GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATORY CONVERSION PRIVILEGE MODEL ACT (#105)

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

This model was identified last year 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 its adoption in 1976.

2. Name of group responsible for drafting the model:

Regulatory Framework (B) Task Force

States Participating:    Wisconsin, Chair    Missouri
                        Arkansas    Nebraska
                        California    Nevada
                        Colorado    New Hampshire
                        Delaware    North Carolina
                        Florida    Ohio
                        Idaho    Rhode Island
                        Iowa    South Dakota
                        Kansas    Utah
                        Kentucky    Vermont
                        Maine    Virginia

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

The following charge 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 were no items of controversy.

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

None.