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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 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.

## Scope

This document is limited to the external view of the Sickness´ sector process concerning the Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members.

The different elements use case description, business actors, and business process as well as supporting UML diagrams and BPMN models pertaining to the Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members.

## 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 |
| 2 | EC Regulation 987/2009 | Regulation EC No 987-2009.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 Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members 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 Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members business process.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members business process based on the RUP use case template, as well as the relationship to other use cases.

Chapter 5 describes the Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker and/or his/her family members business process using business process modelling notation (BPMN).

# Description

## Business Scenario

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

This particular case allows the competent institution to inform the institution of the former Member State(s) of employment that the former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors are no longer entitled to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State(s) of employment of the frontier worker at the expense of the competent institution.

The institution of the former Member State(s) of employment confirms the cancellation of the entitlement document to the competent institution.

This particular case is not provided by the Regulations (EC) 883/2004 and 987/2009 but it can be very helpful for both the competent institution and the institution of the former Member State of employment in managing the entitlement to benefits in kind of a former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors.

## Legal Base

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

1. basic Regulation (EC) No 883/2004
2. 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)** |
| 28 | 29 |
| S077 | **✓** | **✓** |
| S131 |  | **✓** |
| S050 | **✓** | **✓** |

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 the Competent institution which informs all the former Member State(s) of employment that the former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors are no longer entitled to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State(s) of employment. |
| ***Counterparty*** | In this BUC the Counterparty is the Institution of the former Member State(s) of employment which is informed by the Competent institution that the former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors are no longer entitled to receive benefits in kind in that former Member State of employment. |

Table 2: Actors & Roles

# Use Case

## RUP Table Representation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use Case ID:** | **S\_BUC\_18a** |
| **Use Case Name:** | Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker / family member of a former frontier worker |
| **Created By:** | Carine Molle | **Last Updated By:** | Carine Molle |
| **Date Created:** | 11/01/2016 | **Last Revision Date:** | 23/11/2016 |
| **Actors:** | Case OwnerCounterparty |
| **Description:** | This particular case deals with the situation where the competent institution informs the institution of all former Member State(s) of employment that the former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors are no longer entitled to receive benefits in kind in the former Member State(s) of employment of the frontier worker at the expense of the competent institution.The institution(s) of the former Member State(s) of employment confirms the cancellation of the entitlement document to the competent institution. |
| **Trigger:** | The competent institution detects that the former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors are no longer entitled in the former Member State of employment which had previously acknowledged the receipt of the entitlement document by sending a S130. |
| **Preconditions:** | The former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors reside or stay in Member State(s) other than the former Member State of employment of the former frontier worker. The concerned person is a former frontier worker or a family member or a survivor of the former frontier worker.The former frontier worker or his/her family members or his/her survivors were previously entitled to benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment. The entitlement to benefits in kind was previously acknowledged by the former Member State of employment which sent a S130 to the competent Member State. |
| **Post Conditions:** | The institution(s) of the former Member State(s) of employment acknowledge(s) receipt of the cancellation of the entitlement document to the competent institution. |
| **Main Scenario:** | **Identify Participants**1. The Case Owner (competent institution) identifies the institutions in the former Member State(s) of employment which had previously acknowledged the receipt of the entitlement document by sending a S130;
2. The Case Owner then identifies the correct institution(s) (Institution(s) in the former Member State(s) of employment). One or several Counterparties can be selected. The Case Owner and the Counterparty(ies) are herein collectively referred to as the Participants.

**Process to inform about the Cancellation of Entitlement Document**1. The Case Owner fills in the "Cancellation of Entitlement Document – Former Frontier Worker – Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S077) by entering the requested information. One SED S077 will be sent by the Case Owner to all the Counterparties previously selected;
2. The Case Owner sends the S077 to the Counterparty(ies).

