

PROJECT HISTORY 2012

REVISIONS TO UTILIZATION REVIEW AND BENEFIT DETERMINATION MODEL ACT (#73)

1. Description of the

4. A General Description of the Drafting Process (e.g., drafted by a subgroup, interested parties, the full group, etc). Include any parties outside the members that participated

The revisions were drafted by the Regulatory Framework (B) Task Force. The Task Force held a conference call Sept. 1, 2011 and a person-to-person meeting at the 2011 Fall National Meeting during which the draft an

PROJECT HISTORY 2010

REVISIONS TO UTILIZATION REVIEW AND BENEFIT DETERMINATION MODEL ACT (#73)

1. Description of

6. A Discussion of the Significant Issues (items of some controversy raised during the due process and the group's response)

None

7. Any Other Important Information (e.g., amending an



5. A general description of the due process (e.g., exposure periods, public hearings, or any other means by which widespread input from industry, consumers and legislators was solicited).

Beginning with the 2001 Winter National Meeting, drafts of the amendments were reviewed and discussed at each National Meeting. Comments were requested and were received and considered throughout the drafting process. In addition, all of the drafts of the amendments to the model acts were posted on the NAIC website.

6. A discussion of the significant issues (items of some controversy) raised during the drafting process and the group's response.

There were no significant discussion issues raised during the drafting process, except for the general issue of whether the NAIC models should be revised to mirror the exact language in the DOL final rule. The task force chose to revise the models to reflect the DOL final rule provisions only where necessary to avoid federal preemption. Provisions already contained in the models that were more protective of consumers were retained.

7. Any other important information (e.g., amending an accreditation standard).

None.