merative™

Cúram 8.1.2

Evidence Broker Guide

Note

Before using this information and the product it supports, read the information in

Edition

This edition applies to Cúram 8.1, 8.1.1, and 8.1.2.

© Merative US L.P. 2012, 2024

Merative and the Merative Logo are trademarks of Merative US L.P. in the United States and other countries.

Contents

1 Sharing evidence by using the evidence broker

The evidence broker mediates the sharing of evidence between cases in an agency. According to an agency's needs, administrators can create sharing configurations based on case and evidence types. Flexible sharing configuration options enable administrators to configure exactly what evidence information is shared between cases. Administrators can also configure whether caseworkers need to manually review evidence that is shared to particular cases. Another objective of the evidence broker is to enable caseworkers to spend less time on administering evidence and to focus on resolving genuine conflicts that occur during evidence sharing.

Why does evidence need to be shared between cases

Agencies widely adopt the principle of evidence sharing to enable information to be shared and processed more efficiently. When a client is registered for a program with an agency, for example, a program that provides financial assistance toward the cost of medical treatment, evidence information is stored about the client in an associated case. When clients avail of multiple programs through an agency, clients can be added to multiple cases. Clients do not want to be required to submit the same information multiple times for themselves and their family members. Also, when client evidence changes, such as a change in address, the evidence change must be communicated to all cases that a client is registered on.

The evidence broker also caters for scenarios where agencies might maintain evidence that is similar but that is structured or formatted differently, with slight content variations. Different case types can require additional information for particular evidence types compared to other cases. For example, the requirements for identifications evidence might vary such that different cases might not record information in identical formats. The Cúram evidence broker is a solution that can be configured to comply with the different needs and concerns of agencies.

Switching to the previous version of the evidence broker

The new evidence broker is enabled by default in Cúram. To switch to using the previous version of the evidence broker, some configuration is required, as described in the *Enabling Evidence Broker 1* section in the *Cúram Upgrade Guide* that is in the Version 7.0.4 of the Cúram Upgrade Helper pack. For more information, see the *Getting started with an upgrade* related link. For information about using the previous version of the evidence broker, see Cúram version 7.0.1 Evidence Broker documentation.

Related information

1.1 Evidence sharing key terminology

A list of key terms and definitions that relate to evidence sharing in Cúram.

- **Add as new**
  An action that is used by caseworkers to insert incoming evidence onto a case when the evidence is not already on the case.

- **Correction**
  A course of action by a caseworker to resolve conflicts between incoming and existing evidence that occur on one or more dates.
- **Custom matching**
  A hook point that allows customers to add extra custom matching criteria to determine what happens to a specific piece of evidence.
- **Delete existing**
  An action that is used by caseworkers to delete an existing evidence record. This action is used when a previously shared evidence record is deleted from a source case, therefore the caseworker wants to delete the corresponding existing evidence record from the target case.
- **Delivery plan**
  An internal object that contains the information that is used by the evidence broker to share a piece of evidence, for example, the type, the status, the target, and the current recommended share action.
- **Edit**
  An action that is used by caseworkers to edit incoming evidence for a specific date, for example, because of missing information on the evidence.
- **Evidence broker**
  The mechanism that allows evidence to be shared throughout the system. The evidence broker mediates the sharing of evidence between cases in an agency.
- **Evidence sharing**
  The sharing of client evidence across Cúram components, such as between cases and person evidence, and between enterprises. Evidence sharing helps to ensure that caseworkers do not have to create the same evidence multiple times and clients do not have to resubmit their information multiple times for eligibility and determination.
- **Evidence sharing triggers**
  Caseworker actions that trigger the broker to share evidence records between cases. The caseworker actions are adding a case member, activating evidence, and authorizing an application.
- **Exact match**
  An exact match occurs when the evidence broker compares the values of an incoming evidence record to the values of existing evidence records, and the values are identical, that is, all the fields match.
- **Identical evidence**
  Evidence records that are shared between cases and whose structure is identical.
- **Ignore**
  An action that is used by caseworkers to not share incoming evidence with a target case. The action also removes the evidence from the incoming evidence list.
- **Logically equivalent (LE)**
  Evidence that is mapped to another type of evidence whose structure is not identical, for example, SSN Details to Identifications.
- **Maintenance pattern**
  The pattern that the evidence follows in the application, that is, single, single over time, multiple, or multiple over time.

  - Birth and death details are single as only one piece of birth and death evidence can exist. Caseworkers cannot enter an effective date for the evidence, they can correct it only.
  - Gender is single over time as one active gender evidence record only can exist. Caseworkers can enter an effective date for the evidence to indicate a change over time.

- Email address is multiple as multiple emails addresses can exist. Caseworkers cannot enter an effective date for an email address, they can correct it only.
- Income is multiple over time as many different forms of income can exist. Caseworkers can enter an effective date for each piece of evidence to indicate a change over time.

Every piece of evidence follows one of these maintenance patterns and each has a unique resolver that determines how the evidence is shared.

- **Manual intervention**
  A process where a caseworker manually reviews and processes an incoming evidence record. Manual intervention is required when the broker does not share the evidence due to data matching issues, conflicts, or because the evidence is not from a trusted source.
- **Parent-child evidence**
  An evidence relationship where one parent evidence record has one or more related child evidence records. For example, a parent evidence type that is called Asset, that captures a person's asset types, might relate to a child evidence type that is called Asset Ownership. Asset Ownership might capture other people with part ownership of the asset.
- **Set of shared evidence data**
  The set of evidence data that the broker shares between cases. The set includes the type of evidence record, its attributes and values, changes to the evidence record, related evidence, members, and participants.
- **Shared instance search**
  A tool that allows administrators to view the actions that the evidence broker resolver recommended for a specific evidence share.
- **Shared verifications**
  Verification items that are shared between cases by the broker so that caseworkers do not need to reverify shared evidence that is already verified for a client. Administrators can configure the broker to share verification items that are associated with evidence.
- **Source case**
  A case that an evidence record is shared from. For example, income evidence from application cases can be shared to integrated cases.
- **Target case**
  A case that an evidence record is shared to. For example, an integrated case can receive income evidence from application cases.
- **Timeline of changes**
  A graphical view of changes to evidence over time that caseworkers can use to review and update the evidence if needed.
- **Trusted source**
  When the broker shares evidence that is configured as a trusted source, the broker uses data matching to identify evidence records to share automatically and reduce the necessity for a caseworker to intervene. If the evidence type of the record that is being shared is not specified as a trusted source in configuration, the broker presents the evidence to a caseworker for review and processing.
- **Update**
  An action that is used by caseworkers to update existing evidence on a case with incoming evidence because the same type of evidence exists on the target case. For more information, see Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence on page 41.

1.2 Evidence sharing between cases

An administrator can create multiple sharing configurations that each specify what evidence is shared between a source case and a target case, where the broker can share both identical evidence and logically equivalent evidence. The configuration also specifies whether the evidence is shared seamlessly, or whether a caseworker must manually review and process the evidence.

The evidence broker recognizes that evidence can be shared at various stages in its lifecycle; for example, evidence can be new, updated, merged, or deleted. The evidence broker provides the necessary business validations to preserve the integrity of the evidence flow on both the source and target cases. The following list outlines the main features of the evidence broker, which are described in more detail in subsequent topics:

- **Share new, updated, and deleted evidence**
  The evidence broker shares evidence records between source and target cases. For example, income evidence from application cases can be shared to integrated cases. For systems that are configured to use person or prospect person evidence, the evidence broker can be configured to share this evidence in addition to case evidence.
- **Evidence sharing is unidirectional and per evidence type**
  The evidence broker shares evidence based on the sharing configuration for each specific evidence type. The sharing configuration also provides the ability to determine which case types that evidence can be shared from and to. If bidirectional sharing between case types is required, an administrator must create a separate sharing configuration for each direction. For example, an agency might decide to configure the sharing of address information from source integrated cases that manage income support programs to target child welfare integrated cases. However, an agency might decide not to configure the sharing of the address information in the other direction from child welfare integrated cases to income support integrated cases. Therefore, with such a configuration, the addition of a new address or an update to an existing address on a child welfare integrated case would not be shared to an associated income support integrated case. However, if a caseworker adds or updates an address on an income support integrated case, it would be shared to an associated child welfare case.
- **Sharing of trusted source evidence**
  Evidence sharing configuration includes the ability to indicate if an evidence type on a particular case type is from a trusted source. When the broker shares evidence from a source that is trusted, it is automatically applied to the target case and activated without the need for user intervention. The broker applies a matching process to determine whether an evidence record should be shared between cases within a particular sharing configuration. However, if the broker cannot identify an exact match, a caseworker is required to intervene and resolve any genuine discrepancies.
- **Manual processing of evidence**
  If evidence is not configured as coming from a trusted source, or if a conflict occurs as described previously, the broker adds the records to a caseworker's incoming list for manual review and processing. An example of an evidence sharing conflict is the existence of duplicate or multiple evidence records. For more information about an evidence sharing conflict, see the 'Data matching examples' section of the *Evidence records and data matching* related link. Caseworkers can compare incoming evidence from different sources to existing evidence and make an informed decision about how to process the evidence.
- **Sharing identical and logically equivalent evidence**
  The evidence broker recognizes the difference between sharing identical evidence and logically equivalent evidence. When the broker shares evidence between source and target

evidence records whose structure is identical, the evidence records are referred to as identical evidence. When the broker shares evidence between source and target evidence records whose structure is not identical, the evidence records are referred to as logically equivalent evidence.

- **Sharing evidence verifications**
  In a sharing configuration, an administrator can specify whether or not verifications are shared with evidence. If an administrator enables the sharing of verifications, the administrator can configure the broker to always share associated verification items, or only if they are used or required by the target case. An advantage of sharing verification items is that if the evidence verification requirements are the same between the source case and the target case, it is not necessary for the caseworker to reverify shared evidence that is already verified for the client.

Related information

Set of shared evidence data

For each evidence record that is created or updated, the evidence broker evaluates the evidence within the context of a wider set of evidence. Therefore, by applying data matching algorithms to a wider set of contextual data, the broker can more accurately match each shared evidence record between the source and target cases. The broker can then determine whether an evidence record should be shared to another case. If the broker does present evidence to a caseworker for manual intervention, the data is presented within the context of a wider set of data. The wider context helps the caseworker to make decisions about how to proceed with the incoming evidence without the need to navigate to other views, either on the same case or elsewhere on the system.

The set of evidence data that the broker shares between cases represents all the relevant information that pertains to a type of evidence, such as income. The set of evidence data includes changes made to evidence data of that type over the lifetime of a case. For example, for a client's income evidence, the client's income amount might be increased or reduced at times throughout the lifetime of the case.

Definition of a set of shared data

To summarize, a set of shared evidence data comprises the following items:

- An active evidence record of a particular type with all its attributes and values.
- The changes that are made to an active evidence record over time:

  - A caseworker can modify an evidence record and enter a new effective date that reflects the date of the change. This type of change is referred to as a succession.
  - A caseworker can correct an evidence record and not enter a new effective date. This type of change is referred to as a correction.
- Any related evidence records that are linked by a parent-child relationship in a hierarchy, including multiple instances of records at any level in the hierarchy.
- The members and participants that are listed on the evidence records that are contained within the evidence data set.

An evidence data set does not comprise the following items:

- In-edit and superseded evidence records; however, in some scenarios the broker might need to compare a shared evidence record to an in-edit record or a superseded record to determine whether the shared record matches a previous version of an active record on the target case.

- Deleted evidence records; the deletion of evidence records is shared, but the broker does not compare deleted evidence records when it applies the data matching process to other shared evidence records.
- Verifications. An administrator must specify within each sharing configuration whether verifications are shared with associated shared evidence records. Then, if verifications are shared, the system adds them to the target case after the evidence record is added.

Period covered by a set of shared data

The period that is covered by a set of shared data is referred to as the period of interest. The period of interest is defined to ensure that the broker shares sufficient historical evidence to enable eligibility and entitlement for all programs to be determined, including backdated or retrospective programs, Likewise, the broker does not share evidence that is redundant because it is too old, and therefore is no longer relevant.

Because retroactive medical assistance programs require evidence for a 15 month period before the program start date, the period that is of interest to a target case in relation to a shared evidence data sets begins 15 months before the case start date. The period of interest continues until the last evidence record in the succession is end-dated. If any evidence records within an evidence data set from a source case overlap, either partially or wholly, with the period of interest for a target case, the broker shares all the succession, correction, and in-edit evidence records within the evidence data set to the target case. Therefore, to maintain data integrity, the broker shares even those evidence records from the evidence data set whose history dates back to significantly before the start of the period of interest. Conversely, if no evidence records within an evidence data set from a source case overlap at all with the period of interest for a target case, the broker does not share any evidence records from the data set to the target case.

Sample scenario to show how the broker considers evidence for sharing

John Smith started his employment at the Beach Hotel in 2008. John Smith contacts an agency in 2011 to apply for food assistance. A caseworker creates a food assistance case, and records John Smith's employer in employment evidence, and records the income from the employment in earnings evidence. The employment evidence is a parent to the child earnings evidence. The evidence data set includes John Smith's income record for the Beach Hotel in the context of the food assistance case. As time passes, John Smith's income from the employer recorded on the case changes every month and the evidence is updated each time with a new income amount and the effective date on which the income changed.

When John Smith contacts the agency again in 2013 to apply for medical assistance, the caseworker creates another case and again records John Smith's employer and income for the Beach Hotel as parent employment and child earnings evidence on the medical assistance case. The set of evidence that is recorded on the new medical assistance case is separate from the set of evidence that is recorded on the food assistance case. Therefore, two sets of evidence data now represent John Smith's employment and earnings, one on each case.

When the caseworker activates the employment and earnings evidence on the new medical assistance case, the broker shares the evidence to the food assistance case. The employment and earnings evidence are shared as one set of evidence data because both the parent and child evidence records are included within the same set of evidence data. The evidence is synchronized with the Beach Hotel employment and earnings evidence that already exists on the food assistance case.

Examples to show how the broker considers evidence data for sharing

The following examples refer to evidence that is provided in the Cúram Income Support and Cúram Income Support for Medical Assistance applications. The examples show how evidence records are included in sets of evidence data.

- **Child evidence record with multiple parent evidence records**

  A caseworker adds a parent alien sponsor evidence record and a parent alien evidence record to a case. The caseworker also adds a child alien sponsorship evidence record to the case. An alien evidence data set is created that contains all the following related parent and child evidence records for the case:

  - The alien sponsor evidence record
  - The alien evidence record
  - The alien sponsorship evidence record

  A caseworker adds two parent tax filing status evidence records to a case. The caseworker also adds a child tax relationship evidence record to the case. A tax filing status evidence data set is created that contains all the following related parent and child evidence records for the case:

  - The two tax filing status evidence records
  - The tax relationship evidence record

- **Evidence records within and outside a case's period of interest**

  A client has been receiving food assistance from an agency for two years. Employment 1 with associated income 1, and employment 2 with associated income 2, are recorded against the food assistance case. The client contacts the same agency to apply for medical assistance. However, because employment 1 ended two years ago, the associated data is outside the period of interest of 15 months and the broker shares only the data associated with employment 2 to the medical assistance case. The medical assistance evidence data set contains the following related parent and child evidence records:

  - The parent employment evidence record for employment 2
  - The child earnings evidence record for employment 2

- **Parent evidence record with multiple child evidence records**

  A caseworker adds a parent medical expense evidence record to a case. The caseworker also adds child medical expense payments and spend-down medical expense evidence records to the case. Then, the caseworker adds a second, unassociated, parent unearned income evidence record to the case. A medical expense evidence data set is created that contains all the following related parent and child evidence records for the case:

  - The parent medical expense evidence record
  - The child medical expense payments and spend-down medical expense evidence records
  - The second, unassociated, parent unearned income evidence record
  - Child medical expense payments and spend-down medical expense evidence records related to the second parent unearned income evidence record

- **Parent evidence record with child and grandchild evidence records**

  A caseworker adds a parent income evidence record to a case. The caseworker also adds a child employer-sponsored coverage record to the case. Then, the caseworker adds a grandchild covered member record to the case. An income evidence data set is created that contains all the following related parent, child, and grandchild evidence records for the case:

  - The parent income evidence record

- The child employer-sponsored coverage evidence record
- The grandchild covered member evidence record

Evidence records and data matching

When the insertion, deletion, or modification of an evidence record is shared from a source case to a target case, the broker applies data matching to determine whether the evidence record matches any records that are already on the case. Depending on whether an exact match is identified, the broker can determine that the evidence record should be inserted onto, modified on, or removed from the target case.

Data matching process

When an evidence record is shared from a source case to a target case, the broker applies data matching to determine whether the evidence record matches any records that are already on the case. Then, according to the defined sharing configuration, the broker then either shares the evidence record shares the evidence record to the target case without caseworker intervention, or refers it to a caseworker for manual review and processing. Whatever action the broker determines is appropriate for the shared evidence record, the broker must adhere to the evidence maintenance patterns and evidence sharing rules, as described in subsequent topics.

When the broker applies data matching to compare a shared evidence record from a source case to an evidence record on a target case, the broker compares all attributes in the match, with the following exceptions:

- The `Comments` attribute
- The `Updated On` and `Updated By` system attributes

An identical match occurs when the values of all the compared attributes are the same, including the effective date on the evidence descriptor.

A case can have sets of evidence data that include evidence records of either a single evidence type, or multiple evidence types, where each evidence data set is in scope for sharing to a target case through a sharing configuration. Multiple evidence types might occur as a consequence of parent, child, and grandchild relationships. The evidence broker compares superseded and active records that are included in the incoming evidence record's shared data set to evidence records of the same evidence type that are on the target case.

The broker applies a series of steps as part of its data matching process to determine whether the incoming evidence exists on the case. Consequently, the broker recommends one of the following actions:

- **Insertion of an evidence record**
  By applying the data matching process, the evidence broker establishes whether the target case already has the shared evidence. If the evidence does not exist on the target case, the broker recommends the insertion of the evidence record onto the target case.
- **Deletion of an evidence record**
  Where the broker shares the deletion of an evidence record, and the evidence broker has established by applying the data matching process that the evidence record exists on the target case, the broker recommends the deletion of the evidence record.

- **Modified evidence record**
  As a result of applying the data matching process, the evidence broker can establish that the target case had the evidence prior to its modification, and therefore the broker can recommend that the incoming modified evidence is applied to the target case.

Sharing records from multiple sources

An administrator can create a sharing configuration to share evidence records from multiple source cases to a single target case. Therefore, if a person is a member of multiple cases, the broker shares the evidence records from multiple locations to a single case for a caseworker. The broker must perform some extra comparisons to ensure that duplicates and conflicts do not occur. For example, the broker shares evidence records from two source cases, case 1 and case 2, to a single target case:

- **The broker uses the latest version of evidence**
  If an evidence record on case 2 is a later version of an evidence record that is also on case 1, only the latest version of the evidence record from case 2 is shared to the target case.
- **The broker prevents duplicate evidence**
  If an evidence record on case 1 is the same version of an evidence record that is also on case 2, the broker detects that the records duplicate each other and shares the evidence record from only one of the source cases to the target case.
- **The broker processes identical evidence before logically equivalent evidence**
  If the broker shares an identical evidence type record from case 1, and a logically equivalent evidence type record from case 2, the broker process the record from case 1 first. Because all attributes are mapped between identical evidence types, while only a subset of attributes might be mapped between logically equivalent evidence types, the broker processes identical evidence first to ensure that as much data as possible is shared to the target case. For example, both Income Support and Insurance Affordability integrated case relationship evidence types have a primary caretaker attribute that does not exist in person level relationship evidence types. Therefore, if a caseworker adds a client to Income Support case 1 and then adds the client to Income Support case 2, the broker first processes the shared identical evidence from Income Support case 1, which ensures that the primary caretaker information is shared to case 2. Then, any shared duplicate logically equivalent evidence is filtered out, while it has been ensured that no information is lost.

Evidence records that require manual intervention

When the broker shares evidence from a trusted source, the broker uses the data matching process to identify evidence records to be shared and therefore to reduce the necessity for a caseworker to intervene. However, in some circumstances the broker will not attempt automatic resolution and will instead present the evidence to the caseworker for assessment so that the evidence can be resolved correctly. The broker will present evidence that requires caseworker review and processing in the following circumstances:

- The evidence type of the evidence record that is being shared is not specified as a trusted source in the sharing configuration.
- The broker cannot identify an exact match between the incoming evidence record and the existing evidence records on the target case.
- The parent and child evidence types have a conflicting sharing configuration, as shown in the following scenarios:

- **Insertion or modification of parent and child evidence records**
  The broker shares the insertion or modification of a parent or child evidence record, where discrepancies exist between the parent and child evidence type sharing configurations; for example, the parent evidence type is configured as a trusted source, while the child evidence type is not configured as a trusted source. The broker adds the record to the caseworker's incoming list.
- **Deletion of parent and child evidence records**
  The broker shares the deletion of both a parent record and a child record to a target case, where the parent record can be deleted automatically, but a caseworker must review the child record. The evidence broker adds both records to the caseworker's incoming list.
- **Deletion of parent evidence record causes orphaned child evidence record**
  The broker shares the deletion of a parent record to a target case. If the deletion of the parent record on the target case causes the child record on the target case to be orphaned with no parent, the evidence broker adds the parent record to the caseworker's incoming list.

Data matching examples

The following examples outline how the evidence broker applies data matching to shared evidence records.

- **Data matching identifies identical match**

  An administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share from person evidence to integrated cases for the address evidence type. The address evidence type is configured as a trusted source on the target case. A caseworker adds the client John Smith to an integrated case. The following sets of address evidence data exist for John Smith:

  - On John Smith's person evidence, an address evidence record records John's private address as 1 Main Street, Utah.
  - On John Smith's integrated case, an address evidence record also records John's private address as 1 Main Street, Utah.

  The caseworker applies a correction to modify the address details on John Smith's person evidence from 1 to 2 Main Street, Utah. The broker seamlessly shares the corrected address evidence record from the source person evidence to the target integrated case.

