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# 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 Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence. The different elements like use case description, business actors, and business process as well as supporting UML diagrams and BPMN models pertaining to Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence 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 Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence business process. This chapter gives a short and detailed description as well as a reference to business process´ legal base.

Chapter 3 lists the actors involved in the Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in the Member State of residence business process.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence business process based on the RUP use case template, as well as the relationship to other use cases.

Chapter 5 describes the Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence business process using business process modelling notation (BPMN).

# Description

## Business Scenario

This BUC allows the institution of the Member State of residence to inform the competent institution that it has issued, on its behalf, an authorisation for a treatment outside the Member State of residence on the basis that the insured person was in need of an urgent vitally necessary treatment.

The competent institution then acknowledges to the institution of the Member State of residence the receipt of the information of the granting of the authorisation, and informs the institution of the Member State of stay, where the urgent vitally necessary treatment is provided, that the claim for reimbursement can be sent directly to the competent institution.

The flow also allows the competent institution to request additional information from the institution of the Member State of residence at any time during the procedure of granting the authorisation.

## Legal Base

This Business Use Case document's 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 SED 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(3) | **26 (3)**  | **26 (4)** |
| S011 | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
| S012 | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |

Table 1: 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 which informs the Competent Member State that it has issued on its behalf an authorization for a treatment outside the Member State of Residence for an insured person who was in need of an urgent vitally necessary treatment |
| ***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 2: Actors & Roles

# Use Case

## RUP Table Representation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case ID:** | **S\_BUC\_11** |
| **Use Case Name:** | Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence |
| **Created By:** | Mirko Brusca | **Last Updated By:** | Carine Molle |
| **Date Created:** | 10/01/2015 | **Last Revision Date:** | 23/11/2016 |
| **Actors:** | Case OwnerCounterparty |
| **Description:** | This flow allows the institution of the Member State of Residence to inform the competent institution that it has issued, on its behalf, an authorisation for a treatment outside the Member State of Residence on the basis that the insured person was in need of an urgent vitally necessary treatment.The competent institution then acknowledges to the institution of the Member State of Residence the receipt of the information of the granting of the authorisation.The flow also allows the competent institution to request additional information from the Member State of Residence. |
| **Trigger:** | An insured person who does not reside in the competent Member State applies for an authorisation (portable document S2) to receive an appropriate (scheduled) treatment outside the Member State of Residence. |
| **Preconditions:** | The Member State of Stay where the insured person must receive the treatment is neither the Member State of Residence nor the Competent Member State;Portable S2 has been completed with the information of the Competent Member State on whose behalf the prior authorisation has been issued by the Member State of Residence. The insured person has received the portable document. |
| **Post conditions:** | The competent institution sends to the Member State of Residence the acknowledgment for the granting of the authorisation. |
| **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 "Information on urgent vitally necessary treatment – outside Member State of Residence" (S011) entering relevant information and enclosing attachments (i.e. start and end date as it appears on the prior authorisation, );
2. The Case Owner sends the S011 to the Counterparty.

**Reply to the request** 1. The Counterparty receives the Information on urgent vitally necessary treatment (S011);
2. The Counterparty fills in an "Acknowledgement of receipt – Information on authorisation for urgent vitally necessary treatment" (S012);
3. The Counterparty sends the S012 to the Case Owner;
4. The Case Owner receives the S012;
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 ounterparty 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 SEDS that have a logical pairing to one another, usually this is known as a request-reply pair.

| **REQUEST SED** | **REPLY SED(s)** |
| --- | --- |
| S011 | S012 |

## Attachments allowed

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

| **SED** | **Attachments** |
| --- | --- |
| **S011** | Allowed  |
| **S012** | Not allowed |

## Artefacts used

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

| **Artefact name** | **Artefact type** |
| --- | --- |
| **S011** | SED |
| **S012** | 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

This chapter describes the Business Use Case Urgent vitally necessary treatment – Request for authorisation in Member State of residence using BPMN 2.0.

