

DATE: March 9, 2010

TO: IIPRC Management Committee

FROM: Industry Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: Proposed Standards For Forms Required To Be Used with the Individual LTC Application (Dated 12/29/09):

- Suitability Forms
- Potential Rate Increase Disclosure Form
- Replacement Notice
- HIPPA Medical Authorization

Self-Certification Note Below Scope, Page 1

Since the Self-Certification Rule has now been adopted, we recommend that you consider allowing these standards to be filed on a self-certification basis. If you agree, we recommend that the title of the standards be changed to say:

“SELF-CERTIFICATION STANDARDS FOR FORMS”.

If you decide to keep the note, the current language would need to change to reflect your decision.

Section 1

B. POTENTIAL RATE INCREASE DISCLOSURE FORM, Pages 2-3

In *item (3)(d)(ii)*, we believe the correct reference should be “Item (3)(c)”.

In *item (3)(g)*, the correct reference should be “Item (3)(f)”, and we presume that the draft intended to cross out the “4” but that this does not show up clearly.

APPENDIX A

Questions Related To Your Income, Page 8 Top

The PSC comments are not consistent with the strikeout. What was the intent?

Questions Related To Your Savings and Investments, Page 8 Bottom

Change the \$20,000 – \$30,000 to “\$20,000 – \$29,999”.

APPENDIX C, Page 11

Item 2, Page 11

We want to confirm with the PSC that the use of Specifications Page in the policy standards, as well as all IIPRC standards, was not intended to restrict a company to that term, and that “Schedule Page”, “Schedule of Benefits”, “Policy Schedule” and other terms may be used.

The intent is to require that the rate schedules be shown in the section that is used for the policy specifications, regardless of what it is called.

The reference here to “schedule page” is somewhat misleading and not consistent with the use of “Specifications Page” throughout all the IIPRC standards.

Item 4, Page 11

In the second bullet, we question the appropriateness of the parenthetical statement referring requirements to state law minimum standards. Why is this necessary for IIPRC standards? If there are state variations in the minimums required, shouldn't the PSC recommend a standard?

Submitted by IIPRC Industry Advisory Committee:

Bill Anderson
Maureen Adolf, Prudential
Steve Buhr, AEGON
Tom English, New York Life
Mary Keim, State Farm Insurance Company
Michael Lovendusky, ACLI
Amanda Mathiessen, AHIP