- **Data matching does not identify an identical match**

  An administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share from integrated cases to integrated cases for the address evidence type. The address evidence type is configured as a trusted source on the target case. A caseworker adds the client John Smith to integrated case 1, and then also adds John to integrated case 2. The following sets of address evidence data exist for John Smith:

  - On integrated case 1, an address evidence record records John's private address as 1 Private Street, Utah.
  - On integrated case 2, an address evidence record records John's mailing address as 1 Main Street, Utah.

  A caseworker applies a correction to modify the private address details on integrated case 1 from 1 to 2 Private Street, Utah. The broker shares the corrected address evidence from the source integrated case 1 to the target integrated case 2. However, because the address is not identified as an identical match, the broker places the modified address evidence record into the caseworker's incoming evidence list for manual review and processing.

The following examples refer to evidence that is provided in the Cúram Income Support and Cúram Income Support for Medical Assistance applications.

- **Data matching identifies multiple versions of an evidence record**

  An administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share from Insurance Affordability integrated cases to Insurance Affordability integrated cases for the enrollment, enrolled member and enrolled plan evidence types. The evidence types are configured as trusted sources on the target case. A caseworker adds the client John Smith as a member on Insurance Affordability integrated case 1, and then also adds John Smith as a member on Insurance Affordability integrated case 2. The following sets of evidence data exist:

  - On Insurance Affordability integrated case 1, enrollment, enrolled member, and enrolled plan evidence records are activated on the case.
  - The broker shares the enrollment, enrolled member, and enrolled plan evidence records from Insurance Affordability integrated case 1 to Insurance Affordability integrated case 2.

  A caseworker updates the coverage start date in the enrollment evidence record on insurance affordability integrated case 2. The enrollment evidence records on Insurance Affordability integrated cases 1 and 2 are now identical except for the updated coverage start date.

  A caseworker then creates a new Insurance Affordability integrated case 3 for a different person. When the caseworker also adds John Smith as a case member on case 3, the broker is triggered to share John Smith's records from case 1 and 2 to the new case 3. The broker compares the two versions of the enrollment evidence records on case 1 and case 2, and establishes that they are identical except for the coverage start date on the enrollment evidence. Therefore, the broker seamlessly shares the latest version of the evidence from case 2 to case 3.

- **Data matching identifies duplicate versions of an evidence record**

  An administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share from Insurance Affordability integrated cases to Insurance Affordability integrated cases for the tax filing status evidence type. The tax filing status evidence type is configured as a trusted source on the target case. The following cases are created:

  - James submits an application through the citizen portal. A caseworker authorizes the application and creates Insurance Affordability integrated case 1. The caseworker populates the tax filing status evidence on case 1.
  - The caseworker creates Insurance Affordability integrated case 2 for James and populates the tax filing status evidence with the same value as on case 1.
  - The caseworker adds Linda as a primary client on Insurance Affordability integrated case 3.

  When the caseworker also adds James as a case member to case 3, the broker is triggered to share John's evidence records from case 1 and 2 to case 3. The broker seamlessly shares the tax filing status evidence without creating any duplicate records on case 3.

  However, consider that the caseworker populates the tax filing status evidence for James on case 2 with a different value compared to case 1. When the caseworker also adds James as a case member to case 3, the broker identifies that the tax filing status evidence attributes do not match on case 1 and case 2. Therefore, the broker places the two tax filing status evidence records from case 1 and case 2 into the caseworker's incoming evidence list for manual review and processing.

Evidence maintenance patterns

An evidence maintenance pattern enforces a set of evidence maintenance restrictions and behavior on evidence sharing that determines how an evidence type is instantiated, corrected, and succeeded. If a caseworker maintains evidence manually in the application, the same evidence maintenance restrictions and behavior are enforced through evidence validations. By applying an evidence pattern to each evidence type, an agency can ensure that evidence of a particular type is shared across cases according to a consistent set of rules.

The default evidence maintenance pattern is multiple over time. It is applied to each evidence type unless an administrator configures an alternative evidence maintenance pattern. Administrators configure the evidence maintenance pattern for each evidence type individually, where they can choose from the following evidence maintenance patterns:

- **Multiple over time**
  The multiple over time pattern defines evidence types that can have multiple active instances, concurrent or otherwise, and allows successions to the instances. Evidence types that the multiple over time pattern is applied to can change over time; for example, a person might have multiple jobs at the same time, for which the person can receive salary increases.

  The multiple over time evidence maintenance pattern applies the following rules to evidence types on which it is applied:

  - It is possible to have multiple instances of the evidence type on a case at the same time, for the same period.
  - The evidence instances can be corrected.
  - The evidence instances can be succeeded.
- **Multiple**
  The multiple pattern defines evidence types that can have multiple active instances, concurrent or otherwise, and prevents successions to the instances. Evidence types that the multiple pattern is applied to do not change over time; for example, addresses. A person might have multiple addresses at the same time; for example, a child who has separated parents can have multiple private addresses, or a person can have both a private address and a mailing address. If a person stops living at or using an address and moves to another address, the address record is not succeeded. Instead, the address record is end-dated and a new address record is created that represents the physical move.

  The multiple evidence maintenance pattern applies the following rules to evidence types on which it is applied:

  - It is possible to have multiple instances of the evidence type on a case at the same time, for the same period.
  - The evidence instances can be corrected.
  - The evidence instances cannot be succeeded.
- **Single**

  The single pattern defines evidence types that can have only one active instance of the same type for a case member on the case, and prevents any successions to the instance. Evidence types that the single pattern might be applied to do not change over time; for example, birth and death details.

  Because only one person can be included in person evidence, a caseworker can add only one instance of a single pattern evidence type to person evidence; for example, birth and death details. However, an integrated case can have multiple case members. Therefore, a caseworker

can add one instance of a single pattern evidence type per case member to an integrated case; for example, one set of birth and death details per case member.

The single evidence maintenance pattern applies the following rules to evidence types on which it is applied:

- It is possible to have only one instance of the evidence type for a case member on a case.
- The evidence instance can be corrected.
- The evidence instance cannot be succeeded.

- **Single over time**

  The single over time pattern defines evidence types that can have only one active instance during a particular period in the case lifecycle for a case member, and allows successions to the instance. Evidence types that the single pattern might be applied to can change over time; for example, gender.

  Because only one person can be included in person evidence, a caseworker can add only one instance of a single over time pattern evidence type to person evidence. However, an integrated case can have multiple case members. Therefore, a caseworker can add one instance of a single pattern evidence type per case member to an integrated case.

  The single over time evidence maintenance pattern applies the following rules to evidence types on which it is applied:

  - It is possible to have only one instance of the evidence type on a case at any particular time in the case lifecycle for a case member.
  - Multiple evidence instances for the same period cannot exist.
  - The evidence instance can be corrected.
  - The evidence instance can be succeeded.

Related tasks

[Configuring evidence patterns on page 69](#)
An evidence maintenance pattern is a set of rules and characteristics that you can apply to an evidence type. You can designate how to instantiate, correct, and succeed that evidence type. You can apply one evidence maintenance pattern to each evidence type.

Evidence sharing rules

The evidence broker must share evidence from a source case to a target case in accordance with the sharing configurations and evidence maintenance patterns that an administrator defines. Also, to maintain data privacy and to avoid sharing data with third parties unnecessarily, the broker must adhere to the evidence business rules.

The evidence broker can either share records automatically to the target case without caseworker review, or add the records to a caseworker's incoming list for manual review and processing. When the broker shares and resolves records without caseworker intervention, the system automatically activates the changed evidence on the target case so that reassessment occurs. Caseworkers can view the changed evidence in the active evidence list page.

When it shares evidence records between cases, the evidence broker complies with the rules that are outlined in the following sections. Some additional rules apply also to the sharing of logically equivalent evidence. For more information, see the *Identical and logically equivalent evidence* section.

Evidence is shared only through a defined sharing configuration

Evidence is shared between two case types only when a sharing configuration exists that defines the evidence types to be shared between the cases. An administrator creates a sharing configuration by using the sharing configuration wizard.

Evidence is shared only between open cases

The evidence broker shares evidence records only between open cases, including the insertion, modification, and deletion of evidence records. Cases that have a status of either closed or canceled are considered to be closed. All other cases, including those that have a status of pending closure, are considered to be open.

For example, two open integrated cases A and B share income evidence records through a sharing configuration. A caseworker inserts an income record onto case A that the broker shares to case B. After case B is closed, the caseworker deletes the income record from case A. However, because case B is now closed, the broker does not share the income record deletion to case B, and therefore the income record is not deleted from case B.

Identical evidence is shared to all directly and indirectly linked cases

In an identical evidence sharing configuration, evidence records are shared from a source case to all target cases that are linked directly and indirectly by configuration to the source case. For example, the broker shares the phone number evidence type from person A's evidence to integrated case B through a sharing configuration. Integrated case B also shares the phone number evidence type with income support integrated case C through another sharing configuration. If a caseworker inserts a phone number onto person A's evidence, the evidence broker shares the phone number evidence record from person A's evidence to integrated case B and to income support integrated case C.

Logically equivalent evidence sharing configurations do not support indirect evidence sharing

The broker does not support the sharing of logically equivalent evidence through indirect sharing configurations. An administrator must explicitly specify a logically equivalent sharing configuration between two cases for evidence to be shared between them. For example, the broker shares evidence between the following cases through logically equivalent sharing configurations:

- The broker shares person A's email address evidence to integrated case B contact details evidence.
- The broker shares integrated case B contact details evidence to income support integrated case C address evidence.

If an email address is activated for person A, the broker shares the email address from person A to integrated case B. The broker also attempts to share the evidence to integrated case C. However, the sharing would fail because a direct logically equivalent sharing configuration does not exist between person A's evidence and integrated case C evidence. For the broker to share the email address evidence to integrated case C, an administrator must specify a logically equivalent sharing configuration that shares email address evidence from person A to contact details evidence on integrated case C.

All active records are shared

All active evidence records are shared, from the first active record on the business start date to later successions. If a succession occurs to an evidence record, any succession records whose status is active are shared to target cases. The broker also shares the deletion of active records.

Evidence records that have a superseded status because they have been corrected are not shared to target cases. Also, in-edit status records that are associated with active evidence records are not shared.

Shared evidence type must exist on the target case

An administrator can configure the evidence types that are associated with each type of case. When an administrator creates a sharing configuration and selects evidence types to be shared between two case types, the administrator can select only evidence types that exist on both cases.

Evidence is shared automatically only for trusted sources

When an administrator creates a sharing configuration between a source case and a target case, the administrator can specify whether the source case is a trusted source. Only evidence records from trusted sources are shared seamlessly to target cases without intervention from a caseworker. A caseworker must manually review and process evidence that is received from a source that is not specified as trusted.

Evidence type rules apply to sharing evidence between participants

A case can have one or more participants, where at least one of the participants is a member of the case. An administrator can configure evidence types on a case to apply either to members and other participants, or only to one or more specific members. To ensure that data privacy is maintained and that data is not unnecessarily shared with third-party agencies, the evidence broker must adhere to the rules that are configured for evidence types.

- **Evidence record applies to all types of case participant**

  An administrator can configure an evidence type that specifies that only the main participant must be either a primary client or a case member; other participants can be a case member, a registered person, or an unregistered person. For an evidence record of such an evidence type to be shared successfully, it is not necessary that each person that the evidence record applies to is a member of the target case. Therefore, if the evidence record contains multiple participants, only the main participant on the source evidence must exist as an active member on the target case for the evidence record to be shared successfully. An example of such an evidence type is student evidence, which contains a member that represents the student and a participant that represents the school. When student evidence is shared, the school is created on the target case.

- **Evidence type applies only to case members**

  An administrator can configure an evidence type that specifies that all participants must be members on the case. For an evidence record of such an evidence type to be shared successfully, each person that the evidence record applies to must be either a primary client or a case member on both the source and the target cases. Therefore, if the evidence record contains multiple participants who must all be members, all participants must exist as active members on the target case for the evidence record to be shared successfully. If one member who is on the source case does not exist on the target case, the evidence record is not shared to the target case. An example of such evidence is household relationship. In this case, the relationship between two case members, such as a husband and a wife, is captured in a

household relationship record. If either the husband or the wife is, for example, members on another integrated case, then this evidence is not shared to that case as both members do not exist on the target case.

- **Evidence type applies only to other participants**

  An administrator can configure an evidence type that specifies that no members exist, only one or more other participants. Such an evidence type is shared to all members' cases and the evidence type is displayed in the incoming evidence list. Caseworkers are responsible for reviewing the evidence in the context of the specific case and for determining whether to add the evidence to the case or to ignore it. An example of such an evidence type is absent parent evidence that contains a participant that represents the absent parent, where the participant is not a member on the source case.

- **Evidence type contains no participants**
  An administrator can configure an evidence type that specifies no participants at all. In this instance, the evidence is recorded against the primary member on the case. If a new case is created for the primary member, the evidence is shared to the target case. Such evidence types are rare and typically represent child evidence in a parent-child relationship.

Case members active period must overlap on source and target cases

The broker shares an evidence record only if a person exists as either a primary client or a case member on the target case for a period that at least partially overlaps with the shared evidence record. If the person is not an active member of the target case for at least some of the period that the shared evidence record applies to, then the evidence record is not shared.

Evidence broker adheres to evidence maintenance patterns

An evidence maintenance pattern enforces a set of evidence maintenance restrictions and behavior on evidence sharing that determines how an evidence type is instantiated, corrected, and succeeded. Therefore, the rules that are applied to a shared evidence record's type through an evidence pattern must be maintained when a target case accepts and activates shared evidence:

- If a shared evidence record's type can have only a single instance of the evidence, another instance of the same evidence type is not activated.
- If a shared evidence record's type can have only a single instance of the evidence during a particular period, another instance of the same evidence type is not activated unless it is for a different period.

For example, consider that an evidence broker sharing configuration exists to share the foster care and foster care payment evidence types between income support integrated cases that are trusted sources. The foster care evidence type is assigned an evidence pattern of single timeline, and the foster care payment evidence type is assigned an evidence pattern of multiple with succession. A person has an existing integrated case A with a foster care evidence record, and two foster care payment evidence records for different payment types. The same person has a second integrated case B that contains the same foster care and foster care payment evidence records. When a caseworker adds a new foster care payment for a different payment type to integrated case A, the evidence broker shares the new foster care payment to integrated case B. The evidence broker has adhered to the evidence pattern for foster care payments, that allows multiple instances of foster care payments on a case.

Removal of in-edit evidence records

The evidence broker shares the removal of evidence records, and the insertion and modification of evidence records. If a record that matches a shared removed evidence record is found on the target case, the matched record is removed from the target case. Any in-edit records that are associated with the removed record on the target case are also removed.

Differences in sharing configuration require manual intervention

An administrator can configure particular evidence types to be shared seamlessly between cases without manual intervention by a caseworker. However, to avoid discrepancies, the evidence broker places some evidence records that are normally processed seamlessly into a caseworker's incoming list for manual review and processing. For more information, see the *Evidence records and data matching* topic.

Related tasks

Creating sharing configurations on page 67

Use the sharing configuration wizard to configure the sharing of evidence from a source case type to a target case type. You can specify the types of identical evidence to be shared. You can also specify the sharing of logically equivalent evidence, by mapping evidence types on the source case to logically equivalent evidence types on the target case.

Configuring evidence patterns on page 69

An evidence maintenance pattern is a set of rules and characteristics that you can apply to an evidence type. You can designate how to instantiate, correct, and succeed that evidence type. You can apply one evidence maintenance pattern to each evidence type.

Identical and logically equivalent evidence

Cúram allows caseworkers to capture and share information about a client. The system design of Cúram means that information is stored as evidence. Evidence types contain a specific type of information that is collected from the client. If the information is stored in exactly the same format then that information is shared using an identical flow. If the information is represented in a different format between a source and target, then you must use a logically equivalent evidence flow.

In a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration, an administrator can map the evidence attributes to be shared between cases through an XML rules file. The XML rules file also specifies other conditions that define how logically equivalent evidence is shared. Therefore, the broker can share matching information between evidence on source and target cases, and also recognize the variation in the structure of information between evidence on different cases.

For example, for a caseworker, the social security number evidence type and the identifications evidence type are logically equivalent because they both share a social security number attribute. However, the identifications evidence type contains extra attributes that are not included in the social security number evidence type. An administrator can create an XML rules file that maps the social security number attribute on the social security number evidence type and the identifications evidence type. Then, the administrator can upload the XML rules file to a sharing configuration that shares social security number evidence to identifications evidence.

Customization of single type evidence sharing

When an administrator creates an identical evidence sharing configuration, the evidence on both the source case and the target case must be represented by the same evidence type. Therefore, when the evidence broker shares evidence through an identical evidence sharing configuration, the broker compares and maps all attributes in the evidence type.

However, if you want to share only a subset of the attributes in an evidence type, an administrator must create a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration where an associated XML rules file maps the shared evidence attributes. In the logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration, an administrator can specify the source evidence and the target evidence to be the same evidence type.

Defining logically equivalent evidence

The topics describe how you can analyze logically equivalent evidence and structure the flow of evidence if appropriate.

When you complete the analysis of data and evidence flow, you can use the XML rules file to implement the evidence sharing requirement. See the related links.

Related tasks

Creating sharing configurations on page 67

Use the sharing configuration wizard to configure the sharing of evidence from a source case type to a target case type. You can specify the types of identical evidence to be shared. You can also specify the sharing of logically equivalent evidence, by mapping evidence types on the source case to logically equivalent evidence types on the target case.

Configuring logically equivalent evidence on page 69

To share data where the representation of the data's structure and format differs between source and target case types, you must configure a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration. Map the evidence attributes to be shared between two case types through an XML rules file that also specifies other sharing actions. The XML rules file must adhere to an XML rules schema that is included in the evidence broker installation.

Related reference

XML sharing rules schema on page 71

The XML sharing rules schema provides the elements and attributes that you can use to define an XML sharing rules file for mapping logically equivalent evidence types.

Sharing rules XML samples on page 79

You can download sharing rules XML samples that provide guidelines for using the sharing rules XML schema to map logically equivalent evidence types.

Evidence analysis

If you consider that data is logically equivalent, then you need to conduct an analysis of the data. The analysis includes looking at the underlying data structure and an initial reassessment of how the structures might potentially map to each other.

Data analysis

As a starting point, understand the relationships between the evidence types in the underlying structure. The mapping might be a single evidence type on the source to a single evidence type on the target but it might be to one or more evidence types on the target. For example, Pregnancy is logically equivalent data but it is a single evidence type in Insurance Affordability, but represented as Pregnancy and Unborn Child data structures in Income Support.

Verify all possible values that are available for each attribute to finalize whether each attribute mapping is correct for the cases and evidence types in question.

You also need to understand the code table values and the full significance of each value to finalize whether each code table mapping is correct for the cases and evidence types in question. For example, "Prizes and Awards" is a code table value in Insurance Affordability, and it might be considered similar to 'Bonus'. However, it is not certain logical equivalence exists so the XML samples do not include a code table mapping for this type. For more information about the XML samples, see the related link.

Ultimately, you must determine whether logically equivalent evidence exists and then map the appropriate values. For example, if you map Income to Paid Employment - Earned Income, income types exist for Paid Employment - Earned Income that do not exist for Income, so no logical equivalence exists for this data.

Once the mapping of data structures is in place then the flow of data throughout the system needs to be analyzed, to evaluate how it might potentially be shared throughout the system from each starting point and therefore what you would want the system to do in each sharing flow.

For example, even though SSN Details and Identifications are considered logically equivalent, the analysis of the flow of data established that the starting point of evidence flow for SSN Details is earlier than for Identifications, as a client can indicate that they applied for an SSN before receiving an actual SSN. The Identifications evidence is not affected by the SSN application and consequently the starting point evidence flow for Identifications information is different. The difference introduced conditions around the sharing of this evidence as you want to share from SSN Details to Identifications when an actual SSN value exists. For a sample of SSN Details to Identifications, see the related link.

Attribute analysis

You can decide to use logically equivalent mapping for the source and target evidence if:

- A different set of attributes exist on the source and target, and you need to share one or many of these attributes.
- Individual evidence attributes have a different name but represent the same data.
- You need to map a subset of attributes rather than all attributes on an evidence type.
- No equivalent code table and values exist on the target case, but you require some or all of the code table values from the source evidence type on the target.

If you select individual attributes on the evidence types to map as logically equivalent, then you define a link between two types of evidence that gives them an identical status for system processing.

For system processing purposes, you use the XML rules file to define and map the attributes of an evidence type and establish their logical equivalence.

Evidence attribute mapping

See the `EvidenceMapping` and `Mapping` XML elements to complete the mapping of attributes for evidence types in the XML rules file. See also the `sourceCodeTable` and `targetCodeTable` attributes of the `Mapping` element for code table value mapping.

Default Cúram installation and samples

A default installation provides samples for the Income Support case scenarios. The samples illustrate some implementations of logically equivalent evidence using the XML schema for evidence sharing. The samples reference the caseworker scenarios that they maintain and how the caseworkers might expect to work with logically equivalent sharing.

The XML samples are available from Code Samples on the Merative Support Docs (transitional) site.

Related reference

Sharing rules XML samples on page 79
You can download sharing rules XML samples that provide guidelines for using the sharing rules XML schema to map logically equivalent evidence types.

XML sharing rules schema on page 71
The XML sharing rules schema provides the elements and attributes that you can use to define an XML sharing rules file for mapping logically equivalent evidence types.

Supported actions and data structures

You can apply several instructions or actions to evidence types to complete the flow of evidence across Cúram source and target cases for logically equivalent evidence. You might also want to consider the data structures for evidence types on source and target cases.

Supported actions

By applying some of the available actions in a logically equivalent sharing configuration, the evidence flow finalizes the sharing of data between the source and target cases with additional activity. During evidence sharing, some of the following evidence processing events can take place. Review the evidence types and actions in conjunction to see how these events can affect the flow of evidence sharing.

