

Approved

EESSI Business Use Case

Annex Nr.14 to the note AC 370/16rev

*S\_BUC\_08*

*Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State)*





# Table of Contents

[Table of Contents 2](#_Toc493238478)

[1. Introduction 8](#_Toc493238479)

[1.1. Purpose 8](#_Toc493238480)

[1.2. Scope 8](#_Toc493238481)

[1.3. Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations 8](#_Toc493238482)

[1.4. References 9](#_Toc493238483)

[1.5. Overview 9](#_Toc493238484)

[2. Description 10](#_Toc493238485)

[2.1. Business Scenario 10](#_Toc493238486)

[2.2. Legal Base 10](#_Toc493238487)

[3. Actors & Roles 11](#_Toc493238488)

[4. Use Case 12](#_Toc493238489)

[4.1. RUP Table Representation 12](#_Toc493238490)

[4.2. Request – Reply SEDs 15](#_Toc493238491)

[4.3. Attachments Allowed 15](#_Toc493238492)

[4.4. SED and Sub-process Versioning 15](#_Toc493238493)

[5. Business Processes 17](#_Toc493238494)

[5.1. Case Owner and Counterparty 17](#_Toc493238495)

[5.2. Sub Processes 18](#_Toc493238496)

[6. Appendices 19](#_Toc493238497)

[6.1. Issues 19](#_Toc493238498)

**Document Control Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Settings** | **Value** |
| **Document Title:** | **Business Use Case****S\_BUC\_08 Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State)** |
| **Project Title:** | **EESSI (Electronic Exchange of Social Security Information) Project** |
| **Document Author:** | **European Commission, DG EMPL F5** |
| **Project Owner:**  | **European Commission, DG EMPL D2** |
| **Doc. Version:**  | **V4.1.0** |
| **Sensitivity:**  | **Public** |
| **Date:**  | **09/08/2018** |

**Document history:**

The Document Author is authorized to make the following types of changes to the document without requiring that the document be re-approved:

* Editorial, formatting, and spelling
* Clarification

To request a change to this document, contact the Document Author or Owner.

