

MHO CONTRACTS & RULES WORKGROUP
February 18, 2009

MHOs Attending: Bruce Abel (LaneCare), Dave Bast (JBH) Seth Bernstein (ABHA), Kim Burgess (Washington Co), Kevin Campbell (GOBHI), Deborah Friedman (CMHO), Len Lomash (Verity), Susan Montgomery (GOBHI), Jim Russell (BCN)

AMH Attending: David Fischer, Kellie Skenandore, Ralph Summers

Guest Appearance: Bob Nikkel

Item	Discussion	Action / Due Date
1. Timeline for 2010 contract	Definitions section in MHO and FCHP/DCO contracts to be realigned for 2010. Other areas for revision or language development will be related to early childhood services and long term care. Not clear at this time whether DOJ will be requesting new or revised language. 2010 timeline document was distributed.	April 1 deadline to identify issues or topics for inclusion in revisions for 2010 contract. Routine, non-material housekeeping revisions will be coordinated by Tammy, Kellie and Deborah.
2. Integration activities and potential contract language	<p>Highlights of discussion with Bob Nikkel regarding integration activities and development of contract language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuum from coordination through to integration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination – still operating in silos and the effort is focused on getting the silos to communicate and coordinate ○ Collaboration – more active engagement across silos ○ Integration – more subtle and sophisticated relationships, with blended technology ▪ Apply to the quadrant model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quadrant 1 – coordination ○ Quadrants 2&3 – collaboration ○ Quadrant 4 - integration ▪ Integration at the service level is key – multidisciplinary model ideal ▪ Menu of options for integration is needed 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the intended outcomes from integration activities? Have to determine intended outcomes before contractual language can be developed ▪ What is CMS' position on integration as it related to contract language, what will be the impact on the EQR? (Bob is talking with Jim Edge re potential CMS reaction and possible need for a plan amendment) ▪ Consider previous work done related to integration, and other venues where integration is a topic of discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MHO-FCHP Integration Workgroup (Bruce will suggest at OHP Contractors meeting that this workgroup be re-instituted) ○ David Pollack's work ○ Barbara Mauer's paper ○ On the agenda at February, March and April MAC meetings ○ SB 156 ○ Health Fund Board ○ Legislative activity re integrated health homes ▪ Need for a work plan / action plan with key areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Definitions ○ Outcomes / key markers ○ Review of existing information ○ Barriers to integration ○ Analysis of current state of integration ○ Plan for supporting further integration <p>There was lack of agreement in the group as to the level of specificity that would be acceptable in contract language. Agreed that the next step is to review current language in MHO and FCHP contracts.</p>	<p>March meeting - review and suggest reorganization of current Integration and Coordination section of MHO contract; review current language in FCHP contract.</p>
<p>3. Disclosure Statement forms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Governmental Entities form has been completed, final disposition within DHS is still under discussion 	<p>When disposition has been agreed upon, AMH will distribute the form electronically to MHOs</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual and group practice forms are already available ▪ Status of DHS review of Oregon Practitioner Credentialing Application as substitute for individual disclosure statement is unknown 	<p>Kellie will send link or documents themselves to MHOs</p> <p>Deborah will follow-up with Katrina Gonzales of DMAP</p>
4. Letter from DHS holding plans harmless from impact of MMIS	Letter being drafted in a meeting later today; will be distributed for comment at OHP Contractors and MHO Contractors meetings tomorrow	Distribution at meetings on Feb 19
5. DHS obligations related to MHO contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact of MMIS transition on provider verification of eligibility and potential for billing errors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the provider can document their eligibility check and it turns out the MMIS information was erroneous, and the provider provided a service based on this information in good faith, then DHS is liable for the bill. This commitment already exists in the general Medicaid rule (141-120). ○ 2010 Contract will include language related to this responsibility on the part of DHS and/or specifically reference the rule ▪ Exhibit O and lack of defined responsibility for DHS to respond to discrepancies identified in enrollment data by plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2010 contract will include reciprocal language identifying DHS' role and responsibility related to validation of enrollment data 	<p>Kellie will provide the specific rule citation to MHOs</p> <p>Kellie to track for 2010 language revisions</p> <p>Kellie to track for 2010 language revisions</p>

Next meeting: March 18, 2009

Agenda: Review of Integration and Coordination section of contract
Identification of other issues and topics for 2010 contract revisions