- **Display data for review and confirmation**
  As data is shared, it might be necessary to display some evidence for further review by a caseworker. The review can apply to both changed data and shared data but also to evidence that is not changed to ensure that consistent data is maintained between a source and target. A change might occur in the integrity of the overall data if other changes are in progress on the case and it is no longer safe to broker evidence. See the disability evidence type.
- **Create additional evidence**
  The logically equivalent evidence actions add new parameters after the attribute mapping takes place. You might use this action to create child evidences for parent-child evidence types. See the pregnancy evidence type.
- **End dating succession**
  When a new evidence record is created, a succession style is used to create the new record. End dating if applied allows a new record to be created with a new effective or start date. You might need to apply the succession style if no succession style is in place on the target evidence. See also evidence maintenance patterns.
- **Filter evidence subtypes**
  If additional categories of evidence exist for an evidence type, then you can select one category of evidence from the evidence type. As a result, you are able to handle evidence types when evidence is stored in a hierarchical structure that uses subcategories. See the identifications evidence type.

If you decide the evidence flow requires some specific actions, you can set them through an XML rules file.

Supported data structures

Data mapping in logically equivalent evidence currently supports various different data structures between source and target. However, a restriction applies to logically equivalent evidence mapping and sharing configurations. To enable the evidence broker to track a shared instance of logically equivalent evidence, the output from an instance of shared logically equivalent evidence must be a single evidence record. Therefore, individual shared evidence resolution actions are available for each evidence record, which are to either insert, update, or delete the evidence at the target case.

The following mappings are supported:

- **Single evidence type to single evidence type**
  The mapping requires a sharing configuration to be set up by an administrator with a single sharing XML file that contains the attribute and code table mappings between the evidence types. Refer to the many examples in the sample XML files, benefit to benefit, disability to disability, or SSN details to identifications evidence.
- **Single evidence type to many evidence types**
  Given the restriction, the logically equivalent mappings must be between two specific evidence types, but the target evidence type can result in the creation of child records if required. Refer to the mapping of pregnancy to pregnancy and unborn children in the sample XML files for examples.

  Another example of sharing from a single evidence type to many evidence types is when you share the income evidence type in Insurance Affordability cases to paid employment and earned income evidence in Income Support cases. Again, given the restriction to share and track a single evidence type, the mapping is achieved by individual logically equivalent sharing configurations, each with its own sharing XML file. The broker handles the recreation of the relationship after the evidence is mapped and shared.
- **Many evidence types to single evidence type**
  The restriction applies as this mapping provides a single output evidence record for tracking. The input of many evidence types is achieved by specifying multiple `EvidenceMapping` elements in the XML schema. Refer to the sample XML files, paid employment and earned income evidence in Income Support cases sharing to income evidence in Insurance Affordability cases.

Evidence flow instructions

See the `Action`, `Set`, `Display`, and `Create` XML elements and child elements in the XML rules file to add, review, or amend evidence to complete the appropriate sharing of evidence for the logically equivalent configurations.

See the `ShareWhen` and `Filter` XML elements to refine how the data is shared by adding restrictions to the flow of evidence.

Related reference

[Sharing rules XML samples on page 79](#)
You can download sharing rules XML samples that provide guidelines for using the sharing rules XML schema to map logically equivalent evidence types.

[XML sharing rules schema on page 71](#)

The XML sharing rules schema provides the elements and attributes that you can use to define an XML sharing rules file for mapping logically equivalent evidence types.

Identifications and SSN details evidence types

The sharing rules XML file for mapping identifications and SSN details evidence is provided in the Insurance Affordability solution for sharing SSN details evidence from an Insurance Affordability case to person level identifications evidence. For example, an administrator can configure the broker to share social security number evidence from an Insurance Affordability case to identifications evidence for a person. Likewise, an administrator can configure the broker to share identifications evidence from a person's evidence to an Insurance Affordability case.

The following table shows how, in a sharing configuration, an administrator can map a subset of attributes between the identifications evidence and the SSN details evidence:

Table 1: Mapping of identifications evidence to SSN details evidence

Identifications evidence	SSN details evidence
participant	participant
alternateID	alternateID
altIDType	altIDType
fromDate	fromDate
toDate	toDate

The SSN details evidence also contains the attributes `ssnStatus`, `noSSNReasonCode`, `noSSNReason`, and `OtherDetails`. However, they are not mapped in the sharing configuration because a potential mapping does not exist for the attributes. The identifications evidence also contains a `preferredInd` attribute, but it is not mapped in the sharing configuration.

The data type of the mapped attribute `altIDType` is code table. The `altIDType` attribute on both the identifications evidence and the SSN details evidence references the same `ConcernRoleAlternateID` code table. Therefore, in the sharing rules XML file, an administrator can map the code table value `CA1` that relates to the social security number evidence for both the identifications evidence and the SSN details evidence, as shown in the XML samples.

Table 2: Mapping the altIDType attribute between identifications evidence and SSN details evidence through the `ConcernRoleAlternateID` code table

Identifications evidence code table value	SSN details evidence code table value
CA1 Social Security Number	CA1 Social Security Number

With the previous configuration, when a caseworker enters a value for social security number on either identifications evidence or on SSN details evidence, it is shared as identical when the broker shares evidence between the two evidence types.

Filtering an evidence subcategory

Identifications evidence can keep a range of identifications, so use an evidence subtype to ensure you map the correct identification. In this scenario, the identifications subtype is the social security number.

See the `Filter` XML element in the sample sharing rules XML schema for information about identification evidence subcategories that you can use for the identifications evidence type.

System processing for logically equivalent evidence sharing

Evidence sharing in a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration follows the same general rules for evidence sharing as evidence sharing in an identical evidence sharing configuration.

Therefore, the evidence broker shares logically equivalent evidence between cases when all the following conditions are met:

- An administrator has configured sharing between a source case and a target case.
- The broker identifies shared source evidence as being logically equivalent to evidence on the target case, as defined by the mapped evidence attributes and other conditions in the XML rules file.
- The evidence has been triggered for sharing; for example, a caseworker modifies any attribute on the evidence that has been mapped as logically equivalent. However, the broker shares only mapped attributes. If only an unmapped attribute on the evidence is modified, the broker shares the evidence to the target case as unchanged.

When the broker shares a logically equivalent evidence record from a source case, if an evidence record of the same type does not exist on the target case, the system creates an evidence record on the target case. The type of the evidence record that is created on the target case matches the target evidence type that is defined in the sharing configuration's XML rules file. The system then populates the new evidence record with the information that is available on the source evidence record. Details within the XML rules file can specify any specific steps that need to be taken when the evidence record is created.

A different evidence pattern can be assigned to a source evidence record compared to the evidence pattern that is assigned to the logically equivalent target evidence record. The system must adhere to the rules of the evidence pattern that are assigned to the evidence record on the target case.

- **Share new evidence to mapped logically equivalent evidence example**

  For example, an administrator has set up a logically equivalent sharing configuration to share social security number details evidence from Insurance Affordability integrated cases to identifications evidence on person evidence. The social security number details evidence is configured as a trusted source on the target case.

  A caseworker has added Mary Smith as a case member on an Insurance Affordability integrated case. The identifications evidence that exists on Mary's person evidence does not include the social security number evidence subtype. The caseworker adds social security number evidence to Mary's Insurance Affordability integrated case, and populates the social security number.

  The evidence broker shares the social security number evidence from the Insurance Affordability integrated case to Mary's person evidence. On Mary's person evidence, the broker creates and activates the shared evidence as identifications evidence, and populates all the mapped evidence fields from the shared social security number evidence.

Logically equivalent evidence sharing rules

The broker also adheres to the following rules when it shares logically equivalent evidence:

- **Reviewing extra unmapped evidence attributes on target case evidence**

  An administrator might map some, but not all, attributes on an evidence type as logically equivalent. To prevent unmapped attributes on target case evidence from being either

incorrectly overwritten, or retained incorrectly without manual intervention, an administrator can configure a mapped dependency attribute that indicates a business dependency between the mapped and unmapped attributes. If the attribute value changes, a caseworker must review the unmapped attribute values on the target case to evaluate whether they are still either correct or relevant based on a change in the values of the mapped attributes:

- When the dependency attribute changes and additional information is included on the target evidence record, the source evidence record is placed on the caseworker's incoming list.
- When the dependency attribute changes and no additional information is included on the target record, the source evidence record is accepted and activated automatically based on the sharing configuration.
- When the dependency attribute does not change, the source evidence is automatically accepted and activated based on the sharing configuration.

Similarly, an additional participant on a shared source evidence record can change and cause additional information in unmapped attributes to be available on the target evidence record that are not available on the source evidence record. For example, on a student evidence record, the school participant can change. In such a scenario, a caseworker must review the additional information on the target evidence record in the incoming list and ensure that it is still relevant to the additional participant on the target case. However, if no additional information is populated in unmapped attributes on the target evidence, the evidence is automatically accepted and activated where possible.

- **Target evidence contains extra, unmapped information example**

  An administrator has set up a logically equivalent sharing configuration to share disability evidence from Insurance Affordability integrated cases to disability evidence on income support integrated cases. The disability evidence is configured as a trusted source on the target case.

  A caseworker adds the client John Smith as a case member of an Insurance Affordability integrated case and also as a case member of an income support integrated case:

  - Disability evidence records exist on both the Insurance Affordability integrated case, and also on the income support integrated case, where the disability type is set to brain injury.
  - The same information is present on the fields that are mapped between the two evidence records.
  - Additional information that indicates a brain injury category is present in the unmapped fields on the target disability evidence record that is on the income support integrated case.

  The caseworker then changes the disability type in the disability evidence record on the Insurance Affordability integrated case from brain injury to physically disabled/ incapacitated. The broker shares the modified disability evidence record from the Insurance Affordability integrated case to the disability evidence record on the income support integrated case. The additional brain injury category information that is present in the unmapped fields on the target disability evidence record is no longer relevant. Therefore, the broker adds the shared disability evidence record to the caseworker's incoming evidence list for manual review and processing.

- **Evidence end-dating on the target case**

  Some evidence types do not support the modification of evidence records, known as succession. Instead, to accommodate a change in evidence, the previous evidence record must

be end-dated and a new evidence record created in its place. Therefore, a scenario can occur where the broker shares a logically equivalent evidence record from an evidence type that supports succession, to an evidence type that does not support succession. In such a scenario, the sharing configuration can determine that the system should end-date the target evidence record, and insert the information from the source evidence record into a new evidence record on the target case. The system maintains the correct dates on any evidence records that are either end-dated or created as a result of sharing logically equivalent evidence. The end-date on an existing target evidence record is specified according to the following criteria:

- If the shared evidence record has only a start date, the start date is specified as the end-date on the existing target evidence record.
- If the shared evidence record has both a start date and an effective date, the effective date is specified as the end-date on the existing target evidence record.
- **End-dating evidence on a target case example**

    For example, an administrator has set up a logically equivalent sharing configuration to share identifications evidence from person evidence to SSN details evidence on Insurance Affordability integrated cases. The identifications evidence is configured as a trusted source on the target case. If identifications evidence is shared to the Insurance Affordability case, the XML rules file specifies that if SSN details evidence exists on the target case, it should be end-dated. The system should then create an SSN details evidence record on the target case and populate it with the information from the shared identifications evidence.

    A caseworker has added John Smith as a case member on an Insurance Affordability integrated case. The Insurance Affordability case contains SSN details evidence in which the value of `SSN status` has been set to `Applied for SSN`.

    The caseworker enters John's social security number into the identifications evidence on his person evidence. The broker shares the identifications evidence to John's Insurance Affordability case. The system end dates the SSN details evidence on the Insurance Affordability case, and sets the end date to the effective date from the shared identifications evidence. The system then creates an SSN details evidence record that includes the information from the shared identifications evidence, and sets the start date of the new record to the effective date of the shared identifications record. The system activates all the changes.

Verification items

By default, the broker does not share verification items that are associated with an evidence record to a target case. However, an administrator can configure the evidence broker to share verification items that are associated with either identical or logically equivalent evidence, as well as the evidence that is being shared to the target case.

When a client first provides evidence for a case, a caseworker can request a verification record that confirms the validity of the evidence. The caseworker then enters the evidence and the verification onto the case. An administrator can configure conditional verification rules that determine whether a verification applies to an evidence record based on a set of conditions. For more information about conditional verification rules, see the related link.

If the broker shares verification items between a source case and a target case, the verification documentation that was provided for the evidence at source is copied and applied to the evidence on the target case. When the shared evidence record is either inserted or modified on the target case, the verification engine re-runs on the copied verification documentation on the target case.

Because the verification requirements are not necessarily the same on the source case and the target case, the verification engine assesses whether the evidence requires reverification on the target case. However, if the verification requirements are the same between the source case and the target case, it is not necessary for the caseworker to reverify evidence that is already verified for the client.

For each source to target case evidence sharing configuration, an administrator can configure the broker to share verification items under the following circumstances:

- **Always**
  The broker always shares associated verification items, even if they are not used or required by the target case.
- **If applicable**
  The broker shares associated verification items to the target case only if they are used or required by the target case, as defined in any conditional verification rules configurations.

Adding shared verification items to a case

When the broker shares evidence to a target case, different verification requirements on the source case and the target case can prevent the evidence from being shared seamlessly and the evidence remains in a not verified status. The broker adds the evidence to the caseworker's incoming list and sends a notification that the evidence requires further verification.

Related concepts

Evidence validations and verifications on page 88
When the broker shares evidence to a target case, the system triggers validation and verification checks on the individual evidence types. The checks ensure that evidence that the broker adds to the target case maintains the data integrity that is required for the case.

Evidence sharing triggers

If a sharing configuration exists between a source case and a target case, certain caseworker actions trigger the evidence broker to share evidence records between the cases.

The following caseworker actions trigger the evidence broker to share evidence, where a relevant sharing configuration exists between the source and target case types. The broker shares the most recent active version of evidence in accordance with sharing configurations, evidence sharing rules, and evidence maintenance rules. When the broker shares evidence to a target case, the system either resolves the evidence automatically onto the target case, or adds the evidence to the caseworker's incoming evidence list for manual review and processing.

- **Adding a case member**

  If a caseworker adds a person as a case member to a case, the evidence broker shares the person's evidence, and the evidence from any other cases that the person is included on, to the target case.

  Adding a case member typically triggers evidence sharing, with one exception. During the application authorization process, the ongoing case and the product delivery cases are created and members are added to the new cases. The adding a case member trigger point that normally pulls evidence onto a newly created integrated case is bypassed where that trigger point is encountered during the authorization of the application case. Instead, the trigger point of authorizing the application is used to push the evidence from the application case to the cases as required.

- **Activating evidence**

  If a caseworker activates the addition, modification, or removal of evidence onto a case, the evidence broker shares the updated evidence to the relevant target cases.

  Activating evidence normally triggers evidence sharing with the following two exceptions:

  - When evidence is configured to use the redesigned evidence broker and when evidence is changed on an application case, the evidence is automatically activated. However, until the application is authorized, evidence activation does not trigger evidence sharing.
  - During application submission, if evidence is changed on a case, for example, on the person record, evidence activation does not trigger evidence sharing. Instead, the evidence is also created on the application case so that it can be shared during application authorization.

  The reason for the exceptions is that at this stage in the application process, the evidence might not yet be ready to share outward to other cases. Instead, the evidence is shared to other cases during application authorization.

- **Authorizing an application**

  If a caseworker authorizes an application, the evidence broker shares the evidence from the associated application case to the relevant target cases.

- **Pre-authorization Sharing**

  Evidence on an application case can be configured to share prior to authorization. For example, this may be required where applications experience delays getting to authorization stage in the process and agencies do not want to wait to have the citizen's updated circumstances shared. If no mandatory outstanding verifications exist against the evidence, the evidence will share once activated. If there are mandatory outstanding verifications against the evidence, the evidence will not share until all outstanding verifications are satisifed. As well as configuring the evidence at the application case level and enabling it for pre-authorization sharing, the following system property also needs to be turned on `curam.application.preauthorization.sharing.enabled`. More information on configuring evidence for pre-authorization sharing can be found in the *Intake Configuration Guide*.

Reviewing evidence on a case's incoming list

The evidence broker places some evidence records into a caseworker's incoming evidence list for manual review and processing. For the currently expanded incoming evidence, a timeline of changes displays over both the incoming and the existing evidence where you can click a date to view the evidence for that point in time.

Before you begin

1. The Incoming Evidence page contains several features to provide information about the incoming and existing evidence to help with manually processing evidence sharing decisions. For more information, see the *Understanding the Incoming Evidence page* related link.
2. Log on to the Cúram application as a caseworker, and display the target case that has incoming evidence.

About this task

The following list outlines the circumstances where the broker places an incoming evidence record into the caseworker's incoming evidence list on the existing case for manual review and processing:

- The evidence type of the evidence record that is being shared is not specified as a trusted source in the sharing configuration.
- The parent and child evidence types have a conflicting sharing configuration.
- The broker cannot identify an exact match between the incoming evidence record and the existing evidence record on the existing case.

Procedure

1. On the existing case, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
    A list of incoming evidence types that require manual review and processing is displayed. View a high-level description of the evidence that is being shared where information about the most recent change to the evidence is displayed if there are changes over time. When there is child evidence for the parent, both the evidence names are displayed in the description. When there are multiple child evidences, only one child evidence is displayed in the description.

2. Expand an evidence type to review it.
    For the evidence type that you click, a comparison view displays the evidence that is incoming to the case. Existing evidence that is comparable to the incoming evidence is displayed next to the incoming evidence. Existing evidence is considered comparable if it is not an exact match to the incoming evidence but is of the same type and can potentially be used to update the existing evidence.

    > **Note:** Both existing evidence that is in an Active and an In-Edit state are displayed on the existing evidence side of the comparison view.

    Various cards also display as they are needed to process the evidence sharing. If a card is not needed for the type of evidence you are processing, a card does not display.

    1. If the incoming evidence is comparable to the existing evidence and is comparable to more than one existing evidence, the **Choose an Existing Evidence from the case to compare with** card is displayed. If there is only one existing evidence, this card is not displayed. Use the **Choose an Existing Evidence from the case to compare** card to click the existing evidence to compare to the incoming evidence. Click the right and left arrows to scroll through comparable evidences on the existing case.
    2. The **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed if the incoming evidence is comparable to the existing evidence. If there is no existing evidence that is comparable, the card is not displayed. Use the **Update Existing Evidence** card to update existing evidence.
    3. If the incoming evidence has missing information that must be provided before the evidence can be shared, the **Information is Missing** card is displayed. If the incoming evidence is comparable to the existing evidence, you do not see the **Update Existing Evidence** card until the **Information is Missing** card no longer displays. For more information about the cards, see the *Understanding the Incoming Evidence page* related link.

3. On either the incoming or existing evidence timeline of changes, click a date to view the evidence for that point in time. A maximum of three dates display at a time. So if the left or right arrow is highlighted, use the arrows to view earlier or later dates on the timeline.

4. Use the timeline of changes to review the incoming evidence and, if appropriate, compare to the existing evidence on the case.
   If evidence of the selected type does not yet exist on the existing case for the client, no existing evidence is displayed next to the incoming evidence. Instead, informational text is displayed in the evidence details panel. If existing evidence is displayed next to the incoming evidence, evidence information that differs between the incoming and existing evidence is highlighted.

5. Click an action on either the incoming evidence or on the existing evidence.

   The actions that you can choose to process the evidence depend on whether the shared evidence already exists on the existing case or not and whether the evidence that is being shared is a deletion of previously shared evidence.

   The following table lists the actions that you can click on the incoming evidence.

Option	Description
Update	Click **Update** when evidence of the same type as the incoming evidence exists on the existing case and you want to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence.
	If the evidence includes a timeline of historical or more recent information, the entire timeline is automatically processed. If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically processed
Add as new	Click **Add as new** when the incoming evidence does not exist on the existing case and you want to insert it onto the case. You might also choose to click **Add as new** when evidence of the same type as the incoming evidence exists on the existing case, but it is determined to not be the same evidence.
	If the evidence includes a timeline of historical information, the entire timeline is automatically added to the case as part of the same action. If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically added to the case.
Ignore	Click **Ignore** when you do not want to share the evidence with the target case and want to remove the evidence from the incoming evidence list. If the evidence that is being shared includes changes over time or a

Option	Description
	hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically ignored.
Edit	Click **Edit** when you want to edit the incoming evidence for a specific date. For example, you might want to edit when you have missing information on your evidence.

The following table lists the actions you can click on the existing evidence.

Option	Description
Delete Existing	Click the **Delete Existing** action when you want to delete an existing record. The **Delete Existing** action is enabled when the incoming evidence record was deleted from the source case if the evidence record was previously shared between the cases.

6. After an action is clicked and the incoming evidence is processed, a check mark is displayed in a green filled circle followed by the message The incoming evidence is resolved. The processed incoming evidence is displayed on the existing evidence side of the comparison view.

Related concepts

Understanding the Incoming Evidence page on page 38
The Incoming Evidence page contains several features to provide information about the incoming and existing evidence to help with manually processing evidence sharing decisions.

Understanding sharing and case participant roles on page 48
Before the broker can display evidence in the incoming evidence list of the existing case, the broker must first create a related case participant role on the case if the role does not exist.

Understanding the Incoming Evidence page

The Incoming Evidence page contains several features to provide information about the incoming and existing evidence to help with manually processing evidence sharing decisions.

The following list outlines the features that caseworkers can use to manually process evidence sharing decisions:

- View cards that display messages and actions based on the incoming evidence that is being shared and the existing evidence to which it is being compared.
- Use the timeline of changes to analyze how to process the incoming evidence, for example to understand where conflicts in the incoming and existing evidence exist.
- View descriptions of the current evidence under the timeline of changes to help with the selection of comparable evidence. The descriptions give an at-a-glance view of the evidence details being shared. Use the description to help you determine whether the evidence record is the same on the incoming and existing sides.