| **Revision** | **Date** | **Created by** | **Short Description of Changes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| v0.1 | 10/01/2015 | Mirko Brusca | First draft |
| v0.2 | 21/04/2015 | Mirko Brusca | Final Review after Chris Segaert and Alyson LONGSTAFF Review. |
| v0.3 | 13/08/2015 | Carine Molle | Document history : table is now in reverse chronological order.Chapter 2 : 2.1 last sentence of paragraph has been modified2.2 Basic Regulation No 883/994 has been replaced by No 883/2004 Chapter 4 : Modification based on AHG remark (S075 and S076 should be a repeatable process)Small modification based on Test Team review (split big task in smallest ones)Chapter 5 :Section 5.3 :- Diagram for "Identify Participants" sub-process has been added- Diagram for "Request Info" sub-process has been replaced by the new oneGrammatical corrections (minor correction) based on feedback received from Alyson LONGSTAFF in another BUC. |
| v0.4.0 | 20/01/2016 | Carine Molle | Parts of the document have been added in order to be in line with document presentation and content to be approved by Administrative Commission.As agreed during the AHG Members meeting 04/11/2015:H\_BUC\_01 is added for Case Owner AD\_BUC\_05 Forward is added for CounterpartyClaimant is removed from the BUC.Chapter 22.1 Business Scenario is renamed and updated. Last sentence is removed2.2 Legal Base is updatedChapter 3 Actors & RolesClaimant is removedChapter 44.1 RUP Table Representation"Actors" – Claimant is removed"Main scenario" – Step 8 is added"Exceptions" is added"Includes" is updated"Alternatives scenarios":- Branch 2 : H\_BUC\_01 is added for Case Owner- Branch 3 : AD\_BUC\_05 Forward is added for Counterparty"Special Requirements" is updated according to the branches added4.2 Request – Reply SEDs is added4.3 Attachments Allowed is added4.4 RUP UC Diagram is updated (H\_BUC\_01 and AD\_BUC\_05 are added, Claimant is removed)4.5 SED and Sub-process Versioning is addedChapter 55.1 Case Owner (BPMN is updated – Claimant is removed and H\_BUC\_01 is added)5.2 Counterparty (BPMN is updated – AD\_BUC\_05 is added)5.3 Called Sub ProcessesIdentify Participants BPMN is updated5.4 Main Scenario is removedChapter 6Section 6.1 Related Use Cases is removedSection 6.2 Privacy and Security Assumptions is removedVersion number of the document has been changed to be in line with the convention M.m.p where :- 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) |
| v0.5.0 | 01/03/2016 | Carine Molle | As requested H\_BUC\_01 is added for the Counterparty.Section 4 : RUP Table RepresentationBranch 1 : details have been addedBranch 3 is added (H\_BUC\_01 for the Counterparty).Other branch is renumbered.Branch 4 : At [step 5] is replaced by*After [step 5] and before [step 6]*Section 5 BPMN diagram has been replacedSection 6.1 comment on issue 1 received from Belgium is added |
| v0.99.0 | 15/04/2016 | Carine Molle | Candidate for AC Approval as agreed by the Sickness rapporteur. |
| v1.0.0 | 28/06/2016 | Valérie Banchereau | Status logo set to 'Approved' following AC approval of June, 20th 2016.Alignment to the standard description and layout of the BUC. |
| v1.1.0 | 13/06/2017 | Joël Fiora | **Change Request EESSI-1798**: As agreed by AHG members, "AD\_BUC\_07 – Reminder" has been added for Case Owner and Counterparty:- Correction Section 4: description of Branches 'Reminder' – Branches 4 and 5-Correction Section 4, Branch 1 and 2, withdraw the use of H\_BUC\_01 as 'Reminder' **Change Request EESSI-1849**: "H\_BUC\_01" is added for the Case Owner"H\_BUC\_08" is added for the Counterparty and replaces S075 and S076Section 4.1 has been updated (Branch 4 and 5 added)Section 4.4 has been updated (Reminder is added)Section 4.5 SED and Sub-process Versioning: H\_BUC\_01 and H\_BUC\_08 are added)S075 and S076 are removed |
| v1.1.1 | 03/07/2017 | Joël Fiora | - Included BPMN picture in section 5- removed Use Case diagram |
| v4.1.0 | 09/08/2018 | Eric Briffoz | - Section 4.4: merged 2 tables (for SED & for Subprocesses) into 1 Artefact table.- Version adaptations to release 4.1.0. |

# Introduction

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to construct an external view of, the 'EESSI business system' as described in EC Regulations 883/2004 and 987/2009. The ‘EESSI Business System’ describes the business and expected business processes without any 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, and business processes.

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.

## Scope

This document is limited to the external view of the Sickness' sector process concerning Scheduled Treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State). The different elements like use case description, business actors, and business process as well as supporting UML diagrams and BPMN models pertaining to the Scheduled Treatment - Information on Coverage of Specific Benefit in Kind case.

## Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

Please see the EESSI Project Glossary [here](https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/CITnet/confluence/display/EESSI/Project%2BInformation%2Bfor%2BStakeholders)

## References

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Description** |  |
| 1 | EC Regulation 883/2004 | [Regulation EC No 883- 2004.pdf](../../../amadere/AppData/Local/3.Specifications/1-Legal%20Base/Regulation%20EC%20No%20883-%202004.pdf) |
| 2 | EC Regulation 987/2009 | [Regulation EC No 987-2009.pdf](../../../amadere/AppData/Local/3.Specifications/1-Legal%20Base/Regulation%20EC%20No%20987-2009.pdf) |
| 3 | UML 2.x | <http://www.omg.org/spec/UML/> |
| 4 | BPMN 2.0 | <http://www.omg.org/spec/BPMN/index.htm> |
| 5 | UML 2.0 In Action | Henriette Baumann, Patrick Grassle & Philippe Baumann, 2005, ISBN 1904811558 |
| 6 | RUP@EC standard 5.0 | <http://www.cc.cec/RUPatEC_Standard/> |
| 7 | RUP op maat | <http://www.rupopmaat.nl/> |

## Overview

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

Chapter 2 introduces the Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State) 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 Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State) business process.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State) business process based on the RUP use case template, as well as the relationship to other use cases.

