

**DRAFTER'S NOTE**  
**FROM THE**  
**LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRB-2313/P2dn  
PJK:wlj:jf

March 15, 1999

1. Because the language that OCI submitted on revoking, suspending and limiting certifications (see s. 632.83 (4) (d)) made the last sentence of s. 632.83 (4) (a) in the draft somewhat redundant, I removed that last sentence. Okay?

2. The language that OCI submitted on revoking, suspending and limiting certifications (s. 632.83 (4) (d)) is very similar to s. 628.10 (2) (b) in current law. I added the word "endanger" after "conduct of its business", which is the wording of s. 628.10 (2) (b), but I'm not sure that the omission of the word "endanger" was inadvertent. Is the language as drafted okay? If the omission was intentional, I will remove the word "endanger" and move the commas around so that the language would mean that the methods or practices in the conduct of an independent review organization's business, as well as its financial resources, are inadequate to safeguard the interests of consumers or the public.

3. On the same topic (s. 632.83 (4) (d)), would an organization have "good character"?

4. OCI indicated that the draft should not address how health benefit plans compensate independent review organizations. Should the last sentence of s. 632.83 (3) (a) be deleted altogether instead of just the part about OCI determining the fee?

5. Notice that I changed some references to "independent reviewer" in the previous version of the draft to "clinical peer reviewer" instead of to "independent review organization" because it seemed more appropriate. Are these changes okay? Are there any other instances where you would prefer "clinical peer reviewer"?

Pamela J. Kahler  
Senior Legislative Attorney  
Phone: (608) 266-2682  
E-mail: Pam.Kahler@legis.state.wi.us