- **Cards**
  Various cards display based on the evidence that is being shared and the caseworker action that is required. Depending on the incoming evidence, cards are displayed next to the incoming and existing evidence timeline of changes.

    - If the incoming evidence is comparable to more than one existing evidence, a **Choose Existing Evidence from the case to compare with** card is displayed. Here you can select the existing evidence to compare to the incoming evidence. Use the right and left arrows to scroll through comparable evidences on the existing case. Even where existing evidence is of the same type as the incoming evidence, if the incoming evidence was previously linked to evidence in the existing case only the linked existing evidence is displayed.
    - If comparable evidence exists on the existing case, an **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed that you can use to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence. When the incoming and existing evidence have information that conflicts on the same date, the number of dates on which there is conflicting information is displayed along with two radio buttons **Incoming information is correct** and **Existing information is correct**. When there is no conflicting information, then no radio buttons are displayed. Use the action **Update** button to initiate actions from this card.
    - If information is missing on the timeline, a card that is labeled **Information is missing from <x> timeline change** is displayed to remind you to provide missing evidence details. When the **Information is missing** card is displayed, the **Update Existing Evidence** card is not displayed until all missing evidence details are provided.

  After you choose an incoming evidence to view from the incoming evidence list, a case type, and case number display under the label Incoming Evidence on the left. The case type displays cases such as application case, integrated case, product delivery case, and the person record. The associated case number displays to the right of the case type. On the right, is the existing case and the same type of information is displayed. In this area, you also see the actions **Add as New** and **Ignore**. When the actions are not available for you to select, the actions are not highlighted.
  For more information about the update cards, see the *Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence* related link.

- **Descriptions**
  The current description displays the latest description of each evidence item. This information gives a quick at-a-glance view of the evidence that is being shared. You can use this information to help compare the evidence between the incoming and existing evidence to ensure you are sharing between the same evidence.
  When there is child evidence for the parent, both the evidence names display in the description. When there are multiple child evidences, only one displays in the description.

- **Timeline of changes**
  A timeline of changes is displayed over both the incoming evidence and the existing evidence. Dates are represented as dots. A maximum of three dates are displayed at a time. If there are more than three dates on either the incoming or existing evidence, then the arrows on either side are highlighted to indicate the direction of the dates. For the currently expanded evidence type, color-coded dots and dates on the timeline represent the date on which the evidence started and the dates on which the evidence changed over time.

    - An arrow points to the currently selected dot from underneath.
    - A solid blue dot indicates the currently selected evidence record.
    - An open blue dot indicates a cleared evidence record.

- A filled dot with an explanation point (!) indicates that a special action is required. These dots display the same whether selected or cleared.

  - If a label (Conflict) is displayed over the dot, there are conflicting details between the incoming and existing evidence for that date. When the conflict is resolved, the label and the explanation point no longer display.
  - If a label (Information missing) is displayed over the dot, there is information that is missing in the evidence details. When the missing information is added, the label and the explanation point are no longer displayed. When the (Information missing) label is displayed over a date on the timeline, the (Conflict) label is not displayed until the missing information is provided and the information is then in conflict with the existing evidence.

> **Note:** An (Information missing) label is displayed over a dot where the information that is missing includes missing mandatory information from a field that includes a mandatory asterisk. This includes fields such as those that are conditionally mandatory for which validations are then displayed when you modify the evidence.

When an evidence type is initially expanded, dates in the timeline are highlighted by default, depending upon the evidence that is being processed.

- If the incoming evidence and existing evidence have no records that have a matching start date or effective date, the date of the latest evidence change over time on the Incoming Evidence side of the page is selected by default.
- When a record is selected on either the incoming evidence or existing evidence side of the page, if there is a record that has a matching start date or effective date on the other side, the matching record is also selected by default.
- If the incoming evidence and existing evidence have at least one record that has a matching start date or effective date, the date of the latest matching record on the incoming evidence side of the page is selected by default.
- When a record is selected on either the incoming evidence or existing evidence side of the page, if there is no record with a matching start date or effective date on the other side, no record is placed into focus on the other side of the page. A message displays on the other evidence side that there is no corresponding date in the timeline.

For the currently expanded evidence type, labels display in the timeline over the date in two situations. The following list outlines the two situations:

- The word (Conflict) precedes the timeline date when a conflict exists between the incoming evidence and the existing evidence on the date selected. This label displays when the date is selected or not selected along with the explanation point in the dot. When there is a conflict, extra special formatting displayed in the evidence.
- The words (Information missing) precede the timeline date when there are one or more details that are missing from the incoming evidence. This label displays when the date is selected or not selected, and this label displays along with the explanation point in the dot. When there is information that is missing, extra special formatting is displayed in the evidence details section.

> **Note:** An (Information missing) label displays over a dot if the information that is missing includes missing mandatory information from a field that includes a mandatory asterisk. This includes fields such as those that are conditionally mandatory for which validations are then displayed when you modify the evidence.

For more information about the update cards, see the *Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence* related link.

For the currently selected date in the timeline of changes, the following list outlines the information that is displayed in the content area:

- Started on or changed on is displayed next to the name of the evidence to indicate whether the evidence record started on the date that is selected in the timeline or changed on the date that is selected in the timeline of changes.
- When conflicts exist, the specific conflicting evidence details are highlighted in yellow preceded by an open circle icon that is filled with an explanation point in the middle. The same highlighting displays on both the incoming evidence and existing evidence.
- When the timeline of changes displays (Information missing) for a specific date, the same words display in the evidence details for the specific missing evidence details. In the evidence details section, preceding the words (Information missing) is a circle icon that is filled with yellow and an explanation point. This highlighting displays for each individual field that is marked with an asterisk that has information that is missing. After you enter all the missing mandatory information (or all the fields with the asterisks), you might still receive a message that some evidence details are missing.
- When the incoming evidence includes parent-child relationships and the parent and child evidence start or change over time on different dates, the evidences display on different dates on the timeline. When the parent and child evidence both start or change over time on the same date, the parent and child evidence display on the same date with the parent evidence that is displaying beneath the child evidence.

> **Note:** Other mandatory evidence information might also be missing that does not include the display of the mandatory asterisk. This includes information that is conditionally mandatory. Validations are displayed when you modify the evidence if this information is not provided.

Related concepts

[Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence on page 41](#)
The **Update** action automatically determines how to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence based on the incoming and existing evidence that is being compared, along with user input where required to resolve conflicts in evidence information.

Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence

The **Update** action automatically determines how to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence based on the incoming and existing evidence that is being compared, along with user input where required to resolve conflicts in evidence information.

When caseworkers are manually processing incoming evidence, caseworkers might already have the same type of evidence on their case. Incoming evidence is not an exact match but is comparable and can potentially be used to update the existing evidence. Use the **Update** action to share the incoming evidence with comparable evidence on the existing case. If the incoming evidence includes a timeline of historical information, the entire timeline is automatically

processed. If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically processed.

Caseworkers are presented with information on an **Update Existing Evidence** card that is relevant to the incoming and existing evidence that is being compared. Guidance is provided to help caseworkers determine whether to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence or instead add as new evidence or ignored. The following list outlines the three evidence sharing patterns to where the guidance applies:

- The incoming and existing evidence have conflicting information on the same date that must be resolved (see the Correction section).
- The incoming and existing evidence can be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case (see the Timeline update section).
- The incoming and existing evidence can be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case and also have conflicting information that must be resolved (see the Correction and timeline update section).

Correction

When evidence to be shared has the same date on both the incoming and existing cases and the evidence information conflicts on the date, you must determine whether the incoming or existing evidence is correct so that either the existing evidence can be corrected or it can be confirmed to already be correct.

When the incoming and existing evidence have the same date on their timeline of changes and the information conflicts, the label (Conflict) displays over the date on both timelines. The evidence information might also be in conflict on more than one date. The number of dates on which there is conflicting information is displayed on the **Update Existing Evidence** card.

The card provides radio buttons to click if the incoming or existing evidence is correct. The card also includes a message that reminds the user to review the comparable timeline of changes on each case before the user clicks a button.

- **Incoming information is correct**
  When the incoming evidence is correct, click the radio button **Incoming information is correct**. A message is displayed that indicates that the evidence on the current case will be updated with the shared evidence from the incoming case. If you decide to continue and you click **Update**, the details from the incoming evidence replace any values in the existing evidence where there are conflicts on the same date in the timeline of changes. The updates to the existing evidence are in an In-Edit status and are displayed on the **In-Edit Evidence** page where changes can then be applied.
  For more information, see the *Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence* related link.
- **Existing information is correct**
  When the existing evidence is correct, click the radio button **Existing information is correct**. A message is displayed that indicates that the evidence on this case will be kept and confirmed as correct. If you decide to continue and you click **Update**, the existing evidence on the case is not updated. However, it is placed into an In-Edit state so that when changes are applied, the evidence that is confirmed to be correct can then be shared back to the case from which the evidence was originally shared.

> **Note:** When evidence information conflicts on more than one date, clicking the **Existing information is correct** radio button and then clicking the **Update** results in all conflicting evidence being updated on the existing evidence. You cannot indicate that incoming evidence is correct on one date but that the existing evidence is correct on another date.

Timeline update

When the incoming evidence can be used to form an updated timeline on the existing case because it contains either historical or more recent changes to the evidence, you must review the timeline of changes. In this type of scenario, both the start date and the dates on which the evidence that is changed over time are different across the incoming and existing evidence timeline, so there is no conflicting information on the same date. The card does not contain radio buttons because there is no evidence that conflicts on the same date. The only action in the card is **Update**.

When you select the action **Update**, a message is displayed that indicates that evidence on the existing case will be updated with changes that are shared from the incoming case. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, an extra message is displayed. The message indicates that the start date of the existing evidence will be updated to the start date of the incoming evidence and this change might affect eligibility.

If you decide to continue and you click **Update**, the historical or more recent changes to the evidence are added to the timeline of changes on the existing evidence. The system establishes the correct timeline of information for the evidence that is based on the start dates and the effective dates of change of the incoming evidence timeline and the existing evidence timeline. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, the start date is updated automatically on the evidence of the existing case and does not need to be manually updated by a caseworker.

The updates to the existing evidence are in an In-Edit status and are displayed on the **In-Edit Evidence** page where changes can then be applied.

For more information, see the *Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence* related link.

Correction and timeline update

Sometimes the incoming evidence can potentially be used to both correct and form an updated timeline on the existing case. In this situation, you see a card with the same radio buttons as in the correction scenario and an **Update** action. As with the correction scenario, when the incoming and existing evidence have the same date on their timeline of changes and the information conflicts, the label (Conflict) is displayed over the date on both timelines. The evidence information can also be in conflict on more than one date. The number of dates on which there is conflicting information is displayed on the **Update Existing Evidence** card. Other dates on the timeline might not display a label because the dates are not the same or there are no conflicts. Where the dates are not the same, as with the timeline update scenario, the incoming evidence contains historical or more recent changes to the evidence that can be used to update the timeline on the existing case.

For more information, see the *Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence* related link.

- **Incoming information is correct**

  When the incoming evidence is correct, select the radio button **Incoming information is correct**. A message is displayed that indicates that evidence on the existing case will be updated with changes that are shared from the incoming case. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, an extra message is displayed. This message indicates that the start date of the existing evidence will be updated and this change might affect eligibility. As the existing evidence is also corrected with information from the incoming evidence, a message is also displayed that indicates that where there are conflicts information will be corrected with shared incoming information.

  If you decide to continue and you click **Update**, the details from the incoming evidence replace any values in the existing evidence where there are conflicts on the same date in the timeline of changes. The historical or more recent changes to the evidence are also added to the timeline of changes on the existing evidence. The system establishes the correct timeline of information for the evidence based on the start dates and the effective dates of change of the incoming evidence timeline and the existing evidence timeline. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, the start date is updated automatically on the evidence of the existing case and does not need to be manually updated by a caseworker.

- **Existing information is correct**

  When the existing evidence is correct, click the radio button **Existing information is correct**. A message is displayed that indicates that evidence on the existing case will be updated with changes that are shared from the incoming case. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, an extra message is displayed. The message indicates that the start date of the existing evidence will be updated, and this change might affect eligibility. As the existing evidence is correct and will not be corrected with information from the incoming evidence where there are conflicts, a message is displayed that indicates that where there are conflicts information on the existing case will be kept.

  If you decide to continue and click **Update**, the historical or more recent changes to the evidence are added to the timeline of changes on the existing evidence. The system establishes the correct timeline of information for the evidence based on the start dates and effective dates of change of the incoming evidence timeline and the existing evidence timeline. When the start date of the incoming evidence is earlier than the start date of the existing evidence, the start date is updated automatically on the evidence of the existing case and does not need to be manually updated by a caseworker.

  > **Note:** Where there are conflicts on the same date, the existing evidence on the case is not updated. The updates to the existing evidence are placed in an In-Edit status and are displayed on the **In-Edit Evidence** page where changes can then be applied.

  > **Note:** When evidence information conflicts on more than one date, selecting the **Existing information is correct** radio button does not update any of the conflicting evidence on the existing case. You cannot indicate that incoming evidence is correct on one date but that existing evidence is correct on another date.

Editing missing information

Incoming evidence can be used to update the existing evidence unless mandatory information is missing from any changes to the evidence over time that prevent it being used to make updates to the existing evidence.

When mandatory information is missing, the **Update Existing Evidence** card is not displayed. An **Information is missing** card is displayed with the message that before the incoming evidence can be added to the case the missing information must be provided for each change to the evidence over time. The card also displays the number of evidence changes over time with missing information.

When mandatory information is missing, the label (Information missing) precedes the dates on the timeline of changes where there are one or more details that are missing from the incoming evidence.

To provide the missing information, click a date on the timeline of changes then click **Edit**. A message is displayed with information that the evidence is not added to this case until the evidence is added. When you continue, the **Edit evidence** window is displayed where the missing information is entered. When the missing information is provided, the (Information missing) label no longer displays for the date on the timeline of changes.

When all the missing mandatory information is added to all changes over time for the incoming evidence, the **Update Existing Evidence** card is then displayed and can be used to process the incoming evidence.

> **Note:** The missing information that is provided is shared to the existing case only. When evidence is edited in the incoming evidence side of the comparison view, the evidence on the case that shared the evidence is not updated.

Parent-child evidence

If either or both of the incoming and existing evidence include parent-child evidence records, when you use the **Update** action the existing parent-child evidence is automatically updated with all parent and child evidence records from the incoming evidence as appropriate. The update includes corrections to parent or child evidence in the existing case when the **Incoming information is correct** radio button is clicked and updates to the timeline on the existing case that can contain changes over time to either parent or child evidence.

For more information, see the *Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence* related link.

If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, you can edit both the parent and child records by using the associated edit evidence page for the evidence type. The **Edit** action is displayed to the right of the name of the evidence type on each page.

Related concepts

Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence on page 48
Examples of common scenarios where the incoming and the existing evidence are comparable and the **Update** action can be used.

Adding new evidence to a case

When you are manually processing incoming evidence, click the action **Add as New** to add incoming evidence to the existing case.

When you use the **Add as New** action, the entire timeline is automatically added to the case as part of the same action. Therefore, a full set of evidence is available on the existing case without the need to add each history evidence record individually.

After the records are shared from the incoming case, the changes display on the existing evidence side of the comparison view. The **Add as New** action is no longer enabled.

The evidence that is added to the existing case is placed in an In-Edit status and displayed on the **In Edit Evidence** page where changes can then be applied.

Incoming evidence can be added to the existing case unless the incoming evidence was deleted or if mandatory information is missing from any changes to the evidence over time that prevent its addition to the case.

Editing missing information

When mandatory information is missing, the **Add as New** action is disabled. An **Information is missing** card displays with the message that before the incoming evidence can be added to the case the missing information must be provided for each change to the evidence on the timeline. The card also displays the number of evidence changes over time with missing information.

When mandatory information is missing, the label (Information missing) precedes the dates on the timeline of changes where there are one or more details that are missing from the incoming evidence.

To provide the missing information, click a date on the timeline of changes and click **Edit**. A message is displayed with information that the evidence is not added to this case until the evidence is added. When you continue, the edit evidence window is displayed where the missing information is entered. When the missing information is provided, the (Information missing) label is no longer displayed for the date on the timeline of changes.

When all missing mandatory information is added to all changes over time for the incoming evidence, click the action **Add as New** to add the incoming evidence to the case.

For more information about the **Edit** action, see the *Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence* related link.

If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically added to the case. For example, the evidence is configured with a parent-child relationship in an integrated case with paid employment and earned income as the child evidence. If the client is receiving two separate income payments from a particular employment, the following outlines the evidence records that are created:

- One paid employment parent evidence record.
- Two earned income child evidence records, one record for each of the two payments.

All the evidence displays on the existing evidence side of the comparison view after the evidence sharing completes.

Related concepts

Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence on page 41
The **Update** action automatically determines how to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence based on the incoming and existing evidence that is being compared, along with user input where required to resolve conflicts in evidence information.

Ignoring evidence

From incoming evidence, select **Ignore** when you do not want to share the evidence with the existing case and want to remove the evidence from the incoming evidence list. When the

evidence includes a timeline of historical information, the entire timeline is automatically ignored.

If you ignore the incoming record, the evidence record is not resolved and might be redisplayed in the incoming evidence list in the future. Also, when you use the **Ignore** action, the evidence record is not linked to an evidence record on the target case. Therefore, the system cannot automatically process future shared updates to the evidence record. If the evidence being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, all records in the hierarchy are also automatically ignored.

Editing evidence on an incoming case

From incoming evidence, click **Edit** when you want to edit the selected incoming evidence. For example, you might see the label (Missing information) and you want to add the evidence details.

On the incoming evidence side of the comparison view, an **Edit** action is available to modify the incoming evidence. The **Edit** action is used to provide missing mandatory information and to make other required updates to the incoming evidence. This includes updates that might be required to resolve validations for conditionally mandatory information or to process specific evidence sharing scenarios. For more information, see the *Specific evidence sharing scenarios* related link.

Use the **Edit** action to modify evidence information that requires an update. When there is missing mandatory information, the label (Missing information) is displayed next to fields that display a mandatory asterisk. When you select a date on the timeline of changes, normally the icon displays a solid blue dot. But when there is at least one field with missing information on the timeline of changes, a label (Missing information) and an icon '!' are displayed. This highlighting indicates that the missing details on the evidence must be provided before the evidence can be shared. All changes to the evidence over time with missing information must be updated before you share the evidence. The label (Missing information) and the icon are removed from the timeline of changes when the missing information is added to the specific evidence record.

The **Edit** action is displayed underneath the timeline of changes to the right of the name of the evidence type. This action is available even when the label (Missing information) does not display over a selected date in the timeline of changes.

Any updates that you make to the evidence by using the **Edit** action are shared to the existing case only. When evidence is edited in the incoming evidence side of the comparison view, the evidence on the associated incoming case is not updated.

If the evidence that is being shared includes a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, you can edit both the parent and child records by using the associated **Edit Evidence** page for the evidence type. The **Edit** action is displayed to the right of the name of the evidence type for each parent and child evidence.

Related concepts

Specific evidence sharing scenarios on page 52
For illustration purposes, five example scenarios outline types of more uncommon evidence sharing scenarios that work differently from the three main types of evidence sharing patterns.

Deleting a previously shared record

Previously shared evidence might be deleted from the source case. After the evidence is deleted, the evidence is shared, and the icon **Deleted** displays next to each deleted incoming evidence

record that was deleted. The **Delete Existing** action is enabled for the corresponding evidence record in the target case.

When you select the action **Delete Existing** on the existing evidence side to remove incoming evidence from a case, a confirmation is displayed. The confirmation message requests you to confirm that you want to delete the existing record from the target case.

After you confirm to delete the existing record from the target case, the icon **Pending Deletion** displays on the existing evidence side by the evidence record. The evidence is placed into a **Pending Deletion** state. When multiple shared records are deleted on the source case, you must delete each record individually on the existing case. If a set of deleted data contains a hierarchy of parent and child evidence records, you must delete each record separately.

Understanding sharing and case participant roles

Before the broker can display evidence in the incoming evidence list of the existing case, the broker must first create a related case participant role on the case if the role does not exist.

The broker creates case participant roles only for evidence that was shared to the existing case in accordance with the defined sharing configuration and rules. If a caseworker clicks the action to ignore incoming evidence on an existing case, the caseworker might need to review and remove some related participant roles on the existing case.

For example, a sharing configuration is defined to share student evidence between integrated cases where sharing is not specified as a trusted source. The caseworker adds and activates new student evidence onto John Smith's integrated case, where the student evidence includes school details.

As defined by the sharing configuration, the broker shares the student evidence to John Smith's integrated case and displays the evidence in the incoming list of the case. The broker adds the school to the integrated case as a case participant. If a caseworker ignores the incoming student evidence from the incoming case, the school remains on the case as a case participant. A caseworker must remove the case participant.

Evidence sharing patterns when comparing comparable evidence

Examples of common scenarios where the incoming and the existing evidence are comparable and the **Update** action can be used.

Correction for non-parent/child evidence

- **About this task**
  When evidence to be shared has the same date on both the incoming and existing cases and the evidence information conflicts on the date, you need to determine whether the incoming or existing evidence is correct so that either the existing evidence can be corrected or it can be confirmed to already be correct.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, student evidence is used. In each case, the same student evidence is entered except for one field, **Student Status**.

Scenario

1. A client has two integrated cases where both cases include the same student evidence except for one difference. For example, the **Student Status** for student on integrated case 1 is full time and on the integrated case 2, the **Student Status** is part time.
2. The student evidence is active on both cases.