Chapter 5 describes the Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State) business process using business process modelling notation (BPMN).

# Description

## Business Scenario

This BUC allows the institution of the Member State of residence, in case it is not the competent institution to issue an authorisation, to forward the request for an authorisation made an insured person/pensioner to the competent institution.

The competent institution subsequently decides if an authorisation is granted or not, and

• issues a portable document S2 to the person concerned,

• and informs the institution of the Member State of residence of its decision.

## Legal Base

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

* Basic Regulation (EC) No 883/2004
* Implementing Regulation (EC) No 987/2009

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)** |
| **20** | **27** | **26** |
| S009 | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
| S010 | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |

Table : SED – Legal base relationship matrix

# 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 Institution of the Member State of Residence to which the insured person/pensioner is requesting the authorization |
| ***Counterparty*** | In this BUC The Counterparty is the Institution of the competent Member State entitled to grant an authorization to receive an appropriate treatment. |

Table : Actors & Roles

# Use Case

## RUP Table Representation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case ID:** | **S\_BUC\_08** |
| **Use Case Name:** | Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay (Residence not in competent Member State) |
| **Created By:** | Mirko Brusca | **Last Updated By:** | Carine Molle |
| **Date Created:** | 10/01/2015 | **Last Revision Date:** | 01/03/2016 |
| **Actors:** | Case OwnerCounterparty |
| **Description:** | This case deals with the situation when an insured person/pensioner, who does not reside in the competent Member State, requests the institution of his/her place of residence for an authorisation for a scheduled treatment outside the Member State of residence.The institution of the place of residence examines whether the conditions to issue an authorisation in the Member State of residence are met or not, and informs the competent institution of its conclusions. |
| **Trigger:** | An insured person/pensioner (claimant), who does not reside in the competent Member State, requests the institution of his/her place of residence for an authorisation for a scheduled treatment outside the Member State of residence |
| **Preconditions:** | The insured person stays outside the residence Member State and the competent Member State if the latter one is mentioned in Annex IV of Regulation (EC) 883/2004. Currently the Member States mentioned in the ANNEX IV are: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Cyprus, Luxemburg, Hungary, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden, as well as Iceland, Liechtenstein and Switzerland.The institution of the Member State of residence is not competent for issuing an authorisation (Member State is not mentioned in ANNEX 3 of Regulation (EC) 987/2009. |
| **Post Conditions:** | The competent institution decides if an authorisation is granted or not, and* issues a portable document S2 to the person concerned,
* informs the institution of the Member State of residence of its decision.
 |
| **Main Scenario:** | **Identify Participants**1. The Case Owner (Institution of Member State of Residence) identifies the Competent Member State entitled to issue the authorisation;
2. The Case Owner then identifies the correct institution in the Competent Member State. There will be only one counterparty. The Case Owner and the Counterparty are herein collectively referred to as the Participants;

**Request for entitlement document** 1. The Case Owner fills in the "Request for entitlement document - scheduled treatment outside Member State of residence " (S009) entering information about its conclusions and attaching all relevant medical data (medical report, treatment options, medical evaluation/examination by a medical officer, ...);
2. The Case Owner sends the S009 to the Counterparty.

