

**PROJECT HISTORY - 2007**

**GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE STANDARDS MODEL ACT (#100)**

**1. Description of the project, issues addressed, etc.**

This model was identified in 2004 as in need of revision as part of the NAIC model law review initiative. The revisions make the model consistent with NAIC model law drafting requirements and make other changes necessary to update the model since it was last amended in 1988 to reflect HIPAA's group nondiscrimination and preexisting condition requirements. The revised model also includes new provisions related to true group associations. These revisions tightened up the requirements to help ensure that these associations are legitimate entities.

**2. Name of group responsible for draft the model and states participating:**

Regulatory Framework (B) Task Force

**States Participating:**

Wisconsin, Chair	Montana
Arkansas	Nebraska
California	Nevada
Colorado	New Hampshire
Delaware	Ohio
Florida	Oregon
Idaho	Rhode Island
Kansas	South Dakota
Kentucky	Utah
Maine	Vermont
Missouri	Virginia

**3. Project authorized by what charge and date first given to the group:**

The following charge was first given in January 2004:

Review and revise, as necessary, NAIC model laws and regulations identified as in need of review and revision as a result of the NAIC model law review initiative. Report annually.

**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, and comments received on them, were reviewed and discussed by the Task Force.

**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.**

Each draft of the proposed revisions to the model was circulated to interested parties and posted on the NAIC website. Interested parties were given the opportunity to submit comments. The Task Force reviewed and considered all comments received.

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

There was one item of controversy. It concerned whether additional requirements should be added to the model with respect to permitted association groups. After considerable discussion, the Task Force agreed on a compromise. The Task Force agreed to add the additional requirements but allow a period of time for those associations that do not meet the new requirements to come into compliance. In addition, there was considerable debate about what those additional requirements should be for associations to be considered "true" groups. After several meetings, a compromise was reached.

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

None.