



September 11, 2007

Bonnie L. Harkless
The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs
Division of Regulations Development – C
Room C4-26-05
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850

em5/03/7

Dear Ms. Harkless:

I would like to thank the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) for this opportunity to review and submit comments related to the draft 2009 MA and Part D applications.

We applaud CMS' decision to move to electronic submission of the MA applications for 2009. We believe this is a great step forward in simplifying the application process while creating a more streamlined, efficient approach for Medicare Advantage organizations.

We are concerned that the addition of numerous attestations, particularly in the draft 2009 Part D application, may be perceived as a shift in the oversight relationship between CMS and sponsors. Sponsors may view such additions as creating additional regulatory burden while signaling a move away from the longstanding partnership relationship to one that is more onerous. Sponsors already implement these requirements as outlined in regulations, manuals, statute, contracts and other guidance. Adding these attestations to the application may only serve to create hesitation as these organizations determine whether to contract with CMS.

Additional specific comments related to the 2009 MA application are in the attached matrix.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the 2009 application process. We appreciate all of the work that CMS put into these documents. And we look forward to our continued partnership with CMS.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Powell

Director, Policy and Compliance

Enclosure

PART C-2009 APPLICATION COMMENT MATRIX

				_
	future.	Needs Plans		
	We encourage CMS to consider moving to a more fully automated process for the SMP application process in the	1 General Guidance for Special	- ₽	SS
		Needs Plans		
Clarify date	March 10, 2007 date is confusing, perhaps this was meant to be March X 2008.	I General Guidance for Special	t	99
		Delivery		<u> </u>
Delete "that is" after Policies		5.1.5.3.a Health Services	7	6t
	We would appreciate the addition of clarifying language around what CMS expects in this element.	anoisivord provisions	7	0\$
_	and prior to "CMS"			
lliw 1918 "after will implement" after will	Include more information on what CMS is looking for in this element. A verb appears to be missing after "wil"	3.1.B Access to Services	3	68
		Disentollment, and Eligibility		
Delete "disembroils" and insert "disenrolls"	Element 19 -	1.13.2 Enrollment,		87
	approach for Medicare Advantage organizations.			
	is a great step forward in simplifying the application process while creating a more streamlined, efficient	System (HPMS)		
	We applaud CMS' decision to move to electronic submission of the MA applications for 2009. We believe this	5. Health Plan Management	I	
(Number
Suggestion (Insert, Delete, or Revise)		Section Number/ Header	Part	Page
			dno ro r	2 Cordina
	Employer Group (PFFS_Direct)	age Master ApplicationX		
	Translator Cuant (DEEC Direct)	V notionilant antich and	tenuth A	waaihaM
	a (Diesze cu eck ou e):	apply to the following document	: S109Wm	r itese coi
	(,	,	000 dT
	-		_ 	_ :ят∀л
ORGANIZATION'S NAME: Covenity Health Care, Inc.				
THE WAY THE TAXABLE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF TH				

Powell, Cheryl A.

From:

Powell, Cheryl A.

Sent:

Tuesday, September 11, 2007 11:49 AM

To:

'bonnie.harkless@cms.hhs.gov'

Cc:

'Letticia.Ramsey@cms.hhs.gov'

Subject:

Please find attached our comments on the Draft 2009 application

Attachments:

CVTY PartC-2009appcommentmatrix.xls

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. Please find in the email two general comments from Coventry with respect to the draft 2009 MA and Part D applications. Additional comments related to the 2009 MA application are in the attached matrix.

General Comments -

We applaud CMS' decision to move to electronic submission of the MA applications for 2009. We believe this is a great **step forward in simplifying the application process** while creating a more streamlined, efficient approach for Medicare **Advantage organizations**.