**Reply to the request** 1. The Counterparty receives the request for entitlement document (S009);
2. The Counterparty fills in a " Reply to request for Entitlement Document - scheduled treatment outside Member State of residence " (S010) specifying its decision;
3. The Counterparty sends the S010 to the Case Owner;
4. The Case Owner receives the S010.
5. This use case ends here.
 |
| **Alternative Scenarios:** | ***The Following Branches determine the use of Horizontally Defined Sub Processes within the Business Process*** |
| 1. ***At any step after [step 7] the Counterparty may optionally choose to request medical information from Case Owner***
2. The Counterparty executes business use case ***H\_BUC\_08 – Medical Information***
3. [This Branch] Ends
 |
| 1. ***At any step after [step 8] the Case Owner may optionally choose to request AdHoc Information from Counterparty***
2. The Case Owner executes business use case ***H\_BUC\_01 – Adhoc Exchange of Info;***
3. [This Branch] Ends
 |
| ***The Following Branches determine the use of Administrative Defined Sub Processes within the Business Process*** |
| 1. ***At any step after [step 5] the Counterparty may optionally choose to Forward this Business Process to another Institution within its MS who assumes responsibility for changing it***
2. The Counterparty executes business use case ***AD\_BUC\_05 – Forward Case;***
3. [This Branch] Ends.
 |
| 1. ***after Branch 1 [step 1] Counterparty may optionally choose to send a reminder in order to receive the Information expected and not yet received***
2. The Counterparty executes business use case ***AD\_BUC\_07 -*\_*Reminder;***
3. [This Branch] Ends
 |
|  | 1. ***At any step after [step 4] Case Owner may optionally choose to send a reminder in order to receive Information expected and not yet received.***
2. The Case Owner executes business use case ***AD\_BUC\_07*\_ *-*\_*Reminder;***
3. [This Branch] Ends
 |
| **Exceptions:** | None |
| **Includes:** | See diagram at part 4.4 |
| **Special Requirements:** | **SR0**: General RuleAs the request is individualized the case can concern only one person. **SR1**: Rules about invoking of Branches[Branch 1] – May be invoked more than once[Branch 2] – May be invoked more than once[Branch 3] – May be invoked once when the first SED is received by Counterparty and before sending the answer[Branch 4] – May be invoked more than once.[Branch 5] – May be invoked more than once. |
| **Assumptions:** |  |
| **Notes and Issues:** |   |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Request – Reply SEDs

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

| **REQUEST SED** | **REPLY SED(s)** |
| --- | --- |
| **S009** | S010 |

## Attachments Allowed

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

| **SED** | **Attachments** |
| --- | --- |
| **S009** | Allowed  |
| **S010** | Allowed |

## Artefacts used

The following table specifies the artefacts that are used in this Business Use Case.

| **Artefact name** | **Artefact type** |
| --- | --- |
| **S009** | SED |
| **S010** | SED |
| **H\_BUC\_01\_Subprocess** | BUC |
| **H\_BUC\_08\_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 |

# Business Processes

The following paragraphs describe the Business Use Case Scheduled treatment - Request Entitlement Document in Member State of Stay using BPMN 2.0.

## Case Owner and Counterparty



Figure : depicts the use case end-to-end for the Case Owner and Counterparty, from a high level.

## Sub Processes

Not applicable.

# Appendices

## Issues

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue date** | **Description** | **Replies** | **Action/Resolution** | **Close date** |
| 1 | 20/01/2016 | H\_BUC\_01 has not been added for the Counterparty while this participant can use the exchange of S075 – S076 in order to request additional information from the Case Owner.But it means in the same time, that no "reminder" can be sent to the Case Owner. What do you think about this ? | **BE COMMENT (08.02.2016)**We have the possibility of exchanging S075-S076 for additional information, and indeed, it means that no “reminder” can be sent to the Case Owner. However, would adding H\_BUC\_01 between steps 5 and 6 not create more confusion, i.e. a S- and a H-procedure to ask for more information?Why would that be an issue in this BUC but not in S\_BUC\_09 v0.5.0 where we have a similar situation? | H\_BUC\_01 will be added. | 01/03/2016 |
| 2 | 28/06/2016 | Conversion of the BPMN to split between Case Owner and Counterparty. |  | Scheduled for update. |  |