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NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS RECEIVED PER 1000 BENEFICIARIES

Annual Report 2015/16

Number of complaints received per 1000 beneficiaries:
2015

- 2014: 0.5
- 2015: 0.65
NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS RECEIVED: 2015

Number of complaints resolved and Inquiries/Invalid complaints

- Valid resolved - 3643
- Inquiries / Invalid resolved - 2151
OPEN MEDICAL SCHEMES WITH MOST COMPLAINTS

Open medical schemes with most complaints / 1000 beneficiaries (2015)
TRENDS - OPEN MEDICAL SCHEMES

- SPECTRAMED:
  - Administrative inefficiencies due to change in administrator (from V-Med to Agility)
  - Delayed payment of members’ accounts due to insufficient data.
  - Incorrect assessment of accounts – valid claims incorrectly rejected.
  - PMB accounts paid at scheme rate and reprocessed after receipt of CMS complaints.

- RESOLUTION HEALTH:
  - Administrative inefficiencies such as loading authorisation under incorrect dependants.
  - Processing accounts from incorrect benefit category.
  - Service providers and members informed that PMB procedures will be funded up to monetary limit contrary to Regulation 8(1) of the Medical Schemes Act.
  - PMB accounts paid at scheme rate and reprocessed after receipt of CMS complaints.
CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATORS

- Complaints related to delayed payment of accounts and incorrect processing of accounts.
- Insufficient data transferred from one administrator to another.
- Delayed verification and delayed release of payment of accounts.
- Recordings not transferred over to new administrator prior to the take-over.
- Section 57 (4)(c): BoT to ensure proper control systems are employed by or on behalf of the medical scheme.
- Section 57 (4)(h): BoT to ensure operation and administration of a medical scheme comply with the provisions of the Medical Schemes Act.
GENESIS - Incorrect interpretation of the Act which led to absurdity.

Reasons furnished why certain accounts would not be funded in full were the following:

- “Member was diagnosed with a PMB condition prior to the PMB legislation was implemented, therefore the condition does not qualify for benefits…”

- “Genesis is obliged to fund in-hospital treatment of PMB conditions”. This means PMBs do not qualify for funding if treatment was rendered on an outpatient basis.

- In terms of section 29(1) (o) and (p), Genesis only funds PMB accounts if treatment was rendered at a public hospital. Therefore, the decision to short-pay accounts was justified.
GENESIS:

- Serious non-compliance with the Medical Schemes Act, particularly on funding conditions that are listed as Prescribed Minimum Benefits (PMBs) application.
- Members of Genesis exposed financially.
- The Supreme Court of Appeal held in the matter between The Council for Medical Schemes v Genesis Medical Scheme that Genesis was liable to fund in full PMB treatment rendered in a private hospital, including the costs of a prosthesis. This means the member was protected from financial burden of funding the balance of the account relating to the treatment of a PMB condition.
- The Scheme’s petition to appeal the decision to the Constitutional Court was dismissed.
PAYMENT OF PMBs FROM THE MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

- Paying PMB accounts from medical savings account in contravention of Regulation 10 (6) of the Act.
- Accounts reviewed after receipt of CMS complaints and payment later made in full from the risk benefit.
- No clear reasons furnished why payment was processed from the incorrect benefit.
- Reasonable conclusion that no mechanisms in place to “flag” PMB accounts from non-PMB benefits or deliberate policies by Schemes.
- Concerned about staff training / incorrect assessment of claims and / or blatant disregard of the provision of the Act.
GENERAL CUSTOMER SERVICE

- Increase in volume of complaints relating to the afore-mentioned.
- Complaints were in respect of the following:
  - Call recordings not available;
  - Telephone calls not answered;
  - Membership certificates not issued;
  - Correspondences from members not responded to;
  - Members’ calls not returned resulting in members making multiple follow-ups;
  - Medical schemes declined request to escalate matters to higher authorities.
CONDUCT OF DOCTORS

- Lack of understanding of the PMB regulations.
- Ill-advising patients about the liability of medical schemes on funding treatment for PMB conditions.
- Failing to disclose their non-DSP status to their patients.
- Demanding payment from members of medical schemes where medical schemes partly funds their accounts.
- Section 53 (1) (a) and (b) of the National Health Act.
- Ethical Rule 27(A)(d) of the Ethical Rules of Conduct for Practitioners registered under the Health Professions Act 1974 – a practitioner has a duty to provide information about the costs associated with treatment / alternatives available to patients to enable proper decision-making by patients.
RESTRICTED MEDICAL SCHEMES WITH MOST COMPLAINTS

Restricted schemes with most complaints / 1000 beneficiaries (2015)
GEMS – COMPLAINTS TRENDS

- GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES MEDICAL SCHEME (GEMS)
  - Appears in the Top 10 for the first time.
  - Services-related complaints raised by GEMS members increased.
  - Most complaints related to medicines, pathology and radiology accounts.
  - My Care / Helios JV – Clearing House contract for Clearing House services with GEMS from Jan 2015.
  - Contract management was a concern – GEMS had to hold its contracted party accountable thus protecting the interests of its members.
  - Service Level Agreement reviewed and implementation of the penalty / termination clause in Sept 2015.
  - The Board of GEMS provided the Registrar’s office with continuous update on SLA with My Care.
  - Close monitoring of the matter after termination of the contract.
A WAY FORWARD

MEDICAL SCHEMES
- Root cause analysis of complaints
- Clear communication of benefits
- Ongoing training of staff
- Performance management of administrators (SLA) and implementation of penalty clause.

MEMBERS
- Lack of understanding of PMB regulations
- Lack of understanding of nature and extent of discretionary benefits
- Not reading material from medical schemes
- Choosing benefit options that do not suite their healthcare needs.