**Process Cancellation & Send Confirmation of Cancellation of Entitlement Document**1. The Counterparty(ies) receive(s) the S077;
2. Each Counterparty fills in the "Confirmation of Cancellation of Entitlement Document – Former Frontier Worker – Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S131) by entering the requested information. The institution of the former Member State of employment informs the competent institution that it has received the S077 and has proceeded to the cancellation of the entitlement to benefits in kind for the person concerned;
3. The Counterparty sends the S131 to the Case Owner;
4. The Case Owner receives the "Confirmation of Cancellation of Entitlement Document – Former Frontier Worker – Family Member of Former Frontier Worker" SED (S131) containing the information about the confirmation that the former Member State has received the S077 and has proceeded to the cancellation of the entitlement of benefits in kind for the person concerned;
5. This use case ends here.
 |
| **Alternative Scenarios:** | 1. ***At [step 8] the Case Owner may optionally choose to fill in and send a Dispute Registration Date (S050).***
2. The Case Owner fills in a Dispute of Date SED (S050) where they express a dispute concerning the cancellation date indicated in the section 5 of SED S131;
3. The Case Owner sends the S050 to the Counterparty;
4. The Counterparty receives the S050;
5. The Counterparty fills in the S131 by entering the new date as of which the person concerned is no longer entitled to benefits in kind in the former Member State of employment at the expense of the competent institution;
6. The Counterparty sends the S131 to the Case Owner;
7. [This Branch] Ends.
 |
| ***The Following Branches Determine the use of Horizontally Defined Sub Processes within this Business Process*** |
| 1. ***At any step after [step 5] the Counterparty may optionally choose to request AdHoc Information from Case Owner.***
2. The Counterparty executes business use case ***H\_BUC\_01 – Adhoc Exchange of Info*;**
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 this Business Process*** |
| 1. ***At [step 5] the Counterparty may optionally choose to Forward this Business Process to another Competent Institution within its MS who assumes responsibility for handling it.***
2. The Counterparty executes business use case ***AD\_BUC\_05 – Forward Case*;**
3. [This Branch] Ends.
 |
|  | 1. ***After Branch 2 [step 1] a Counterparty may optionally choose to send a reminder in order to receive the answer to Ad Hoc 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 4.4 |
| **Special Requirements:** | **SR0**: General RuleAs the cancellation of entitlement is individualised the case can concern only one person.Cancellation of entitlement can be sent to several institutions in all former Member States of employment. **SR1**: Rules about invoking of Branches:[Branch 1] – May be invoked more than once.Horizontal[Branch 2] – May be invoked more than once.[Branch 3] – May be invoked more than onceAdministrative[Branch 4] – May be invoked once only when the first SED is received by Counterparty and before sending the answer.[Branch 5] – May be invoked more than once.[Branch 6] – 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)** |
| --- | --- |
| **S077** | S131 |
| **S050** | S131 |

## Attachments Allowed

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

| **SED** | **Attachments** |
| --- | --- |
| **S077** | Allowed  |
| **S131** | Allowed |
| **S050** | Allowed |

## Artefacts used

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

| **Artefact name** | **Artefact type** |
| --- | --- |
| **S077** | SED |
| **S131** | SED |
| **S050** | 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 |

# Business Processes

This chapter describes the Business Use Case Cancellation of entitlement document of a former frontier worker/family member of a former frontier worker using BPMN 2.0.

## Case Owner and Counterparty



*Figure 2: depicts the use case end-to-end, from a high level, using the BPMN 2.0 collaboration diagram*

## Sub Processes

Not applicable.