3. The evidence broker shares the integrated case student evidence from the incoming case to the existing case.

Procedure

1. On the Person record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the student evidence to see the Incoming Evidence page.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence from integrated case 1 is displayed.
4. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence from the existing case (integrated case 2) is displayed.
5. The label (Conflict) is displayed next to the dates for the incoming and existing evidence. In the student evidence, the conflicting **Student Status** values are highlighted on each side because the values are different. The **Update Existing Evidence** card presents the user with the option to click whether **Incoming evidence is correct** or **Existing evidence is correct**.
6. Option 1: The student evidence that is shared from the incoming case is correct and the student evidence is to be updated on the existing case. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming evidence is correct**. Then, click **Update** and click **Update**. The existing case is updated with the corrected **Student Status** from the incoming case.
7. Option 2: The student evidence that is shared from the incoming case is incorrect and the student evidence on the existing case is to remain the same. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Existing evidence is correct**. Then, click **Update** and **Update**. The existing case student evidence values remain the same. The conflicting **Student Status** is not updated. The Student evidence on the existing case is also placed into a status of in-edit and when changes are applied is shared to the case from which the evidence is being shared.

Correction for parent-child evidence

- **About this task**
  When evidence to share has the same date on both the incoming and the existing cases and the evidence information conflicts on the date, you need to determine whether the incoming or existing evidence is correct so that either the existing evidence can be corrected or it can be confirmed to already be correct. The same is true when parent-child evidence is shared. Corrections can be made for conflicts on both the parent and the child evidence.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, parent student evidence and child student expense evidence is shared from one integrated case to another. In each case, the same student evidence is entered except for one field, **Student Status**. In each case, the same student expense evidence is entered except for one field, **Amount**.

Scenario

1. A client has two integrated cases where both cases include the same student and student expense evidence, except for one difference on each. For example, the **Student Status** for student on integrated case 1 is full time and on the integrated case 2, the **Student Status** is part time. The **Amount** for student expense is $50 per month on one case and on the other is $40 per month. The start dates are the same for the student and student expense evidence on each case.
2. The student and the student expense evidence on both the cases are active.
3. The evidence broker shares both the integrated case student and the student expense evidence from the incoming case to the existing case.

Procedure

1. On the Integrated Case record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the student **Student** > **Student Expense** evidence to display the Incoming Evidence page.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the student and student expense from integrated case 1 are displayed.
4. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the student and student expense evidence from the existing case (integrated case 2) are displayed.
5. The label (Conflict) is displayed next to the dates for the incoming and existing parent and child evidence.
6. In the student evidence, the conflicting **Student Status** values are highlighted on each side because the values are different.
7. In the student expense evidence, the conflicting **Amount** values are highlighted on each side because the values are different. The **Update Existing Evidence** card presents the user with the option to select whether **Incoming evidence is correct** or **Existing evidence is correct**.
8. Option 1: The student and student expense evidence that are shared from the incoming case is correct and the student and student evidence are to be updated on the existing case. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming evidence is correct**. Then, click **Update** and **Update**. The following list outlines how the existing case is updated:

   - Corrected **Student Status** on the student evidence from the incoming case.
   - Corrected **Amount** on the student expense from the incoming case.

9. Option 2: The student evidence and student expense that are shared from the incoming case is incorrect and the student and student expense evidence on the existing case must remain the same. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Existing evidence is correct**. Then, click **Update** and click **Update**. The existing case student and student expense evidence values remain the same. The conflicting **Student Status** and **Amount** are not updated. The Student evidence on the existing case is also placed into a status of in-edit and when changes are applied is shared to the case from which the evidence is being shared.

Timeline update

- **About this task**
  When the incoming evidence can be used to form an updated timeline on the existing case because it contains either historical or more recent changes to the evidence, ensure that you review the timeline of changes. In this type of scenario, both the start dates are different across the incoming and the existing evidence timeline, so there is no conflicting information on the same date. The card does not contain radio buttons because there is no evidence that conflicts on the same date. The only action in the card is **Update**.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, integrated case student evidence is used to share to integrated case student evidence. Each case has one student evidence entered, and the evidences have different start dates and different information for **Student Status**.

Scenario

1. A client has two integrated cases where both cases include the same student evidence. The evidence is the same between the cases except that the start date on the incoming case (integrated case 1) is earlier than the start date on the existing case (integrated case 2) and the **Student Status** is different as it changed over time.
2. The student evidence is active on both cases.
3. The evidence broker shares the integrated case student evidence from the incoming case to the existing case.

Procedure

1. On the Integrated Case record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the student evidence to display the Incoming Evidence page.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence from the integrated case 1 is displayed.
4. No evidence is displayed on the existing evidence timeline of changes because the student evidence on the existing case has a different start date.
5. Click the date on the existing evidence side so that you can view that evidence.
6. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence from the integrated case 2 is displayed.
7. No evidence is displayed on the incoming evidence timeline of changes because the student evidence that is being shared has a different start date than the existing evidence that is selected.
8. As both the incoming and the existing student evidence support changes over time and do not have the same start date, the **Update Existing Evidence** card that is displayed does not allow the user to indicate whether the incoming evidence or the existing evidence is correct. The card allows the incoming and existing evidence to be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case only.
9. Where the student evidence is to be shared from the incoming case, click **Update** and **Update** in the **Update Existing Evidence** card. Two records are displayed in the timeline of changes for the existing evidence. The existing student evidence is updated with the history of change for the **Student Status** that was shared from the incoming case. The start date of the existing student evidence is also updated to match the start date of the incoming evidence because it is earlier.

Correction and timeline update

- **About this task**
  Sometimes the incoming evidence can potentially be used to both correct and form an updated timeline on the existing case. In this situation, you see a card with the same radio buttons as in the correction scenario and an **Update** action.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, integrated case student evidence is used to share to integrated case student evidence.

Scenario

1. A client has two integrated cases where both cases include student evidence. The incoming case (integrated case 1) contains a student evidence with a change over time.
2. The existing case contains one student evidence record. The start date on the student evidence record for this case (integrated case 2) is the same as the effective date of change on the other case (integrated case 1). For case 2, the evidence is the same as the second evidence record on integrated case 1 except for one difference. For example, the **Student Status** for student on case 1 is full-time and on case 2, the **Student Status** is part time.
3. The student evidence is active on both cases.
4. The evidence broker shares the corrected integrated case student evidence from the incoming case to the existing case.

Procedure

1. On the Integrated Case record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the student evidence to display the Incoming Evidence page.

3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence is displayed for integrated case 1. Two dates display on the timeline. The second date has the label Conflict next to it.

4. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the student evidence is displayed for integrated case 2. One date is displayed on the timeline. The date has the label Conflict next to it.

5. The label (Conflict) displays on both the incoming and the existing evidence where the date is the same.

6. In the student evidence, the conflicting **Student Status** values and dates are highlighted on each side because the values are different.

7. On the incoming case, click the other date, that is, the first record.

8. No evidence is displayed on the existing evidence timeline of changes because the student evidence on the existing side does not have a matching date to the incoming side.

9. The **Update Existing Evidence** card presents the user with the option to click whether **Incoming evidence is correct** or **Existing evidence is correct**.

10. Option 1: The **Student Status** of the evidence that is shared from the incoming case on the date where this is a conflict is correct and the student evidence is to be updated on the existing case. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming evidence is correct**. Click **Update** and click **Update**. The **Student Status** on the student evidence in the existing case is updated with the corrected student status from the incoming case for the date on which the evidence was in conflict. Two records are displayed in the timeline of changes for the existing evidence. The existing Student evidence is updated with the historical change to the student evidence that was also shared from the incoming case.

11. Option 2: The **Student Status** of the student evidence that is shared from the incoming case on the date where there is a conflict is incorrect and the student evidences on the existing case must remain the same. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Existing information is correct**. Click **Update** and click **Update**. The existing case student evidence on the date where this is a conflict remains the same. The conflicting **Student Status** is not updated. Two records are also displayed in the timeline of changes for the existing evidence. The existing Student evidence is updated with the historical change to the student evidence that was also shared from the incoming case. The start date of the existing Student evidence is also updated to match the start date of the incoming evidence because it is earlier.

Specific evidence sharing scenarios

For illustration purposes, five example scenarios outline types of more uncommon evidence sharing scenarios that work differently from the three main types of evidence sharing patterns.

The following list outlines the three main types of evidence sharing patterns:

- The incoming and existing evidence have conflicting information on the same date that must be resolved.
- The incoming and existing evidence can be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case.
- The incoming and existing evidence can be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case and also have conflicting information that must be resolved.

For more information about these evidence sharing patterns, see the *Updating existing evidence with incoming evidence* related link.

However, certain evidence sharing scenarios fall into patterns that require that the incoming evidence is processed in a manner that is different from the three main types of patterns. The

following examples outline these types of evidence sharing scenarios that use evidence types that are shared between persons and integrated cases.

Incoming and existing evidence have conflicting information, different start dates and an evidence pattern of multiple or single

- **About this task**

  If the incoming and the existing evidence have both conflicting information and different start dates, an **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed so that the user can combine the evidence to form a new timeline on the existing case. However, when an evidence pattern is single or multiple it is not possible to create succession records.

  To accommodate this type of pattern, when the incoming and existing evidence have conflicting information and different start dates and also have an evidence pattern of single or multiple, a different version of the **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed. Users can use this card to process the incoming evidence as a correction.

  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, integrated case Phone Number evidence is shared to person Phone Number evidence. The start date of the person Phone Number evidence is different from the start date of the integrated case Phone Number evidence and the Phone Number details also differ.

Scenario

1. A client is registered as a person.
2. Phone Number evidence of type Personal is created for the client with a start date that is the same as the date of person registration.
3. An application for benefits is created and is submitted for the person later. During the creation of the application, a different phone number is entered into the application.
4. The application is authorized and an integrated case is created.
5. The evidence broker shares the Phone Number evidence from the integrated case to the client's Person record.

Procedure

1. On the Person record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the Phone Number evidence.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the Phone Number evidence from the integrated case is displayed with the start date that was given to the evidence when the application was created and authorized.
4. No evidence is displayed on the existing evidence timeline of changes because the Phone Number on the existing evidence has a different start date. However, a (Conflict) label is displayed over the two different dates for the incoming and existing evidence and the **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed to the user with the option to click whether **Incoming evidence is correct** or **Existing evidence is correct**.
5. Option 1: If the Phone Number evidence that is shared from the integrated case is correct and the start date of the Phone Number evidence on the Person's record must be updated to the same start date as that of the start date on the integrated case.

   1. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming evidence is correct** and then click **Update** and then **Update**. The person record is updated with the corrected Phone Number from the integrated case and the start date of the Phone Number is also updated to the start date of the Phone Number evidence from the integrated case.
6. Option 2: If the Phone Number evidence that was shared from the integrated case is correct and the start date of the Phone Number evidence on the Person's record must remain the same.

1. On the Incoming Evidence side, click **Edit** and then click **OK**. Now you can change the **Start Date** on the Incoming Evidence to be the same as the Phone Number evidence on the Person's record. Click **Save**.
2. On the **Incoming Evidence** page, the start date of the incoming evidence is now the same as the start date of the existing evidence and both the incoming and existing evidence are displayed at the same time and the conflicting phone number information is highlighted.
3. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming evidence is correct**. Then, click **Update** and then **Update**.

> **Note:** Changing the start date on the Incoming Evidence side does not directly change the start date on the person Phone Number evidence. However, if you have evidence sharing that is configured from the integrated case evidence to the person Phone Number evidence, then the Phone Number evidence might be shared back to the person Phone Number evidence.

Logically equivalent incoming and existing evidence have different evidence patterns

- **About this task**
  When logically equivalent evidence is shared, the evidence pattern of the incoming evidence might be single over time and the evidence pattern of the existing evidence might be multiple over time.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, person Identifications evidence is shared to integrated case SSN Details evidence by using a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration. The start date of the person Identifications evidence is different from the start date of the integrated case SSN Details evidence and a correction is made to the person Identifications evidence.

Scenario

1. A client is registered as a person.
2. Identifications evidence of type Social Security Number (SSN) is created for the client with a start date that is the same as the date of person registration.
3. An application for benefits is created and submitted for the person later. During the creation of the application, the client's SSN is used for the application.
4. The application is authorized and an integrated case is created.
5. The caseworker is notified that the SSN entered on the client's person Identifications evidence is incorrect and the caseworker corrects the value, leaving the start date unchanged.
6. The evidence broker shares the corrected person Identifications evidence to the integrated case.

Procedure

1. On the existing integrated case, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the SSN Details evidence.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the Identifications evidence that was shared from the Person record is converted into SSN Details evidence due to the logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration. The Identifications evidence is displayed for the date on which the original Identifications evidence started.
4. No evidence is displayed on the existing evidence timeline of changes because the SSN Details on the existing evidence have a different start date.

5. As both the incoming and existing evidence support changes over time, the **Update Existing Evidence** card that is displayed does not allow the user to indicate whether the incoming evidence or the existing evidence is correct. The **Update Existing Evidence** card allows the incoming and existing evidence to be combined to form an updated timeline on the existing case only.

6. Option 1: If the change to the client's SSN was a correction that is intended to be shared as a correction to the SSN Details on the integrated case, you can correct the SSN on the existing case with the incoming value and retain the start date of the evidence in the existing case.

   1. On the Incoming Evidence side, click **Edit** and then click **OK**. Now you can change the start date on the Incoming Evidence side to match the start date on the existing case side so the SSN does not change over time on the existing case. Click **Save**.

   2. On the **Incoming Evidence** page, the **Update Existing Evidence** card is updated to display radio buttons to allow the user to specify whether the incoming information is correct or the existing information is correct. The timeline of changes displays evidence on both sides and a (Conflict) label because the dates are now the same.

   3. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming information is correct**, then click **Update** and then click **Update**. The existing integrated case is updated with the corrected SSN from the Person record.

      > **Note:** Changing the start date on the Incoming Evidence side does not directly change the SSN start date on the Person Identifications record. However, if you have evidence sharing that is configured from the SSN Details evidence to the Person Identifications evidence, then the SSN Details evidence might be shared back to the Person Identifications evidence.

7. Option 2: If the change to the person's SSN was a correction that is intended to be shared as a correction to the SSN Details on the integrated case, you can correct the SSN on the existing case with the incoming value and update the start date of the evidence in the existing case.

   1. Complete the steps from Option 1.

   2. On the integrated case, navigate to the in-edit SSN Details evidence and change the start date.

8. Option 3: If the client's SSN changed over time, you can update the timeline of changes on the existing case.

   1. Click **Update** and then click **Update**.

   2. On the Existing Evidence timeline of changes, you now see an updated timeline that represents a change over time for the SSN.

Incoming and existing evidence both include parent evidence and only incoming evidence includes child evidence

- **About this task**
  When parent-child evidence is shared, the same type of parent evidence might already exist on the existing case but not include the child evidence.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, the parent Income evidence and the child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence is shared from one integrated case to another.

Scenario 1

1. A client has two integrated cases, where both cases include the same Income evidence and the evidence is the same.
2. A caseworker adds child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence to the Income evidence on one of the cases.
3. The evidence broker shares the new child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence to the other integrated case.

Procedure

1. On the Integrated Case record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the **Income** > **Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence**.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the parent Income evidence and the child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence from the integrated case are displayed.
4. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the parent Income evidence from the existing integrated case is displayed.
5. The **Update Existing Evidence** card is displayed to the user with the version of the **Update** action that combines the incoming and existing evidence to form an updated timeline on the existing case because the existing case does not yet include the child evidence.
6. The **Add as New** action is also displayed because this option is always available unless the incoming evidence represents a deletion.
7. Either the **Update** action or the **Add as New** action can be used.
8. Option 1: Use the **Update** action.

   1. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Update** and then click **Update**. The child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence is added to the parent evidence in the existing case.

9. Option 2: Use the **Add as New** action.

   1. Click **Add as New**. The child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence is added to the parent evidence in the existing case.

   > **Note:** While the **Add as New** action normally creates new evidence on the existing case, in this scenario, because the parent evidence is the same on both cases, the **Add as New** action adds the child evidence to the existing parent evidence.

Scenario 2

1. A client has two integrated cases, where both cases include the same Income evidence and the evidence is the same.
2. A caseworker updates the amount of the parent Income evidence on one of the cases and adds the child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence.
3. The evidence broker shares the corrected parent Income evidence and the new child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence to the other integrated case.

Procedure

1. On the Integrated Case record, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the **Income** > **Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence**.
3. On the incoming evidence timeline of changes, the parent Income evidence and child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence from the integrated case are displayed.
4. On the existing evidence timeline of changes, the parent Income evidence from the existing integrated case is displayed.

5. A (Conflict) label is displayed over the date for the incoming and the existing parent evidence. The **Update Existing Evidence** card that is displayed presents the user with the option to click whether **Incoming information is correct** or **Existing evidence is correct**.

6. Option 1: If the parent evidence from the integrated case is the same evidence as the existing parent evidence and is the correct information and the child evidence is to be added to the existing parent evidence.

   1. In the **Update Existing Evidence** card, click **Incoming information is correct**. Then, click **Update** and **Update**. The existing integrated case record is updated with the corrected parent Income evidence from the integrated case and the child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence is added to the existing parent evidence.

7. Option 2: If the parent evidence from the integrated case is not the same evidence as the existing parent evidence and new parent evidence is to be created and the child evidence added to the new parent evidence.

   1. Click **Add as New**. The new parent Income evidence is added to the existing integrated case and the child Employer Sponsored Coverage evidence is added to the new parent evidence.

      > **Note:** A (Conflict) label continues to be displayed over the dates for the incoming and the existing parent evidence because the existing evidence timeline of changes still displays the original parent evidence.

Incoming and existing evidence are identical and were not previously linked

- **About this task**
  If the incoming and existing evidence are identical and were not previously linked, for example by creating the evidence on one case and then by using the **Add as New** action to accept it onto another case through evidence sharing, the incoming evidence appears in the Incoming Evidence list but does not need to be processed.
  To illustrate the procedure that can be used to process this type of evidence sharing pattern, Benefit evidence is shared from one integrated case to another integrated case. The Benefit evidence is identical on both cases.

Scenario

1. A client has an integrated case that includes Benefit evidence.
2. Another integrated case is created for the client and Benefit evidence that is identical to the Benefit evidence in the other integrated case is created.
3. The evidence broker shares the Benefit evidence from one integrated case to the other.

Procedure

1. On the existing integrated case, click **Evidence** > **Incoming Evidence**.
2. Expand the Benefit evidence.
3. The Benefit evidence is displayed on both the incoming and the existing evidence timeline of changes.
4. The **Update Existing Evidence** card is not displayed and the **Add as New** action is disabled because the incoming evidence already exists in an identical state on the existing case.
5. Navigate from the Incoming Evidence list and back.
6. The incoming evidence is no longer displayed.

Related concepts

The **Update** action automatically determines how to update the existing evidence with the incoming evidence based on the incoming and existing evidence that is being compared, along with user input where required to resolve conflicts in evidence information.

Planning evidence sharing configurations

When you plan what evidence to share between different case types in your organization, review the guidelines in this topic. Consider whether the same evidence type is used on more than one case type. If an evidence type is used in more than one place, consider whether changes to the data should be communicated to other cases. Also, consider whether a target case type should be configured to automatically accept any changes, or should caseworker be forced to decide whether to accept incoming shared evidence.

> **Note:** For system processing to work correctly, it is essential that person and prospect person evidence that is configured outside of the person tab is configured to share any changes back to the person tab.
>
> For example, an organization might have a child welfare case that maintains identification evidence for a person, and an income assistance case that also maintains identification evidence for the same person. If sharing is not configured between the two case types, it is important to share evidence back to the individual's person tab, because it ensures that all the person and prospect person evidence can be viewed centrally.

Recommended sharing configurations for organizations that are using Universal Access

The following sections outline recommended sharing configurations for organizations that are using Universal Access:

- **Sharing from a source person to a target application case**
  An existing registered person applies for a program online. The caseworker who is managing the application case might want to know what information exists for the person and have the opportunity to update the information that is received on the application case for the person.
- **Sharing from a source application case to a target person or prospect person**
  When the application is complete, programs are authorized. New information might have been received about the person on the application that should be shared to the person's record.
- **Sharing from a source application case to a target ongoing integrated case or product delivery case**
  When an application case is authorized, you can configure the evidence broker to share the evidence from the application case. However, it should not be necessary for a caseworker to review and apply changes to evidence again on the integrated case. Therefore, the trusted source setting in the sharing configuration should enable the shared evidence to be automatically accepted onto the target case.
- **Sharing from a source ongoing case to a target application case**
  A person has an existing ongoing case and makes a new application for benefits. The intake worker who is managing the application is interested in receiving the existing information on the system for the person because it might impact the person's new application.

- **Sharing from a source ongoing case to a target person or prospect person**
  It is important that the person record contains all the person evidence changes, and that it is up to date. Therefore, sharing should be enabled from an ongoing case, to ensure that any updates to evidence are shared to the person record where system processing relies on the data.
- **Sharing from a source person to a target ongoing case**
  Any evidence that is captured about a person should be shared to an ongoing case to ensure that the information that might affect eligibility and entitlement is up to date. Therefore, the caseworker who owns the ongoing case is provided with information about a case member that was updated elsewhere. The trusted source setting in the sharing configuration can be configured to force caseworkers to review the evidence, and to then decide whether to accept or ignore the evidence for the target case.

End-to-end evidence scenarios

The scenarios in this section describe the full end-to-end flow of evidence through the system from application to ongoing case.

Citizen applies for benefits

A citizen, Mary, applies for a benefit online. Mary has never received benefits in the past and she is not recorded on the system. The scenario outlines the steps for applying for a benefit, and shows how the evidence broker shares Mary's data between cases.

1. Mary completes an online application for benefits and enters the following information:

   - Name
   - Date of birth
   - Gender
   - Phone number
   - Email address
   - Address
   - Income
   - Expenses
   - Employment

2. Mary submits the application to the agency where the search and match process determines that Mary is not registered on the system.

3. Mary is automatically registered as a person. The registration process captures the mandatory registration information, which is Mary's name, date of birth, and gender. The system creates the following person evidence records: name, birth and death, and gender.

4. An application case is created automatically when the application is submitted. All the evidence that is captured is mapped to the new application case and is automatically activated.

