	12%	13%	3%	190
	2021	9%	14%	24%	16%	15%	12%	9%	170
All Firms	2019	8%	13%	31%	20%	11%	9%	7%	11,376
	2020	18%	15%	29%	16%	8%	8%	6%	13,066
	2021	9%	19%	31%	18%	10%	8%	5%	15,377

Region



Table shows the number of cases for injured workers in your region the region and where their law firm is located

Top 5 body systems for injuries						
Top 10 Regions for law firms	Hearing	Lower extremity	Psychiatric and psychological disorders	The spine	Upper extremity	Grand Total
ACT	1	23	19	42	41	126
Hunter	26	11	8	12	11	68
Illawarra	1	14	12	10	14	51
Inner West	214	2	5	2	4	227
Murray		6	8	10	6	30
Parramatta	34	16	9	23	35	117
Riverina	5	58	57	65	78	263
South Coast	2	34	35	48	45	164
Sydney City	8	44	72	90	66	280
Western Sydney		5	6	9	10	30
Grand Total	291	213	231	311	310	1356
Percent of matters in Riverina and Murray	2%	30%	28%	24%	27%	22%
Excluding Hearing Loss						27%



Closed case outcomes from January 19 to December 21


Summary Outcome	Final Outcome		No Final Outcome		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
All Firms						
Commission or Court	11322	46%	435	2%	11757	27%
Other Outcome	175	1%	13072	72%	13247	31%
Pre-Proceedings	13162	53%	44	0%	13206	31%
Advice Only	0	0%	4632	25%	4632	11%
Grand Total	24659	100%	18183	100%	42842	100%
Percentage	58%		42%			
Riverina and Murray						
Commission or Court	188	68%	5	3%	193	46%
Other Outcome	2	1%	127	87%	129	31%
Pre-Proceedings	86	31%		0%	86	20%
Advice only		0%	14	10%	14	3%
Grand Total	276	100%	146	100%	422	100%
Percentage	65%		35%			



Funding Guidelines – 2021 reforms


- > ILARS Funding Guidelines largely unchanged since 2019
- > *Multiple funding applications for the same worker* – ask client if previous lawyer; speak to IRO
- > *Stage 2 funding – ‘having some merit’* - be specific about the dispute or claim and why it has merit
- > *Review of funding decisions* – ask IRO for reasons for decision; if seeking a review provide reasons and specify the outcome sought

Applications




Duplicate Applications – 642 DA outcomes 2019-2021
Applications Consolidated with other grant - 626 CA outcomes 2019 -2021
Accurate details in application for funding
Attaching PDF's, not links
Correct ILARS reference in the subject line

Applications



Invoices





Independent
Review Office

Schedule 5 Inquiries

Simon Cohen

Independent Review Officer

Schedule 5 inquiries

- IRO system improvement actions
- Schedule 5 of the PIC Act – inquiry power
- Recent and current inquiries
 - Delays in determining liability
 - Practical operation of section 59A WCA
 - Errors in weekly payments
- Other system improvement actions



Independent
Review Office

Substantive Law Update

Review of recent decisions under s 60 WCA

Jeffrey Gabriel

Director Solutions



Relevant decisions

Shipp v Community First Development Ltd t/as Indigenous Community Volunteers [2021] NSWPIC 2

Bliss v State of NSW (Illawarra Shoalhaven Local Health District) [2021] NSWPIC 269

Summers v Sydney International Container Terminals Pty Limited t/as Hutchison Ports [2021] NSWPICPD 35

Honarvar v Professional Painting AU Pty Ltd [2022] NSWPICPD 12 - 31/03/2022



Diab v NRMA Ltd [2014] NSWCCPD 72 – Roche DP



Re-stated the test for "*reasonably necessary*" as set out by Burke CCJ in *Rose v Health Commission (NSW) (1986) 2 NSWCCR 32*:

- The treatment's purpose and potential effect is to alleviate the consequences of the injury.
- The Court must conclude, exercising prudence and sound judgment and good sense, that it is "reasonably necessary". This involves the Court deciding on the facts as found that the treatment is essential to, should be afforded to, and should not be forborne by the worker.
- 3. The Court will have regard to medical opinion about the treatment's relevance & appropriateness, any available alternatives, cost and its actual or potential effectiveness and its place in the usual medical armoury of treatments for the particular condition.

