

July 26, 2023 Update: WSIB Dispute resolution and appeals value-for-money audit consultation

LAL update July 26, 2023: On July 26, 2023 the WSIB [updated its consultation webpage](#) with this message:

Update July 26, 2023

The first phase of our consultation began on June 8, 2023 and closed on July 21, 2023. We appreciate all the feedback received, which overwhelmingly supports improvements to the dispute resolution and appeals process while raising valid concerns around the potential impact of truncated deadlines. We'll publish the consolidated submissions along with our analysis and response, in the fall of 2023.

This is the first phase in our effort to improve people's experience with dispute resolution and appeals at the WSIB and to make sure people get the support they need to get the best possible return-to-work and recovery outcomes. We welcome all perspectives so that any improvements we make take into consideration the impact on the people we're here to help.

As we work toward making gradual improvements in our delivery of dispute resolution and appeals services and consider the opportunities presented in the audit, we will provide more opportunities for consultation before final decisions are made. In the meantime, additional comments and feedback are welcome by email to appealsfeedback@wsib.on.ca.

- In fall 2023, LAL will review all of the papers that have been submitted to the Board along with the WSIB "analysis and response" and will file a further update once completed.
- The Board's statement that "*the feedback received, which overwhelmingly supports improvements to the dispute resolution and appeals process while raising valid concerns around the potential impact of truncated deadlines,*" does not in my view suggest the conclusion that the responses support the Board's recommendations *per se*, but that there is wide-spread support for *improving* the WSIB decision-review and appeals processes, as there should be, and as in my experience, there always has been.
- As set out in my paper, I have argued that the **Quality Assurance** recommendations ([KPMG VFMA](#), pp. 6, 7, 18, 22, 27 and 31 primarily), are excellent recommendations. A strong argument could be advanced that the Board, for the moment, should focus exclusively on those recommendations, and see how progress evolves over the next several years. A new and improved Quality Assurance program, on its own, is a pretty big apple to bite into, and I doubt it will prove to be controversial.
- It seems that the Board has heard the concerns about the "*impact of truncated deadlines.*" It will be interesting to see if that translates into adjustments to the Board's approach. It very well might.
- More soon.

LAL