5. Later that day, Mary arrives for an interview with Paul, the intake worker, and realizes that the date of birth that she supplied on her application was typed incorrectly. Paul selects the birth and death evidence on the application case, edits the date of birth to the correct date, and saves the details.

6. Paul reviews the rest of the application case evidence. Because everything is complete and in order, Paul authorizes the program that Mary applied for in the application. The application authorization triggers the evidence broker to share the application evidence based on sharing configurations. The broker shares only the evidence that is required for the ongoing cases, for the programs that are being authorized.

7. When the application is authorized, an integrated case is created automatically for Mary, and a product delivery case is also automatically created for the program for which Mary has been approved. The evidence broker processing is triggered by the authorization of the application case. The brokering configuration determines what evidence needs to be shared and where it needs to be shared. In this case, the configuration is such that the sharing must occur between the integrated case and Mary's person record. All evidence types that are captured for Mary will be shared to the integrated case. However, only the following evidence types are configured for sharing to Mary's person record, because the details are more generic and typically apply to any case that Mary is a member of. The additional evidence types such as income, expenses, and employment might be appropriate only for certain types of cases.

   - Name
   - Birth and death
   - Gender
   - Phone number
   - Email address
   - Address

8. The evidence broker shares the following evidence from the application case to the integrated case:

   - Name
   - Birth and death
   - Gender
   - Phone number
   - Email address
   - Address
   - Income
   - Expenses
   - Employment

9. The evidence broker then shares the following evidence from the application case to Mary's person record:

   - Name
   - Birth and Death
   - Gender
   - Phone Number
   - Email Address
   - Address

10. All the evidence that is shared from the application case to the integrated case is configured to be trusted, in which case it is automatically activated when the broker adds it to the integrated case.

11. The evidence that is brokered to Mary's person record is automatically managed as follows:

   - The broker adds the phone number, email address, and address evidence to Mary's person tab.
   - Because name, gender, and birth and death evidence exist on Mary's person tab, the system processes the evidence as shown in the following steps:

     - For each evidence record, the system performs a check to determine whether the incoming evidence matches with any evidence that is already held.

- Because the gender and name evidence that is already held on Mary's person record contains the same data as the incoming records, the system treats the evidence as identical and does not update the existing records.
- The birth and death information record that is shared from the application case does not match the birth and death record that is on Mary's person record. The caseworker corrected Mary's person record on the application case when Mary came in for her application interview. To determine whether the existing record should be updated, the system compares the date that both evidence records were received. In this case, as the application case update to the birth and death evidence is more recent, the system updates the birth and death evidence record on Mary's person record. Any user who views the evidence record can see the update history.

Registered person applies for benefits

John applies for a benefit online. John has received benefits in the past and is recorded on the system. The scenario outlines the steps when a registered person applies for a benefit, and shows how the evidence broker shares John's data between cases.

1. John completes an online application for benefits and enters the following information: name, date of birth, gender, phone number, email address, address, income, expenses, and employment.
2. John submits the application to the agency, where the search and match process determines that he is already registered on the system. John is matched to a registered person on the system through name, date of birth, and gender records.
3. An application case for the benefit is then created for John. All of the information that John supplied in his online application is added to the application case as evidence. An application case is created automatically when the application is submitted. All the evidence that is captured on John's application is mapped to the new application case, as configured by using the Data Mapping Engine.
4. The evidence broker then shares John's evidence from the person tab to the application case, where it is displayed as incoming evidence. All the evidence that is on the person tab is the same as the evidence that is on the application case, except for the phone number evidence.
5. Paul, the caseworker, reviews and compares the incoming evidence and the existing evidence in his incoming list for the application case. The broker helps Paul to determine the appropriate action by highlighting the differences between the incoming evidence and the existing evidence. A new mobile phone number has been recorded on the application case. Paul chooses not to take the phone number onto the application case because he knows that the number that he has already on the application case is correct. Therefore, Paul selects **Ignore** for the incoming phone number.
6. Paul finishes his review of the application case evidence and authorizes the application case. The application authorization triggers the evidence broker to share the application evidence based on its sharing configurations.
7. An integrated case is created automatically for John, and also the system creates a product delivery case for the benefit.
8. The evidence broker shares the evidence from the application case to the integrated case.
9. The evidence broker then shares John's application evidence to the person tab. Because the evidence had already been shared from the person to the application case, the evidence is not shared again. Only the new phone number record is shared to the person tab.

Adding a relationship and related person to an integrated case

Mary is a registered person with an integrated case. Mary contacts the agency to inform them that her son John is back in her care. The scenario outlines the steps when a relationship and a related person are added to an integrated case.

1. Mary contacts the caseworker Paul who manages her ongoing case. She advises Paul that her son John, who previously lived with her estranged husband, has come back into her care.
2. Paul accesses Mary's case evidence and sees that no relationship information is recorded between Mary and any other person. Paul creates a new relationship evidence record that relates Mary to her child, John. Paul searches for John and discovers that he is already registered as a person in the system.
3. Paul decides to apply the new relationship record to Mary's case. A reciprocal relationship between John and Mary does not yet exist on the integrated case because John is not a member of the case. After the evidence is applied, the evidence broker is triggered to share the relationship evidence.
4. The evidence broker shares the new relationship evidence to any related case, person, or prospect person record that is included in a sharing configuration for sharing relationship evidence. Therefore, the new relationship record is shared to Mary's person evidence.
5. When the relationship between Mary and John is received in the person tab, the system first determines if a relationship record already exists. Because a relationship is not yet recorded between Mary and John, the new relationship evidence is recorded.
6. When the relationship is added, the system then creates a reciprocal relationship evidence record for John which is displayed on his person tab.
7. After Paul has applied the relationship evidence on the integrated case, he decides to include John as a case member on Mary's case. He selects to add the child John as a member of Mary's integrated case.
8. When Paul adds John to the integrated case, the evidence broker is triggered to retrieve John's evidence from his person record. The broker shares John's evidence from his person record to the integrated case.
9. The caseworker, Paul, sees several incoming evidence records for John, including his name, birth and death, gender, and relationship to Mary.
10. Paul accepts all of the evidence onto the integrated case, where it can be maintained as part of managing the ongoing integrated case.

Sharing logically equivalent SSN evidence to identifications evidence

The scenario describes the processing of an application for a citizen, Fred, who applies for a benefit online. Fred has never received benefits in the past and he is not recorded in the system. An administrator has created a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration between the identifications evidence that is configured against the person or prospect person, and SSN details evidence that is configured against an integrated case.

The administrator has uploaded an XML rules file to the logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration that shares social security number evidence to identifications evidence. The following table shows the mapped evidence attributes:

Table 3: Logically equivalent mapping of identifications evidence to SSN details evidence

Identifications evidence	SSN details evidence
participant	participant
alternateID	alternateID

Identifications evidence	SSN details evidence
altIDType	altIDType
fromDate	fromDate
toDate	toDate
comments	comments

The following attributes on the SSN details evidence are unmapped:

- ssnStatus
- noSSNReasonCode
- noSSNReasonOtherDetails

The following attribute on the identifications evidence is unmapped:

- preferredInd

With the mapping of the SSN details and identifications evidence attributes in the logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration, the broker can share evidence between the two evidence types as if they are identical evidence.

The following steps illustrate how the logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration applies to Fred's application:

1. Fred completes an online application for benefits and enters the required information along with the following SSN identification details:

   Table 4: Fred's SSN identification details

SSN identification details attribute	Value
SSN Identification Reference	123-45-6789
Type	SSN
Comments	A brief note

   Fred does not record any details for the attributes SSN status, No SSN reason, or No SSN other details.

2. Fred submits the application to the agency where it is determined, by using the search and match process, that he is not registered on the system.

3. Fred is registered as a person. The registration process inserts Fred's name, date of birth, and gender, which are mandatory registration information. The system creates the person evidence records, including name, birth and death, and gender.

4. An application case for benefits is then created for Fred and all of the evidence that he supplied in his online application form is added to the application case. An application case is created automatically when the application is submitted, and all the evidence that is captured on the application is mapped to the new application case, by using the Cúram Data Mapping Engine.

5. Paul, the intake worker, reviews the application case evidence and authorizes the application case. When the application is authorized, the evidence broker is triggered to share the application evidence based on evidence sharing configurations.

6. After the application is authorized, an integrated case is automatically created for Fred and the program for which Fred has been approved is added to the integrated case.

7. The evidence broker shares the evidence from the application case to the integrated case. The broker shares the SSN details evidence on the application case directly to the SSN details evidence on the integrated case.

8. The evidence broker then shares Fred's application evidence to his person evidence. The broker maps the SSN details evidence to the logically equivalent identifications evidence in Fred's person evidence. The broker adds the SSN details evidence to Fred's person evidence list as identifications evidence. The broker shares the SSN details evidence as if it is identical evidence in accordance with the sharing configuration's XML rules file.

9. Later the same day, Fred provides details of his passport that was required to verify his date of birth on the integrated case. The receptionist Jan also decides to capture this information in Fred's identifications evidence. Therefore, she does a person search and finds Fred's person record. She opens the person record and then proceeds to create new identifications evidence. Jan selects **Passport** for the type and enters PO111111 for the identification reference.

10. Jan saves the identification record. The evidence broker is triggered to share the identifications evidence to the integrated case.

11. Sam, the caseworker for the integrated case, notices that new incoming evidence has been received. He views the incoming evidence and notices that a passport and ID have been captured for Fred. The record is displayed in Sam's incoming evidence list because the passport identification type has not been mapped in a sharing configuration. Sam decides to ignore the evidence because he does not require it for the case. However, if Sam had accepted the evidence, a new SSN identification evidence record would be displayed in in-edit status. However, when the evidence is activated, the system might have invoked a validation to say that the type must only be SSN. If no validation is applied to the evidence type, the evidence would have been applied to the case.

Mandatory verifications on an integrated case

Lisa is a registered person who has two integrated cases. Both integrated cases have a mandatory income verification requirement. Case A requires verification through a pay slip, and Case B requires verification through both an employer letter and a pay slip. The scenario outlines how the verification is applied and shared.

The following steps assume that a sharing configuration exists to share income evidence between the integrated case types, and that the sharing configuration enables the sharing of verifications with income evidence.

1. Lisa has a meeting with Paul and gives him information about new income.
2. Paul adds the income evidence to Case A, and a mandatory outstanding verification is created on Case A that states that verification by pay slip is required. Lisa gives her pay slip to Paul.
3. Paul adds the pay slip verification document to Case A, which satisfies the verification requirement. Paul activates the income evidence.
4. The evidence broker shares the new income evidence and its associated verification document to Case B.
5. Because the source case is not configured as a trusted source, the income evidence is displayed as incoming evidence on Case B. Paul accepts the incoming evidence, which includes the pay slip document. The verification processing has the following result:

   • The pay slip verification item is a requirement to satisfy income evidence on case B. Because the broker has shared the pay slip verification item from Case A and the verification has been accepted on Case B, the income evidence verification requirement on Case B has been satisfied.

- The employer letter verification item is also a requirement to satisfy income evidence on Case B. Because the employer letter verification item was not required on Case A, it was not captured on Case A. Therefore, Case B has an outstanding verification requirement to satisfy full verification of the income evidence. Before the evidence can be activated, Lisa must provide a letter from her employer.

6. Lisa returns to the agency the next day with a letter from her employer. Paul adds the verification document to the income evidence on Case B. Both verification requirements are now satisfied and the evidence can be activated.

Applying end dating in the creation of evidence records

When caseworkers create evidence records, they can end date previous evidence records of the same type during the creation process, if an administrator has enabled the end dating feature for the evidence type. Caseworkers create an evidence record by recording the evidence in the first page of the evidence wizard. Then, if the end dating feature is enabled, a second page is displayed in the wizard where caseworkers can end date previous evidence records.

About this task

For information about enabling the end dating of previous evidence when creating evidence, see the related link.

For the evidence end dating option to be displayed to caseworkers in the second page of the evidence wizard, certain criteria must be met. For more information, see the related link to the *New Evidence* topic.

When an evidence record uses a **Preferred Indicator** and if the preferred indicator is set, the evidence record becomes the preferred evidence record even when other evidence records of the same type exist on the case. Only one preferred evidence record of the same type is allowed. Therefore, when a new evidence record is created with the preferred indicator set, and a preferred record exists, the following action occurs. The **Preferred Indicator** on the existing preferred evidence record is automatically cleared, whether it is set to `active` or `in-edit`. Then, the auto-unchecking of the preferred indicator on the evidence creates an `in-edit` record of the evidence. The caseworker must then apply the changes.

Use the following procedure to create an evidence record, and to end date previous evidence records.

Procedure

1. Log on to Cúram as a caseworker user.
2. Open a person or an integrated case.
3. Click the **Evidence** tab.
4. To add an evidence record to the case, in the first page of the wizard, enter a new evidence record.
5. If the required value for the received date is different from the default value, enter a value for **Received Date**.
6. From the **Participant** list, select one or more participants that the data applies to.
7. Enter the new evidence record details.
8. Click one of the wizard's exit options, as outlined in the following table:

Option	Description
Save and Next	Saves the data and proceeds to the second page of the wizard.
Save and New	Saves the data and presents a new blank form to create multiple evidence records. **Note:** If **Save and New** is configured on the evidence type, the **Save and New** option is displayed on page one of the wizard only.
Save and Exit	Closes the wizard and saves the data on the page.
Cancel	Closes the wizard without saving the data.

9. In the second page of the wizard, choose one of the following options:

   - To continue without end dating any previous evidence records, do not select any evidence records and click **Finish**. No evidence records are end dated and the wizard closes.
   - To select previous evidence records for end dating, do the following substeps:

     1. Select the appropriate value for **Change Reason**.
     2. If the required value for the evidence end date is different from the default value, enter a value for **Evidence End Date**.
     3. Select one or more evidence records to apply the end date to. The evidence records that are displayed for selection for end dating are the most recent `active` or `in-edit` evidence records of that type, except for the evidence records that you created on the first page of the wizard. If an `active` evidence has an `in-edit` version, only the `in-edit` version is displayed.
     4. Click **Finish** to close the wizard and to save any data that has been entered into the page, or click **Cancel** to close the wizard without saving any data on the page. If you selected an evidence record but you didn't enter a value for **Change Reason**, **End Date**, or both values, when you click **Finish** a validation message is displayed.

Related concepts

Related tasks

Frequently asked questions (FAQs) about evidence

Read Frequently asked questions (FAQs) focused on specific aspects of working with evidence.

In social programs, evidence is information supplied by clients that an organization can use to make an assessment or a determination. Evidence is complex. In the course of their work, caseworkers must navigate the nuances and subtleties of working with evidence. The following five FAQs explain typical scenarios that caseworkers face when working with evidence:

- Using the Incoming Evidence timeline
- Evidence corrections and changes over time
- Modifying evidence

1.3 Configuring evidence sharing

Create evidence sharing configurations where you specify exactly what evidence is shared between case types. Learn how to configure the XML sharing rules files for mapping evidence attributes in logically equivalent evidence sharing configurations. Configure the evidence maintenance patterns that are applied to evidence types.

Creating sharing configurations

Use the sharing configuration wizard to configure the sharing of evidence from a source case type to a target case type. You can specify the types of identical evidence to be shared. You can also specify the sharing of logically equivalent evidence, by mapping evidence types on the source case to logically equivalent evidence types on the target case.

Before you begin

Ensure that the evidence types that you want to share between cases of a specific type are configured on those case types. For example, if you want to share addresses evidence from a person to an integrated case, ensure that the addresses evidence is administratively configured on the integrated case. Also, you must enable the relevant evidence types for sharing.

To configure the sharing of logically equivalent evidence, you must define the sharing rules for the logically equivalent evidence in an XML file. The sharing configuration wizard prompts you to upload an XML file for each set of logically equivalent evidence that you configure. For more information about the XML sharing rules file, see the related link.

Log on to the Cúram application as an administrator, and click **Administration Workspace**.

About this task

Configure the sharing of only identical evidence, only logically equivalent evidence, or a combination of both identical and logically equivalent evidence.

To configure bidirectional evidence sharing between two case types, you must create a separate sharing configuration for each direction. For example, to share from integrated cases to application cases, and to also share from application cases to integrated cases, you must create the following configurations:

- A sharing configuration where integrated cases are the source case type and application cases are the target case type.
- A sharing configuration where application cases are the source case type and integrated cases are the target case type.

You must specify the following settings for each type of shared evidence:

- **Share Verifications**
  You can configure the broker to always share associated verification items, or only if they are used or required by the target case, as defined in any verification rules configurations. If the broker shares verification items to a target case and the verification requirements are the same

between the source case and the target case, it is not necessary for the caseworker to reverify evidence that is already verified for the client.

- **Trusted Source**

  If you select **Yes** to indicate that the source is trusted, evidence from the specified source is shared to the target case and activated without the need for a caseworker to intervene. However, in some exceptional circumstances, caseworkers must review shared evidence, such as when a genuine conflict occurs between the information that is on the source case and on the target case. Trusted source is typically set to yes when an organization manages different case types but within the same line of business. For example, an organization has different teams who manage different integrated cases for income support programs. Any change that is made to any case is considered to be trusted as the customers who provide the information liaise with the same business unit.

  If you select **No** to indicate that the source is not trusted, the caseworker must always review and resolve the evidence that is shared from the specified source to the incoming evidence list. Organizations might decide to set trusted source to no when different types of business units exist who manage different circumstances for clients. For example, an organization has a team of caseworkers who manage all financial assistance programs, and a team of social workers who manage child welfare investigations. When an evidence change occurs on a financial assistance case and the evidence is shared to a child welfare case, social workers might be required to review the evidence before adding it to the case to assess how the evidence impacts their investigation.

Procedure

1. In the Shortcuts panel, click **Rules and Evidence** > **Evidence Sharing**.
2. Click the **Configurations** tab.
3. Click the ellipsis icon **...** in the upper right, and then click **New Sharing Configurations**.
4. Use the **New Sharing Configurations** wizard to create the sharing configuration:
   a) Select the source case type and the target case type.
   b) Add the identical evidence to be shared between the source and the target, if any.
   c) Add the logically equivalent evidence to be shared between the source and the target, if any.

Results

Sharing configurations are displayed on the **Configurations** tab, including details of the source, the target, and the types of evidence shared.

What to do next

On the **Configurations** tab, you can review and edit the sharing configurations. You can add and delete evidence, or delete an entire sharing configuration.

If you edit one or more sharing configurations, the changes become effective when the next evidence sharing trigger occurs. Therefore, if evidence sharing is triggered as a result of the activation of evidence, the evidence is shared in accordance with the updated sharing configurations. However, if evidence had already been triggered for sharing before updates to one or more sharing configurations were saved, the evidence is shared according to the sharing configurations that were in place at the time that the evidence sharing was triggered.

Related concepts

Defining logically equivalent evidence on page 26
The topics describe how you can analyze logically equivalent evidence and structure the flow of evidence if appropriate.

Related reference

XML sharing rules schema on page 71
The XML sharing rules schema provides the elements and attributes that you can use to define an XML sharing rules file for mapping logically equivalent evidence types.

Configuring evidence patterns

An evidence maintenance pattern is a set of rules and characteristics that you can apply to an evidence type. You can designate how to instantiate, correct, and succeed that evidence type. You can apply one evidence maintenance pattern to each evidence type.

Before you begin

Log on to the Cúram application as an administrator, and click **Administration Workspace**.

About this task

The following procedure describes how to configure evidence maintenance patterns for both non-dynamic evidence and dynamic evidence. Non-dynamic evidence is also known as static evidence.

The default evidence maintenance pattern is multiple over time. It is applied to each evidence type unless you configure an alternative evidence maintenance pattern, where you configure the evidence maintenance pattern for each evidence type individually. For more information about the types of evidence patterns, see the related link.

Procedure

1. In the Shortcuts panel, click **Rules and Evidence**.
2. Click either **Non-Dynamic Evidence**, or **Dynamic Evidence**.
3. In the list of evidence types, locate the evidence type that you want to configure and in the row menu, click **Edit**.
4. In the evidence modal, select the appropriate evidence sharing maintenance pattern.

Related concepts

Evidence maintenance patterns on page 20
An evidence maintenance pattern enforces a set of evidence maintenance restrictions and behavior on evidence sharing that determines how an evidence type is instantiated, corrected, and succeeded. If a caseworker maintains evidence manually in the application, the same evidence maintenance restrictions and behavior are enforced through evidence validations. By applying an evidence pattern to each evidence type, an agency can ensure that evidence of a particular type is shared across cases according to a consistent set of rules.

Configuring logically equivalent evidence

To share data where the representation of the data's structure and format differs between source and target case types, you must configure a logically equivalent evidence sharing configuration.

Map the evidence attributes to be shared between two case types through an XML rules file that also specifies other sharing actions. The XML rules file must adhere to an XML rules schema that is included in the evidence broker installation.

About this task

The following procedure outlines at a high level the process for creating the XML rules file. For more information about the associated XML schema and how to format the XML rules file, see the subsequent topics in this section.

When you upload an XML rules file through the sharing configuration wizard, the XML file is validated. If the validation fails, an error message is displayed that prompts you to correct the validation errors.

Procedure

- In the `EvidenceMapping` element, specify the source case evidence type and the target case evidence type.

Child elements of the `EvidenceMapping` element:

- In the `Mapping` element, map the source case evidence type attributes to the target case evidence type attributes.
- Optional: In the `Action` element, insert one or more of the following child elements to specify actions that the broker can apply to the shared logically equivalent evidence:

  - **`Set`**
    Specify a `Set` action, for example, to populate default information on the target evidence record.
  - **`Display`**
    Specify a `Display` action to place a shared logically equivalent evidence record in the caseworker's incoming list when the attributes on the target evidence record contain additional or changed information.
  - **`Create`**
    Specify a `Create` action to create one or more child evidence instances on the target evidence record.
- Optional: In the `ShareWhen` element, specify rules that restrict when the logically equivalent evidence is shared.
- Optional: In the `Filter` element, specify one or more target evidence subtypes to restrict the sharing of the logically equivalent evidence to only those subtypes.
- Optional: In the `MaintenanceStyle` element, specify whether end dating as a succession style is in use for the target evidence in the sharing configuration.