Shipp v Community First Development Ltd t/as Indigenous Community Volunteers - [2021] NSWPIC 2



- Member Beilby - 4/03/2021
- Applied the decisions in *Rose* and *Diab* .
- Held: Bariatric surgery was reasonably necessary medical and related treatment for a worker who suffered a lumbar spine injury and required further spinal surgery.



Bliss v State of NSW (Illawarra Shoalhaven Local Health District) [2021] NSWPIC 269

Member Snell - 2/08/2021

Held that medical cannabis is reasonably necessary treatment for a 2013 back injury.

- The insurer disputed the claim because the worker used marijuana pre-injury and failed to disclose this to the doctors.
- Applied the decisions in *Rose* and *Diab*.
- Failure to disclose prior use was not fatal to the claim. While it reduced the weight given to the doctors' opinions, the evidence as a whole indicates that use alleviates pain, assists in reducing long-term reliance on opioids and improves day-to-day-functioning and mental health.





Summers v Sydney International Container Terminals Pty Limited t/as Hutchison Ports [2021] NSWPICPD 35

President Phillips DCJ – 4/11/2021

Was neck surgery reasonably necessary treatment for a 2019 injury?

- Applied *Diab*.
- Held that the Member made findings about the medical evidence that were not supported by the evidence.
- While the PIC is a specialised Tribunal and is able to draw inferences, it can only interpret or draw inferences from existing evidence and not create evidence.





Summers v Sydney International Container Terminals Pty Limited t/as Hutchison Ports [2021] NSWPICPD 35

- All doctors diagnosed pathologies from the C4 to C7 levels but disagreed about which was the most serious.
- The Member was required to grapple with this issue but failed to do so.
- As a result, the Member was not able to properly construe the medical evidence, which was to the effect that the proposed surgery was reasonably necessary.



Honarvar v Professional Painting AU Pty Ltd [2022] NSWPCPD 12

Deputy President Snell – 31/03/2022

- Right ankle injury (requiring multiple surgeries) and soft tissue injuries to the lumbar and cervical spines. Appellant he had extensive conservative treatment including psychological treatment.
- He sought approval for L5/S1 fusion surgery and an orthopaedic bed & mattress (\$33,700).
- The insurer disputed the claims & the appellant sought a declaration under s 60(5) WCA.



Honarvar v Professional Painting AU Pty Ltd

Member Wynyard entered an award for the respondent & held:

- there was no evidence about the failure of conservative treatments and that the appellant's mental state was probably preventing his recovery.
- both Dr Sheehy and Dr Carmody suggested that pain management was more appropriate than surgery.
- the mattress and bed were recommended to aid recovery from the surgery, but as the surgery claim failed these items were not '*curative apparatus*' within the meaning of s 59 WCA.

The appellant appealed on 12 grounds.

Snell DP allowed the appeal & made a declaration under s 60(5).

Honarvar v Professional Painting AU Pty Ltd

- He applied the decisions in *Diab* and *Rose*.
- He found that the Member did not provide sufficient reasons about why the appellant's self-assessment as to the effectiveness of the alternative treatments did not assist him;
- The Member made factual findings that were not open on the evidence, including that:
 - the evidence about the effectiveness of alternative treatment principally came from the appellant;
 - the doctors recommended surgery because nothing else worked;
 - there was no evidence from practitioners who provided the alternative treatments; and
 - the proposed surgery would not result in any significant improvement or associated functional gains.

Honarvar v Professional Painting AU Pty Ltd

- He found that:
- the amount claimed for the mattress and base was clearly an error (this was reduced by \$30,000 on appeal).
- the mattress and base are '*curative apparatus*' for the purposes of s 59(e) WCA, as
 - they could be fairly described as a '*mechanical contrivance*'; &
 - they have '*therapeutic qualities*' and are used to achieve a particular medical purpose, as the treating surgeon made clear.
- The Member effectively ignored the treating practitioners' evidence.

Final Points

- The case law indicates that the PIC has adopted a consistent evidence-based approach to determining s 60 disputes by applying the test in *Diab* and *Rose*.
- The insurer is required to make a soundly-based decision when disputing a claim under s 60.
- In order to challenge a s 60 dispute, the onus is on the worker to provide the Member with a sound basis for finding that the disputed treatment is reasonably necessary.
- Therefore, the evidence relied upon must address the relevant criteria.
- Subjective evidence from the injured worker alone will not be sufficient.

QUESTIONS