# Appendices

## Issues

| **#** | **Issue date** | **Description** | **Replies** | **Action/Resolution** | **Close date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.1 – RUP Table Representation (Main Scenario step 2)Several counterparties can be selected.Does it mean that the institutions are selected only when the BUC starts or is it possible during the process to add / remove some institutions? | **Answer received from Germany**In my view, it only makes sense when the BUC starts, i.e. when the competent institution sends SED S077.**Comment received from Belgium**Is it technically possible to send the same SED to several counterparties in “one movement”? If not, that means that the same SED should be send separately to all counterparties involved individually.***Answer from EESSI Team***Yes, technically it is possible to send the same SED to several counterparties. When several counterparties have been selected, the sender can choose to send the SED to all counterparties or some of them.  | No action required | 09/02/2016 |
| 2 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.1 – RUP Table Representation (Main Scenario step 3)Is the Section 5 "Cancellation reason" mandatory or not?  | **Answer received from Germany**Yes, it is mandatory. But the title is wrong; it is not only about the reason for cancellation but contains all necessary information about the cancellation. It should thus be called “Cancellation”. I will make myself a note for the next SED review process. **Comment received from Belgium**I would suggest keeping this mandatory. It might help the Counterparty why the entitlement is being cancelled | Note should be sent by AHG member to change the title.A Jira ticket has been declared to handle this issue with the version 4.0 of the SED | 11/02/2016 |
| 3 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.1 – RUP Table Representation (Main Scenario step 3)In the SED S077, section 5.1.1 "Entitlement document S008 / S3" has a wrong data type; it should be a free text while currently it is a date. Could you confirm this while the data model has to be changed? | **Answer received from Germany**Indeed, the date is wrong. I would not allow free text either however. Please allow the choice only between PD S3 and SED S008. We will shorten the title of Section 5.1.1 into “entitlement document” in the next SED version.**Comment received from Belgium**Section 5.1.1 in version 4.0 of SED S077 already has the right data type, i.e. 65 characters. | A Jira ticket has been declared to handle this issue with the version 4.0 of the SED | 11/02/2016 |
| 4 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.1 – RUP Table Representation (Main Scenario step 3)Should the Section 5.1.2 "Issued on" be mandatory or not?  | **Answer received from Germany**Yes, it should be compulsory. We should adapt the SED and introduce a “date” filed in Section 5.1.2.**Comment received from Belgium**I would answer “yes” because but it can be very helpful in managing the entitlement to benefits in kind / the file of the person concerned. | A Jira ticket has been declared to handle this issue with the version 4.0 of the SED | 11/02/2016 |
| 5 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.3 – Attachments allowedCould you confirm on which SEDs attachments are allowed? | **Answer from Germany**OK**Comment received from Belgium**If my memory serves me well, it was decided once that we should keep the option of allowing attachments to all SEDs | No action required | 09/02/2016 |
| 6 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.5 SED and Sub-process Versioning – Add ParticipantDue to the fact that the case can be sent to several institutions in all former Member States, it could be interesting to have the opportunity to "Add Participant" during the handling of the case. Otherwise all the institutions should be selected at the beginning of the process and no change will not be possible during the process.What do you think about it? | **Comment received from Belgium**Cf. issue 1 – OK, if technically possible and no too difficult to implement by the clerks | The participants are selected at the beginning of the process. Sub-processes Add and Remove participant cannot be used.No action required | 11/02/2016 |
| 7 | 12/01/2016 | Section 4.5 SED and Sub-process Versioning – Remove ParticipantDue to the fact that the case can be sent to several institutions in all former Member States, it could be interesting to have the opportunity to "Remove Participant" during the handling of the case. Otherwise all the institutions should be selected at the beginning of the process and no change will not be possible during the process even if the institutions selected are wrong.What do you think about it? | **Comment received from Belgium**Cf. issue 1 and issue 6– OK, if technically possible and no too difficult to implement by the clerks | The participants are selected at the beginning of the process. Sub-processes Add and Remove participant cannot be used.No action required | 11/02/2016 |
| 8 | 21/09/2016 | page 12, alternative scenarios, branch 4 – forwardWhat if there is a change in competence of the Case Owner between sending SED S077 and optional sending SED S050? The competent institution is closed or whatsoever. Should not there be also possibility for the Case Owner to forward the case?  | AHG members refuse this suggestion - this is a horizontal topic which should be handled within the institution repository. | No change | 23/11/2016 |
| 9 | 23/11/2016 | BPMN diagrams will be updated."Reminder" will be added to Case Owner and Counterparty |  | Scheduled for update. |  |