Related concepts

[Defining logically equivalent evidence on page 26](#)
The topics describe how you can analyze logically equivalent evidence and structure the flow of evidence if appropriate.

XML sharing rules schema

The XML sharing rules schema provides the elements and attributes that you can use to define an XML sharing rules file for mapping logically equivalent evidence types.

XML schema structure

The XML schema for mapping logically equivalent evidence types contains the following elements:

```
EvidenceMapping
    Mapping
          CodeTableValue
    Filter
    Action
        Set
            Parameter
                ParamMapping
        Display
        Create
            Parameter
    MaintenanceStyle
    ShareWhen
        <<expression>>
```

Element attributes and code values

The element attribute values can contain a code table name or a code value that is included in a code table. The element attribute values can also contain evidence type attributes.

Selected element attributes are derived through a count method or a generate method. See the descriptions and examples in the tables for more information about the attribute values and how they are derived.

If you need to look up code table values, complete the following steps:

1. Log on to the Cúram application as a system administrator, and click the **System Configurations** tab.
2. In the Shortcuts panel, click **Application Data** > **Code Tables**.
3. In the search criteria section, for **Name**, enter the name of a code table. For evidence type codes, use the EvidenceType code table name.

   From the code tables that are displayed, you can expand the twistie and then display the name and technical ID of the evidence types. You can also refer to any other code tables, for example, DisabilityType and IncomeType and their code values. A range of code tables can also be displayed that matches the type of code table that you look up.

The EvidenceMapping parent element

The `EvidenceMapping` parent element maps two logically equivalent evidence types through source and target attributes.

Table 5: EvidenceMapping element attributes

Element	Description	Example
source	A required value that defines the source evidence type code.	*ET10097*, the evidence type code for paid employment.
target	A required value that defines the target evidence type code.	*DET0026030*, the evidence type code for income.

The Mapping child element

The `Mapping` child element maps one source case evidence type attribute to a target case evidence type attribute. You add one `Mapping` element for each source and target attribute mapping. You can complete as many source and target attribute mappings as you want to share.

For any source and target attribute mapping, optionally you can include a source code table name and a target code table name. The code table and its code values map the specified attribute. See the `CodeTableValue` child element for mapping individual code table values that belong to the specified code tables.

Table 6: Mapping child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
source	A required value that defines the source evidence type attribute.	*participantID*, *disabilityType* are evidence attributes.
sourceLookUp	This supports two distinct pieces of functionality: • A value that is required when you map a case participant source attribute that is of data type to a target attribute that is of string type. The value contains a participant property, such as a name or a description. The value of the target attribute is populated from this attribute. • Looking up employment details when mapping income from an insurance affordability case to an income support case.	• *name*, an attribute from the paid employment evidence type, for mapping an income support case to an insurance affordability case. • *employment*, for each paid employment target attribute that this is specified on, the value should be looked up on the employment associated with the client. This is achieved through the Paid Employment interface of which there is a default implementation out-of-the-box, but customers can provide their own.
target	A required value that defines the target evidence type attribute.	*caseParticipantRoleID*, *disabilityType* are evidence attributes.
sourceCodeTable	An optional value that defines a source code table name if you want to map a code table and some or all of its values for the source attribute. If you define a source code table, you must define a target code table to complete the mapping.	*DisabilityType*, a code table for disability types.

Attribute	Description	Example
targetCodeTable	An optional value that defines a target code table name if you want to map a code table and some or all of its values for the target attribute. If you define a target code table, a source code table is required.	*DisabilityType*, a code table for disability types.

- **The `CodeTableValue` child element**

  If the source and target attributes that are specified in the `Mapping` element are code tables, the attribute mapping is completed by entering the code values for the code table specified. You can map the codes in the `CodeTableValue` child element by adding source and target code table values. If you are sharing all the code table values between the source and target, you map all the values. If only a subset of the code table values is mapped, then you specify only these values.

Table 7: CodeTableValue attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
source	A required value that specifies the source code value from the code table that maps the source and target evidence attribute.	*SAS26302*, an attribute value for the code table *HCSSNApplicationStatus*.
target	A required value that specifies the target code value from the code table that maps the source and target evidence attribute.	*SAS2*, an attribute value for the code table *SSNApplicationStatus*.

The Filter child element

The optional `Filter` child element specifies one target evidence subtype to restrict the sharing of the logically equivalent evidence to only those subtypes. You can specify only one filter in each XML configuration file.

Table 8: Filter child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
evidence	A required value that specifies the evidence type code where evidence subtypes are in use.	*PDC0000259*, the evidence type code for identifications.
attribute	A required value that specifies the evidence subtype from the evidence type.	*altIDType*, an attribute on the evidence type that can filter the identifications evidence type.
codeTableName	A required value that specifies the name of the code table in use for referencing the evidence subtype.	*ConcernRoleAlternateID*, a code table.
codeTableValue	A required value that specifies the value on the code table in use for referencing the evidence subtype.	*CA1*, the social security number on the *ConcernRoleAlternateID* code table.

For example, a person identification evidence type has a type attribute that specifies one of many different subtypes, such as social security number, passport number, driving license and

other identifications. If you share an integrated case social security number evidence type to a person identification evidence type, it does not make sense to share a social security number to an identification evidence record that has a subtype of passport number. In such scenarios, you can use the `Filter` element to match only against the evidence subtype that is specified in the filter. Therefore, in the previous example, you want to filter only against social security numbers.

The Action child element

The optional `Action` child element adds one or more child elements to specify actions that the broker applies to the shared logically equivalent evidence:

- **The `Set` child element**
  The optional `Set` child element specifies a set action on the target evidence, for example, to populate default information. Specify an evidence attribute on the target evidence by using the `Set` child element. You can configure only one `Set` action in each configuration file.

  Table 9: Set child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
type	The target evidence type code where the `Set` action takes place.	*DET0026030*, the evidence type code for income.

- **The `Parameter` child element**
  You must define at least one `Parameter` child element for each `Set` element. Each `Parameter` child element defines the attribute to be set on the target evidence. You can enter more than one `Parameter` child element.

  Table 10: Parameter child element attributes for the Set element

Attribute	Description	Example
name	A required value that specifies the name of the attribute to be set on the target evidence.	*seasonalIncomeInd*, an evidence attribute, taken from the Income evidence type.
tableName	An optional value if the *type* entry is `CODETABLE` or `SOURCECASELOOKUP`. The complete code table name is entered for the type. A code value is then set for the code table. See *value*.	*HCIncomeSource*, a code table.

Attribute	Description	Example
type	A required value that specifies the type of attribute for which an action is being set on the target evidence, where valid values are: `STRING`, for a string entry, `CODETABLE`, for a code table, see *tableName*, `COUNT`, see *countInstance*, `SOURCECASELOOKUP`, used to look up an attribute *srcAttr* on the entity represented by *value* to populate the target attribute represented by *name*.	• *CODETABLE*, the type to indicate that you are setting a code table name and value. • *SOURCECASELOOKUP*, the type to indicate that you are setting the *name* attribute on the target evidence to the value of *srcAttr* on the most recent version of the evidence represented by *value* on the source case. The only exception to this rule is when the evidence type represented by *value* is the same as the evidence type represented by source in the `EvidenceMapping`. In this instance, the *srcAttr* is looked up on the evidence currently being shared.
value	When *type* is SOURCECASELOOKUP, this represents the source entity to be looked up, otherwise it is a required value that is given to the attribute and to be set on the target evidence.	• *DET0026068*, the evidence type code for Military Status when a *srcAttr* like *militaryStatusCode* is being looked up, when *type* is SOURCECASELOOKUP. • *HCIS01*, a code table value for the code table *HCIncomeSource*, when *type* is CODETABLE.
srcAttr	This is only used when *type* is set to SOURCECASELOOKUP. It signifies the attribute whose value needs to be looked up on the source entity, signified by *value*, and mapped to the attribute on the target signified by *name*.	*militaryStatusCode*, an attribute to be looked up on the entity type represented by *value*.
countInstance	An optional value if the *type* entry is `COUNT`. Specify the child evidence type that links to the source parent evidence instance. The instances of the specified child evidence type are counted. The result is placed on the target evidence type.	*ET10125*, the child evidence type code for unborn child. The child evidence is coupled to a parent pregnancy evidence type on an income support case.

- **The `ParamMapping` child element**
  The optional `ParamMapping` child element represents a filter mechanism when the srcAttr that is looked up using the SOURCECASELOOKUP type is a code table value.

Table 11: ParamMapping child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
source	A value that specifies the source code value from the specified code table in `Parameter`. This value can be left blank if there is an appropriate default code table value that can be set on the target.	*MS1*, represents Active Duty on Military Status evidence.
target	A required value that specifies the target code table value.	*VS1*, represents Active Duty on SSN Details evidence. *VS6*, represents No Service on SSN Details evidence. A blank source value can be mapped to this. This represents no Military Status evidence existing on the source case.

- **The `Display` child element**
  The optional `Display` child element specifies an action that places a shared logically equivalent evidence record in the caseworker's incoming list when the specified source attribute changes and the unmapped attributes on the target evidence record contain anything other than default values. Examples of default values are 0 for an integer, 0.00 for an amount, or the default code for a code table attribute. For example, if the value of an attribute that indicates a disability type is changing, the values of the other attributes on the target evidence record might not make sense in the context of the shared evidence record. In such a scenario, a caseworker must manually review and process the shared evidence record. You can configure only one `Display` action in each configuration file.

Table 12: Display child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
changedType	A required value that specifies an evidence type on the source case. A change in the value of a specified attribute on the evidence type initiates a manual caseworker review.	*DET0026010*, the evidence type code for disability.
changedAttr	A required value that specifies an evidence attribute on the source case. A change in the attribute value initiates a manual caseworker review.	*disabilityType*, the type of disability taken from a code table.

- **The `Create` child element action**
  The optional `Create` child element specifies an action that creates one or more child evidence instances on the target evidence record. You can configure only one `Create` action in each configuration file.

Table 13: Create child element attributes

Attribute	Description	Example
instancetype	A required value that specifies the target child evidence type that is created for the parent evidence type.	*ET10125*, the evidence type code for unborn child, on an income support case. The unborn child evidence type is coupled to a parent pregnancy evidence type on an income support case.
reftype	A required value that specifies an evidence type on the source case, where one of the evidence type's attributes contains the number of child evidence instances to be created.	*DET0026008*, the evidence type code for pregnancy, on an insurance affordability case. The pregnancy evidence type is stand-alone for an insurance affordability case.
refattr	A required value that specifies an attribute in the *reftype* evidence on the source case that contains the number of child evidence instances to be created.	*noOfUnborn*, the attribute on the pregnancy evidence type for an insurance affordability case that contains the number of child evidence types to be created.

- **The `Parameter` child element**

  Define one `Parameter` child element for each child evidence instance that is to be created on the target evidence record. Each `Parameter` element defines the attributes of the evidence instance.

Table 14: Parameter child element attributes for the Create element

Attribute	Description	Example
name	A required attribute that specifies the name of an attribute on the created child evidence instance.	*comments*, the name of the created child evidence instance attribute.

Attribute	Description	Example
type	A required attribute to specify the type of attribute that you are creating or how you set the attribute on the child evidence instance. Use the type STRING if you want to specify a value for the named attribute. See *value*. Use the type GENERATE if you want to generate a new value for the named attribute on the child evidence. The use of the GENERATE type creates a case participant role ID that allows a child evidence to be referenced by the parent evidence.	*STRING*, one of the available types to set the attribute.
value	An optional attribute that specifies the value of the attribute on the created child evidence instance. This attribute is used only with type STRING.	*BABY*, a STRING value for the created child evidence instance attribute.

The MaintenanceStyle child element

Use the optional MaintenanceStyle element to indicate that end dating is the style of evidence succession in use for the target evidence in the sharing configuration. For a sharing configuration that uses the MaintenanceStyle element, the existing target evidence record is given an end date and a new evidence record is created on the target with its start date determined by the effective date that is entered on the source. Make only one setting per XML configuration file.

The MaintenanceStyle element has one value of *ENDDATE* in the configuration file:

```
<MaintenanceStyle>ENDDATE</MaintenanceStyle>
```

The ShareWhen child element

Use the optional ShareWhen element to define extra conditions that restrict when logically equivalent evidence is shared. You can define one ShareWhen element per XML configuration file.

Define an expression within the ShareWhen element, where the evidence is shared if the expression evaluates to true. You can define multiple conditions within Rule elements, and then apply And and Or elements to combine the Rule elements into one expression.

The following example shows an expression that indicates a range of benefit types that can apply before sharing takes place. The dynamic evidence type is benefit DET0026014, and the benefit

type code options represent the selected benefit types Medicaid, Medicare Part A, Medicare Part B, and State Supplementary.

```
<OR>
  <Rule> "DET0026014.benefitType" == "HCBT26308" </Rule>
    <OR><Rule> "DET0026014.benefitType" == "HCBT26309" </Rule>
      <OR><Rule> "DET0026014.benefitType" == "HCBT26310" </Rule>
        <OR><Rule> "DET0026014.benefitType" == "HCBT26319" </Rule>
  </OR>
        </OR>
    </OR>
  </OR>
```

Related concepts

Defining logically equivalent evidence on page 26
The topics describe how you can analyze logically equivalent evidence and structure the flow of evidence if appropriate.

Supported actions and data structures on page 28
You can apply several instructions or actions to evidence types to complete the flow of evidence across Cúram source and target cases for logically equivalent evidence. You might also want to consider the data structures for evidence types on source and target cases.

Related tasks

Creating sharing configurations on page 67
Use the sharing configuration wizard to configure the sharing of evidence from a source case type to a target case type. You can specify the types of identical evidence to be shared. You can also specify the sharing of logically equivalent evidence, by mapping evidence types on the source case to logically equivalent evidence types on the target case.

Related reference

Evidence analysis on page 26
If you consider that data is logically equivalent, then you need to conduct an analysis of the data. The analysis includes looking at the underlying data structure and an initial reassessment of how the structures might potentially map to each other.

Sharing rules XML samples

You can download sharing rules XML samples that provide guidelines for using the sharing rules XML schema to map logically equivalent evidence types.

The sharing rules XML samples provide some predefined Income Support sharing configurations that you can customize according to your requirements. Download the samples from Code samples on the Merative Support Docs (transitional) site. The XML samples were last refreshed in Cúram 8.0.0.

Related concepts

Defining logically equivalent evidence on page 26
The topics describe how you can analyze logically equivalent evidence and structure the flow of evidence if appropriate.

Supported actions and data structures on page 28
You can apply several instructions or actions to evidence types to complete the flow of evidence across Cúram source and target cases for logically equivalent evidence. You might also want to consider the data structures for evidence types on source and target cases.

Related reference

Evidence analysis on page 26

If you consider that data is logically equivalent, then you need to conduct an analysis of the data. The analysis includes looking at the underlying data structure and an initial reassessment of how the structures might potentially map to each other.

Related information

Code samples

1.4 Controlling when to match shared evidence

When evidence is configured to share between case types with Trusted Source set to **Yes**, the evidence broker applies data matching to attempt to match the evidence that is being shared with evidence that is already on the target case. If the evidence broker cannot determine how to process the incoming evidence, no match is found. When no match is found, the shared evidence might appear on the **Incoming Evidence** list page for manual intervention, even though Trusted Source is set to **Yes**.

Before you begin

Organizations can use a hook point to implement custom data matching that the evidence broker uses to process the incoming evidence where the system cannot otherwise match the data. The application of the custom data matching logic potentially avoids a manual intervention by a caseworker.

For example, the evidence broker does not identify a match between an incoming evidence record and an existing evidence record of the same evidence type where the evidence records have different start dates but could potentially form a succession on the target case. An organization might want to implement custom logic to automatically process the incoming evidence onto the case as a succession.

About this task

The following sample shows the signature of the `customDataMatching` method on the `curam.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl.AESCustomDataMatching` interface:

```
package curam.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl;

public interface AESCustomDataMatching {

  EvidenceRecordResolverOutput customDataMatching(
      final BORSourceEvidence sourceBOREvidence,
      final List<BOREvidence> targetBOREvidenceList)
      throws AppException, InformationalException;
}
```

Procedure

1. Customize the `customDataMatching` method by implementing the method in a new custom class that implements the `AESCustomDataMatching` interface as shown in the following example:

```
package curam.custom.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl;

import curam.aes.codetable.AESBORACTION;
import curam.aes.sl.bor.impl.BOREvidence;
import curam.aes.sl.bor.impl.BORSourceEvidence;
import curam.aes.sl.bor.impl.EvidenceRecordResolverOutput;
import curam.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl.AESCustomDataMatching;
import curam.util.exception.AppException;
import curam.util.exception.InformationalException;
import java.util.List;

public class CustomAESDataMatching implements AESCustomDataMatching {

  @Override
  public EvidenceRecordResolverOutput customDataMatching(
    final BORSourceEvidence sourceBOREvidence,
    final List<BOREvidence> targetBOREvidenceList)
    throws AppException, InformationalException {

    final EvidenceRecordResolverOutput evidenceRecordResolverOutput =
      new EvidenceRecordResolverOutput();
    //
    // Custom matching logic
    //
    evidenceRecordResolverOutput.setAction(AESBORACTION.<some value>);
    evidenceRecordResolverOutput.setTargetEvidenceID(
      targetEvidenceID);
    return evidenceRecordResolverOutput;
  }

}
```

The return object contains the following elements:

- The recommended action, which is an entry from the `AESBORAction` code table. For more information, see the *System actions recommended by the broker* table in the *Searching for shared instances* related link.
- The identifier of the target evidence record on which the action is carried out.

2. Register the implementation in a Guice module by using a MapBinder. You must base the key for the bound implementation on a key that concatenates the source and target evidence types. For example, if the source type is address, with an evidence type code of `PDC0000261`, and the target type is address, with an evidence type code of `PDC0000261`, then the key will be `PDC0000261PDC0000261`.

3. Implement the registration in a new module class, as shown in the following example:

```
package curam.custom.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl;

import com.google.inject.AbstractModule;
import com.google.inject.multibindings.MapBinder;
import curam.aes.sl.bor.resolver.impl.AESCustomDataMatching;

public class Module extends AbstractModule {

  @Override
  protected void configure() {

    final MapBinder<String, AESCustomDataMatching> aesCustomDataMatchingHandlers =
      MapBinder.newMapBinder(binder(), String.class,
        AESCustomDataMatching.class);

    aesCustomDataMatchingHandlers.addBinding("PDC0000261PDC0000261")
      .to(CustomAESDataMatching.class);
  }
}
```

4. Insert the module class name into the `moduleClassName` column of the `ModuleClassName` database table by adding an extra row to the *ModuleClassName.DMX* file.

Results

When you redeploy the application, the custom data matching logic that is defined in the `customDataMatching()` implementation becomes effective. If the system cannot match shared data, the system applies the custom data matching logic and potentially avoids a manual intervention.

When you perform custom matching and start the succession processor by setting the recommended action to **Modify**, if an effective date is not set on the source record then the system uses the evidence start date as the effective date to prevent creating a succession with a null effective date.

Related tasks

Searching for shared instances on page 90

You can analyze how evidence has been shared around a system by searching for all instances of evidence sharing that have occurred on a particular case or are currently in progress between cases. Use the shared instances search to analyze any sharing problems that might occur. The shared instances search provides details about the evidence broker's decision for each evidence record that it shares.

1.5 Controlling when not to share evidence

Evidence sharing configurations specify what evidence is shared between case types. Organizations can use a hook point to review the evidence that the system is configured to share before the evidence is shared and to prevent evidence sharing under certain conditions. For example, an organization might not want to share evidence from one application case to another when the dates of the two application cases are not the same. Similarly, an organization might not want to share evidence from one application case to another when the evidence that is being shared is from a case that is old and is considered out of date.

About this task

Delivery plans are created for each piece of evidence to share. Use the delivery plan filter to prevent the processing of delivery plans. Delivery plans contain various details that the system can use to retrieve information about the evidences and the cases that are involved in the sharing. The system can use the cases that are shared to determine the conditions under which to ignore a delivery plan.

The following sample shows the signature of the `filter` method on the `curam.aes.sl.deliveryplan.impl.AESDeliveryPlanFilter` interface:

```
package curam.aes.sl.deliveryplan.impl;

@Implementable
@AccessLevel(AccessLevelType.EXTERNAL)
public interface AESDeliveryPlanFilter {
  List<AESDeliveryPlanDtls> filter(final List<AESDeliveryPlanDtls> plans)
    throws AppException, InformationalException;
}
```

Procedure

1. Customize the `filter` by implementing the method in a new custom class that implements the `AESDeliveryPlanFilter` interface as shown in the following example:

```java
import curam.aes.sl.deliveryplan.impl.AESDeliveryPlanFilter;
import curam.aes.sl.entity.fact.AESShareItemFactory;
import curam.aes.sl.entity.struct.AESDeliveryPlanDtls;
import curam.aes.sl.entity.struct.AESShareItemDtls;
import curam.aes.sl.entity.struct.AESShareItemKey;
import curam.core.fact.CaseHeaderFactory;
import curam.core.struct.CaseHeaderDtls;
import curam.core.struct.CaseHeaderKey;
import curam.util.exception.AppException;
import curam.util.exception.InformationalException;
import java.util.ArrayList;
import java.util.List;

/**
 * Sample implementation of AESDeliveryPlanFilter
 */
public class AESDeliveryPlanFilterSampleImpl implements AESDeliveryPlanFilter {

  @Override
  public final List<AESDeliveryPlanDtls>
    filter(final List<AESDeliveryPlanDtls> items)
      throws AppException, InformationalException {

    final List<AESDeliveryPlanDtls> deliveryPlansToIgnore =
      new ArrayList<AESDeliveryPlanDtls>();

    for (final AESDeliveryPlanDtls aesDeliveryPlanDtls : items) {
      final AESShareItemKey key = new AESShareItemKey();
      key.shareItemID = aesDeliveryPlanDtls.shareItemID;
      final AESShareItemDtls aesShareItemDtls =
        AESShareItemFactory.newInstance().read(key);

      // get the source case header details
      final CaseHeaderKey sourceCaseKey = new CaseHeaderKey();
      sourceCaseKey.caseID = aesShareItemDtls.sourceCaseID;
      final CaseHeaderDtls sourceCaseHeaderDtls =
        CaseHeaderFactory.newInstance().read(sourceCaseKey);

      // get the target case header details
      final CaseHeaderKey targetCaseKey = new CaseHeaderKey();
      targetCaseKey.caseID = aesDeliveryPlanDtls.targetCaseID;
      final CaseHeaderDtls targetCaseHeaderDtls =
        CaseHeaderFactory.newInstance().read(targetCaseKey);

      // if the case start dates are not the same then ignore this delivery plan
      if (sourceCaseHeaderDtls.caseTypeCode
        .equals(targetCaseHeaderDtls.caseTypeCode)
        && !sourceCaseHeaderDtls.startDate
          .equals(targetCaseHeaderDtls.startDate)) {
        deliveryPlansToIgnore.add(aesDeliveryPlanDtls);
      }
    }
    return deliveryPlansToIgnore;
  }

}
```

The return object contains the delivery plans to ignore. The object indicates to the system to mark the delivery plans with the code table value `AESDELIVERYPLANSTATUS.IGNORED` and not to process the delivery plans.