## Case Owner and Counterparty



*Figure 2: depicts the use case from Case Owner and Counterparty point of view, from a high level.*

## Sub Processes

Not applicable.

# Appendices

## Issues

| **#** | **Issue date** | **Description** | **Replies** | **Action/Resolution** | **Close date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 21/01/2015 | Despite the Diagram in the Guideline shows that the S013 is sent from the competent Member State to both the Member State of Residence and Stay, in the written description is mentioned that the S013 should be sent only to the Member State of Stay. | [13/03/2015] UK: SO13 should be sent to both Member States. The MS of Stay needs to know who they have to bill, the MS of Residence needs to know they are not going to be billed and the Competent Institution need to know what to pay the MS of Stay.[18/03/2015] BE: the SED S013 is to be sent to1.the MS of Stay to inform it to whom it has to send the claim, and to2. the MS of Residence to inform it that the competent MS has taken the necessary steps to notify the MS of stay to whom the claim should be sent. | Model the double sent. | 18/03/2015 |
| 2 | 21/01/2015 | The Diagram in the Guideline shows that the S013 might be sent before the S012. The analysis of the text shows that the sequence is strict and that S012 must be sent before the S013. | No inquiries | Model the BUC enforcing the S012 to be sent before the S013. | 21/01/2015 |
| 3 | 04/11/2015 | Outcome of the Sickness AdHoc Group Meeting, the process can be simplified.This simplification is based on the hypothesis that the portable document S2 is changed by adding a new section with the information about the competent Member State on whose behalf the S2 has been issued.  | If portable document is changed.Only S011 and S012 are parts of the flows.No need to send a S013.Furthermore, these kind of cases are so rare, that requesting additional information with S075 and S076 are not needed. |  |  |
| 4 | 06/11/2015 | **Comment from Belgium**Requesting additional information with S075 – S076 only to be kept between competent MS and MS of residence |  | These SEDs are kept within this BUC. They could be replaced later by the Horizontal sub-process focused on medical report. | 16/12/2015 |
| 5 | 16/12/2015 | Section 4.5 : SED and Sub-process versioningIs it needed to use this H\_BUC\_01 while there is a specific Sickness sub-process to request additional info ? | BE prefers to use the specific Sickness sub-processes, if existing, rather than Horizontal sub-processes. | H\_BUC\_01 is not used in this BUC | 18/01/2016 |
| 6 | 21/06/2016 | Conversion of the BPMN diagram to split between Case Owner and Counterparty. |  | Scheduled for update. |  |
| 7 | 21/09/2016 | Does the precondition from S\_BUC\_08 also apply here? For a country such as the UK, we will already be receiving an average cost payment from the competent member state per annum. If we follow this BUC in order to issue authorisation for treatment outside of the UK on behalf of another member state, then the competent member state will in effect be paying twice, once to the UK for the person concerned under average cost and secondly to the member state who provided the treatment. The only difference we can see between S\_BUC\_08 and S\_BUC\_11 is that in S\_BUC\_11 there is no time to ask the competent member state for authorisation so the member state of residence issues said authorisation on their behalf. Both scnearios involve the issuing of S2, however one is pre-planned as there is time to do so and the other is urgently vitally neccessary. | This comment will be discussed during the AHG meeting the 4th October 2016. | AHG members agreed while S\_BUC\_08 is the prior authorisation for the planned treatment.The precondition in the new version of the document has been updated and contains the precondition of the S\_BUC\_08.We have to inform you, that this version of the S\_BUC\_11 assumes that the portable document S2 has been updated and changed as adviced and proposed by AHG members. | 23/11/2016 |
| 8 | 23/11/2016 | BPMN diagrams will be updated."S075 and S076" will be replaced by the sub-process H\_BUC\_08."Reminder" will be added for Case Owner and Counterparty."H\_BUC\_01" will be added for Case Owner |  | Scheduled for update. |  |