Also, with respect to the Part D application, we are concerned that the addition of numerous attestations, particularly in the Part D application, may be perceived as a shift in the oversight relationship between CMS and plans. Plans may view such additions as creating additional regulatory burden while signaling a move away from the longstanding partnership relationship to one that is more onerous. Plans already implement these requirements as outlined in regulations, manuals, statute, contracts and other guidance. Adding these attestations to the application may only serve to create hesitation as plans determine whether to contract with CMS.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. We appreciate all of the work that CMS put into these documents.

Thanks.

Cheryl

CVTY -2009appcommentm

America's Health Insurance Plans

601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW South Building Suite Five Hundred Washington, DC 20004

202.778.3200 www.ahip.org





MMMADAMIS IMMADALIMINIS

September 11, 2007

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Office of Strategic Operations and Regulatory Affairs
Division of Regulations Development – C
Attn: Bonnie L. Harkless
Room C4-26-05
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850

Re: CMS-10137

Dear Ms. Harkless:

I am writing on behalf of America's Health Insurance Plans (AHIP) in response to the notice published under the Paperwork Reduction Act in the July 13, 2007 Federal Register (72 FR 38601) by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) concerning the following applications: "Application for Prescription Drug Plans (PDP); Application for Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug (MA-PD); Application for Cost Plans to Offer Qualified Prescription Drug Coverage; Application for Employer Group Waiver Plans to Offer Prescription Drug Coverage; Service Area Expansion Application for Prescription Drug Coverage". AHIP is the national trade association representing nearly 1,300 member companies providing health coverage to more than 200 million Americans. This proposed collection would affect AHIP's member organizations, many of which participate as plan sponsors under the Medicare Part D Prescription Drug Benefit (Part D) program.

We appreciated the summary documents provided by CMS to highlight the proposed changes in the applications and facilitate review. We have only two comments, and they appear below.

Comments

• Follow-Up to CAHPS Survey. Section 3.2.3A5 that appears in the applications for new Prescription Drug Plan (PDP) Sponsors, Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug Plan (MA-PD) Sponsors, and Cost Plan Sponsors offering Part D Benefits contains a new attestation that states: "Applicant agrees to comply with the appropriate follow-up related to the Consumer Assessment of Health

Providers and Systems Survey (CAHPS)." The "High-Level Summary of All Part D Application Revisions from 2008 Solicitation for the 2009 Solicitation" that CMS issued with the proposed applications notes in item six that the new attestation is "Based on 2008 Call Letter and Chapter 7 of the Prescription Drug Benefit Manual." However, neither the 2008 Call Letter nor Chapter 7 contain guidance about the nature and scope of the required CAHPS survey follow-up activities. Section 40.2 of Chapter 7 of the Prescription Drug Benefit Manual states only that, "Specific responsibilities for plan follow-up based upon survey results from CAHPS, once developed, will be described here." To permit sponsors to clearly understand the obligations referenced in the attestation, we recommend that its inclusion be deferred until the guidance referenced in the Manual is issued.

Application Process for a Cost Plan with a Part D Contract to Become an MA-PD Plan Sponsor. We recommend that CMS provide a streamlined application process to address the circumstance in which a Cost Plan that also has a contract as a Part D plan sponsor decides to non-renew its Cost Plan contract and apply to become an MA-PD plan sponsor. Under such a process, where the information provided in the Cost Plan's previously approved Part D application continues to be correct, we recommend that the organization be permitted to complete only the Medicare Advantage portion of the application and provide through an attestation confirmation that the information in the previous Part D application remains accurate. We also recommend that the organization be permitted to request continuation of some or all waivers approved for the existing Part D contract based upon an attestation that the circumstances supporting the waiver(s) still apply. We believe this approach would permit CMS to ensure that the organization continues to meet the qualifications for its Part D contract through a process that avoids duplicative work for both the organization and CMS.

AHIP appreciates the opportunity to comment. If you have questions or would like additional information about the issues we have raised, please contact me at (202) 778-3209 or cschaller@ahip.org.

Sincerely,

Candace Schaller

Senior Vice President, Federal Programs