2. When you provide an implementation, you must use a Guice binding in a custom module to inject the implementation. The following example shows how the bindings might look:

```java
binder().bind(AESDeliveryPlanFilter.class).to(AESDeliveryPlanFilterSampleImpl.class);
```

3. If the module class is new, insert the name of the module class into the `moduleClassName` column of the `ModuleClassName` database entity. To insert the name of the module class, add an extra row to a custom DMX file that populates the entity.

Results

When you redeploy the application, the custom delivery plan filter logic that is defined in the `filter()` implementation becomes effective and all evidence shares pass through this logic.

1.6 Paid employment evidence

When income evidence is shared from Insurance Affordability to Income Support, for example, a number of mandatory fields cannot be populated on the paid employment evidence. As a result, the evidence cannot be shared seamlessly and always requires manual intervention. The logically equivalent sharing XML and a `curam.aes.sl.delivery.processor.impl.PaidEmployment` interface promote the seamless sharing of income to paid employment evidence.

About this task

The following lists the three mandatory fields that must be populated on the paid employment evidence:

- `employmentID`
- `empCaseParticipantRoleID`
- `employmentType`

The `getDetails` API on the interface is called for each logically equivalent XML mapping where the `sourceLookUp` attribute is set to `employment`. When the following mappings exist in the logically equivalent sharing XML:

```
<Mapping source="employerName" target="empCaseParticipantRoleID"
sourceLookUp="employment"/>
<Mapping source="employerName" target="employmentID" sourceLookUp="employment"/>
<Mapping source="employerName" target="employmentType" sourceLookUp="employment"/>
```

the operation is called three times, one time for the retrieval of each attribute. As the preceding information comes from the employment, the retrieval depends on providing the employer name on the income evidence so that a match on employer name can be performed against any of the client's employments.

A check is performed by the infrastructure to verify that the values that are returned are representative of the attributes that are populated. For example, the `employmentType` value must exist in the `PaidEmploymentType` code table. Where the `employmentType` value does not exist, then a blank value is returned. The `empCaseParticipantRoleID` must be a case participant of type `Employer`. Where `empCaseParticipantRoleID` is not a case participant of type `Employer`, then zero is returned. Finally, the `employmentID` that is returned must represent an employment for the client. Where the `employmentID` that is returned does not represent an employment for the client, then zero is returned.

The following sample shows the signature of the `getDetails` method on the `curam.aes.sl.delivery.processor.impl.PaidEmployment` interface:

```
package curam.aes.sl.delivery.processor.impl;

@Implementable
@AccessLevel(AccessLevelType.EXTERNAL)
public interface PaidEmployment {
  Object getDetails(GetPaidEmploymentKey key)
    throws AppException, InformationalException;
}
```

Procedure

1. Customize `getDetails` by implementing the method in a new custom class that implements the `PaidEmployment` interface as shown in the following example:

```
import curam.aes.sl.bor.impl.BORSourceEvidence;
import curam.aes.sl.delivery.processor.impl.PaidEmployment;
import curam.core.sl.infrastructure.entity.dtls.EvidenceDescriptorDtls;
import curam.core.sl.infrastructure.entity.factory.EvidenceDescriptorFactory;
import curam.core.sl.infrastructure.entity.struct.RelatedIDAndEvidenceTypeKey;
import java.util.Set;

/**
 * Sample implementation of PaidEmployment.
 */
public class CustomPaidEmploymentImpl implements PaidEmployment {

  /**
   * This API will be called for each mapping in the XML where
   * sourceLookup is set to employment.
   */
  @Override
  public final Object getDetails(final GetPaidEmploymentKey key)
      throws AppException, InformationalException {

    // Retrieve the employment details
    final RelatedIDAndEvidenceTypeKey rmKey =
      new RelatedIDAndEvidenceTypeKey();
    rmKey.evidenceType = key.shareItemDtls.evidenceType;
    rmKey.relatedID = key.shareItemDtls.evidenceID;

    final EvidenceDescriptorDtls descriptor =
      EvidenceDescriptorFactory.newInstance().readByRelatedIDAndType(rmKey);

    final BORSourceEvidence borEvidence =
      new BORSourceEvidence(descriptor, 0L);

    final Map<String, String> map = borEvidence.getAttributeMap();
    final Set<String> keys = map.keySet();

    for (final String k : keys) {

      // Should find a match on 'employerName' here
      if (k.equals(key.rule.getSourceAttributeName())) {

        // Find the employment and use this to determine the value of
        // key.rule.getTargetAttributeName(). Once found, return the
        // value.
      }
    }

    // If no value is found, return null
    return null;
  }

}
```

2. When you provide an implementation, you must use a Guice binding in a custom module to inject the implementation. The following example shows how the bindings might look:

```
binder().bind(PaidEmployment.class).to(CustomPaidEmploymentImpl.class);
```

3. If the module class is new, insert the name of the module class into the `moduleClassName` column of the `ModuleClassName` database entity. To insert the name of the module class, add an extra row to a custom DMX file that populates the entity.

Results

When you redeploy the application, the custom paid employment logic that is defined in the `getDetails()` implementation becomes effective and all income to paid employment evidence shares pass through this logic.

1.7 Preparing to share data in the pull workflow

Organizations might not want to share evidence automatically in the advanced evidence sharing pull workflow. Organizations can use an interface that, when called, prepares data to share. This data can then be shared by using a manual start of the pull workflow.

About this task

- **Background**
  Typically, at the end of every transaction advanced evidence sharing checks whether any case members were added during the lifetime of that transaction. Adding a case member is one of the trigger points for advanced evidence sharing. Where a case member was added, advanced evidence sharing persists that information to the advanced evidence sharing entities. Immediately, the advanced evidence sharing pull workflow, that is, `AdvancedEvidenceSharingWorkflowPull`, initiates evidence sharing. However, sometimes organizations do not want to automatically initiate evidence sharing.

- **Example**
  In an example intake workflow scenario, persons are registered in one workflow activity and evidence is mapped and added to an application case in a second workflow activity. In the scenario, the normal behavior is that the advanced evidence sharing pull workflow is started at the end of the first workflow activity. However, in this instance, the organization wants to defer advanced evidence sharing until the following criteria are met:

  1. The second workflow activity completes.
  2. All of the evidence is mapped to the application case.

  When the criteria is met, the organization wants to initiate sharing evidence to the application case. The proceeding interface facilitates such a deferment of advanced evidence sharing.

- **Interface**

The following code shows the signature of the `process` method on the `curam.aes.sl.observe.impl.AESShareSetPullManualEnactment` interface:

```
package curam.aes.sl.observe.impl;
@AccessLevel(AccessLevelType.EXTERNAL)
public interface AESShareSetPullManualEnactment {
  long process() throws AppException, InformationalException;
}
```

> **Note:** The preceding interface is not marked as implementable because it is not anticipated that customers are likely to provide their own implementation. For all consumers of this interface, the default implementation is typically sufficient.

1.8 Troubleshooting evidence sharing errors

For seamless sharing configurations, the system attempts to deliver and activate evidence records to a target case. Resilience in the evidence flow ensures that if the system cannot deliver or activate evidence records to the target case, alternative processing options are applied to the evidence records.

The system applies the following rules to handle evidence flow errors:

- If the target case cannot accept any evidence record on delivery of a set of evidence to a target case, all the evidence records that are within the associated set of data are added to the caseworker's incoming evidence list.
- If the system cannot activate any evidence record on delivery of a set of evidence to a target case, then the evidence remains in an in-edit state and a task is raised for the relevant caseworker.

Evidence validation and verification failures can prevent seamless sharing. A diagnostic tool is provided in the evidence broker installation to help identify sharing problems.

Evidence validations and verifications

When the broker shares evidence to a target case, the system triggers validation and verification checks on the individual evidence types. The checks ensure that evidence that the broker adds to the target case maintains the data integrity that is required for the case.

Validation or verification requirements can differ across case types. However, evidence types can be configured against any case type. When the broker attempts to add evidence to a target case by either inserting, modifying, or removing a set of evidence records, the system triggers the validations and verifications that are specific to the case type.

The system applies the following rules to handle validation and verification failures:

- If any validations or verifications prevent the target case from accepting any evidence record on delivery of a set of evidence to a target case, all the evidence records that are within the associated set of data are added to the caseworker's incoming evidence list. The caseworker must manually review and process the evidence records.
- If any validations or verifications prevent the system from activating any evidence record on delivery of a set of evidence to a target case, all the evidence records that are within the associated set of data remain on the in-edit evidence list.

Validation and verification processing examples

The following scenarios show examples of how the system processes validations and verifications for shared evidence records.

- **Validations for shared evidence records are applied to the target case**

  For example, an administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share between income support integrated cases for the following evidence types: absent parent, absent parent child support, child support enforcement, and absenteeism. Each evidence type is configured as a trusted source on the target case.

  A caseworker creates income support integrated case 1, and adds Linda as the primary client, John as a case participant, and Ann as a case member. The caseworker activates the following evidence records on the case:

  - An absent parent evidence record for John, that specifies Ann as the child
  - A child support enforcement evidence record that specifies Linda and Ann
  - An absenteeism evidence record, which links John's absent parent evidence record and the child support enforcement record for Linda and Ann

  A caseworker creates income support integrated case 2, and adds John as the primary client, and Linda and Ann as case members. However, a validation rule on the absent parent evidence specifies that an absent parent must not be a household member. Therefore, the broker adds the shared evidence records from income support integrated case 1 to the caseworker's incoming list for income support integrated case 2 for manual review and processing.

- **Verifications are triggered when verification requirements are different for a source and target case**

  For example, an administrator has set up a sharing configuration to share between insurance affordability application cases and Insurance Affordability integrated cases for the income evidence type. The income evidence type is configured as a trusted source and share verifications is set to always on the target case. The following verifications are configured:

  - On Insurance Affordability application cases, income evidence records require an employer statement and tax records as verification items.
  - On Insurance Affordability integrated cases, income evidence records require employment records and a birth certificate as verification items.

  A caseworker adds John as the primary client on both an Insurance Affordability application case and a related Insurance Affordability integrated case. The caseworker activates income evidence on the application case for John, and associated verifications are resolved on the application case.

  After activation, the broker shares the income evidence to the related integrated case, but the income evidence is unverified on the integrated case. Because the verification requirements are different on the target integrated case when compared to the source application case, the broker adds the income evidence to the caseworker's incoming verifications list on the target integrated case.

Related concepts

[Verification items on page 33](#)
By default, the broker does not share verification items that are associated with an evidence record to a target case. However, an administrator can configure the evidence broker to share verification items that are associated with either identical or logically equivalent evidence, as well as the evidence that is being shared to the target case.

Searching for shared instances

You can analyze how evidence has been shared around a system by searching for all instances of evidence sharing that have occurred on a particular case or are currently in progress between cases. Use the shared instances search to analyze any sharing problems that might occur. The shared instances search provides details about the evidence broker's decision for each evidence record that it shares.

Before you begin
Log on to the Cúram application as an administrator, and click **Administration Workspace**.

About this task

You can search on either a case reference or a person reference to review the details of all related sharing instances that have either been completed or are in progress. The table displays the date and time that the sharing instance was first initiated, the source and target case references, and the status of the sharing instance.

Procedure

1. In the Shortcuts panel, click **Rules and Evidence** > **Evidence Sharing**.
2. Click **Shared Instances Search**.
3. Search for either a case reference, or a person reference.
   A table is displayed that contains a row for each evidence record that is shared to and from the case.
4. Expand each row in the table to view a graphical representation of how the corresponding evidence record is shared between cases.

   All cases that are involved in the sharing instance are indicated by a circular icon, including the source case, the target case, and any other intermediate cases through which the evidence is shared. Hover over a case icon to view information about the type of evidence that is being shared and the system action that completed by the broker. The following table summarizes the possible system action values:

Table 15: System actions recommended by the broker

System action that is recommended that is or completed by the broker	Description
CANCELED_NOT_ON_TARGET	Ignore the shared evidence record because the broker has determined that the record that was removed on the source case does not exist on the target case.
CASEWORKER_REVIEW	The sharing configuration requires a caseworker to manually review and process the shared evidence record; for example, the evidence record is not from a trusted source, or either validation or verification requirements differ between the source and target cases.

System action that is recommended that is or completed by the broker	Description
CORRECT_LINK	The broker has determined that an evidence record on the target case is to be corrected with the incoming evidence from the source case. The LINK status indicates that the broker will remember that the two records are the same in the future, and will synchronize any corrections that are made to either record.
CORRECT_LINKED	The broker has determined that an evidence record on the target case is to be corrected with the incoming evidence from the source case. The LINKED status indicates that the broker remembers that the two records were previously matched, and therefore bypasses the need to perform complex data matching.
EVIDENCE_AND_MEMBER_PARTICIPANT_PERIOD_DONT_OVERLAP	Ignore the shared evidence record because the period that it applies to does not overlap with the period that applies to members and participants on the target case.
IGNORE_LINK	Ignore and link the shared evidence record. The broker has determined that the evidence record on the source case is already on the target case. The LINK status indicates that the broker will remember that the two records are the same in the future, and will synchronize any corrections that are made to either record.
IGNORE_LINKED	Ignore the shared evidence record. The broker has determined that the evidence record on the source case is already on the target case. The LINKED status indicates that the broker remembers that the two records were previously matched, and therefore bypasses the need to perform complex data matching.
IGNORE_LINKED_DUPLICATE	Ignore the shared evidence record because the evidence record has already been shared to the target case.
IGNORE_NO_TARGET_EVIDENCE_DURING_PULL_PROCESS	Ignore the shared evidence record because it was detected, during the data pulling process, that the evidence record already exists on the target case.
IGNORE_RECIPROCAL_TARGET	Ignore the shared evidence record. The target is the person case of the related participant on the relationship evidence that is being shared. A separate evidence record has been shared to the primary participant's person case, which will generate reciprocal relationship evidence on the related participant's person case.
INSERT	Insert and link the shared evidence record onto the target case. The broker has determined that the evidence record should be inserted onto the target case.
MANUAL_INTERVENTION	Requires manual review and processing by a caseworker. After performing complex data matching, the evidence broker could not determine what action to take.

System action that is recommended that is or completed by the broker	Description
MODIFY_LINK	Modify and link the evidence record on the target case. The LINK status indicates that the broker will remember that the two records are the same in the future, and will synchronize any corrections that are made to either record.
PARTICIPANT_NOT_ON_CASE	Ignore the shared evidence record because the participant that it relates to is not active on the target case.
REMOVE_LINKED	Remove the shared evidence record from the target case. The LINKED status indicates that the broker remembers that the two records were previously matched, and therefore bypasses the need to perform complex data matching.

Enabling the evidence sharing trace

If an evidence sharing error occurs, use the shared instance search to investigate possible errors in the sharing flow. However, if sufficient troubleshooting information is not available from the shared instance search, you can enable the evidence sharing trace. The evidence sharing trace records each step of the evidence broker's sharing process in a detailed log.

Before you begin

Use the evidence sharing trace to troubleshoot an evidence sharing error only if you cannot get the required information by using the shared instance search.

Log on to the application as a system administrator, and click **System Configurations**.

About this task
To enable an evidence sharing trace, use the following procedure.

Procedure

1. In the Shortcuts panel, click **Application Data** > **Property Administration**.
2. Search for `curam.aes.advancedEvidenceSharingTrace`.
3. Set the value of curam.aes.advancedEvidenceSharingTrace to `YES`. The default value of curam.aes.advancedEvidenceSharingTrace is `NO`.

What to do next
Review the evidence sharing trace in the system log files.

Generated tasks

Evidence sharing generates three types of tasks. The tasks are generated when the appropriate action could not be applied to evidence that is shared to a target case. The generated tasks inform caseworkers that they must take action.

The evidence broker generates the three following types of tasks in the Workflow Released Processes component of the administrative application:

- **Advanced Evidence Sharing Review Case Evidences Failed To Activate Task**
  The task is generated when the evidence could not be activated.
  The task subject is displayed as `New In-Edit Evidence on Case %1s as evidence failed to activate.`

- **Advanced Evidence Sharing Review Case Incoming List Task**
  The task is generated when manual intervention or caseworker review is set as the system action.
  The task subject is displayed as `New Incoming Evidence on Case %1s that needs to be resolved.`

- **Advanced Evidence Sharing Review PDC Case Incoming List Task**
  The task is generated when manual intervention or caseworker review is set as the system action when the task is generated on the person record.
  The task subject is displayed as `New Incoming Evidence on the Participant Case %1s that needs to be resolved.`

The following criteria apply to the generated tasks:

- When the tasks are generated, by default no deadline details are set.
- Tasks are generated only when either of the following criteria is met:

  - Delivered evidence cannot be activated and must remain in an `In-edit` state on the target case.
  - The system action is `MANUAL_INTERVENTION or CASEWORKER_REVIEW.`
- The task owner is the owner of the target case. If the target case is a person data case, the task owner is the owner of the source case.
- During an execution of the evidence broker, a maximum of one task is generated per target case.

Notices

Permissions for the use of these publications are granted subject to the following terms and conditions.

Applicability

These terms and conditions are in addition to any terms of use for the Merative website.

Personal use

You may reproduce these publications for your personal, noncommercial use provided that all proprietary notices are preserved. You may not distribute, display or make derivative work of these publications, or any portion thereof, without the express consent of Merative

Commercial use

You may reproduce, distribute and display these publications solely within your enterprise provided that all proprietary notices are preserved. You may not make derivative works of these publications, or reproduce, distribute or display these publications or any portion thereof outside your enterprise, without the express consent of Merative.

Rights

Except as expressly granted in this permission, no other permissions, licenses or rights are granted, either express or implied, to the publications or any information, data, software or other intellectual property contained therein.

Merative reserves the right to withdraw the permissions granted herein whenever, in its discretion, the use of the publications is detrimental to its interest or, as determined by Merative, the above instructions are not being properly followed.

You may not download, export or re-export this information except in full compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including all United States export laws and regulations.

MERATIVE MAKES NO GUARANTEE ABOUT THE CONTENT OF THESE PUBLICATIONS. THE PUBLICATIONS ARE PROVIDED "AS-IS" AND WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, NON-INFRINGEMENT, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Merative or its licensors may have patents or pending patent applications covering subject matter described in this document. The furnishing of this documentation does not grant you any license to these patents.

Information concerning non-Merative products was obtained from the suppliers of those products, their published announcements or other publicly available sources. Merative has not tested those products and cannot confirm the accuracy of performance, compatibility or any other claims related to non-Merative products. Questions on the capabilities of non-Merative products should be addressed to the suppliers of those products.

Any references in this information to non-Merative websites are provided for convenience only and do not in any manner serve as an endorsement of those websites. The materials at those websites are not part of the materials for this Merative product and use of those websites is at your own risk.

This information contains examples of data and reports used in daily business operations. To illustrate them as completely as possible, the examples include the names of individuals, companies, brands, and products. All of these names are fictitious and any similarity to actual people or business enterprises is entirely coincidental.

The licensed program described in this document and all licensed material available for it are provided by Merative under terms of the Merative Client Agreement.

COPYRIGHT LICENSE:

This information contains sample application programs in source language, which illustrate programming techniques on various operating platforms. You may copy, modify, and distribute these sample programs in any form without payment to Merative, for the purposes of developing, using, marketing or distributing application programs conforming to the application programming interface for the operating platform for which the sample programs are written. These examples have not been thoroughly tested under all conditions. Merative, therefore, cannot guarantee or imply reliability, serviceability, or function of these programs. The sample programs are provided "AS IS", without warranty of any kind. Merative shall not be liable for any damages arising out of your use of the sample programs.

Privacy policy

The Merative privacy policy is available at https://www.merative.com/privacy.

Trademarks

Merative ™ and the Merative ™ logo are trademarks of Merative US L.P. in the United States and other countries.

IBM®, the IBM® logo, and ibm.com® are trademarks or registered trademarks of International Business Machines Corp., registered in many jurisdictions worldwide.

Adobe™, the Adobe™ logo, PostScript™, and the PostScript™ logo are either registered trademarks or trademarks of Adobe™ Systems Incorporated in the United States, and/or other countries.

Oracle and Java are registered trademarks of Oracle and/or its affiliates.

The registered trademark Linux® is used pursuant to a sublicense from the Linux Foundation, the exclusive licensee of Linus Torvalds, owner of the mark on a worldwide basis.

Microsoft™, Windows™, and the Windows™ logo are trademarks of Microsoft™ Corporation in the United States, other countries, or both.

UNIX™ is a registered trademark of The Open Group in the United States and other countries.

Other company, product, and service names may be trademarks or service marks of others.