

<b>TO:</b>	HCPF
<b>FROM:</b>	PDPPC

At the April 22, 2015 PDPPC meeting a motion was made, seconded, and passed that a rule requiring both Attendant's **AND** the Client's or Authorized Representative's signature be changed.

Change would be from requiring both signatures "the two signature rule", to requiring only the Client/employer or AR's (authorized representative) signature with a qualifying affidavit statement regarding authorization to approve and personal responsibility regarding accuracy of the information, be included.

The PDPPC further request that; if this rule cannot be changed, a reason of proof be provided, IE: if it is in the FMS vendors' contract(s), what will be involved with amending the contracts, (particularly right now given the amendments currently in the works to change to FEA only); if this is a state statute, please identify the specific statute that requires the "two signatures" and/or; if this is a federal statute, regulation or rule requirement by the CMS please identify that specific rule?

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the PDPPC  
 Curtis Wolff  
 Co-Chair PDPPC

<b>DATE Submitted:</b>	December 1, 2015
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Two Signature requirement request

*Please check box below to indicate the type of recommendation this represents.*

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy Recommendation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Operational Recommendation

**Summary:**

**Response:** Response from HCPF regarding any recommendations from PDPPC, should be provided to PDPPC as follows:

Written acknowledgment of formal recommendation and subject received by HCPF with inclusion of HCPF decision (i.e. will all or portions of the recommendation be implemented? If not, why?). The response shall include the implementation date(s) and if necessary work plan or milestones. All written

acknowledgment should be provided to PDPPC co-chairs, so written response can be disseminated to all PDPPC stakeholders.

CDASS Program administrator will offer verbal explanation of HCPF written response/decision to PDPPC at the next PDPPC meeting and will offer HCPF management verbal explanation and answer questions regarding the recommendations. HCPF response to PDPPC recommendations are expected within twenty (20) calendar days of submission to HCPF management. This will enable PDPPC to provide a timely reply to HCPF responses or to respond to supplemental questions at the next PDPPC meeting.

The PDPPC will respond with suggestions within one week following the next PDPPC meeting as follows:

- If the PDPPC does not agree with decisions made by HCPF regarding recommendation/s or
- If the PDPPC has questions about the HCPF recommendation

*Example: PDPPC meets the fourth Wednesday of the month. On Wednesday January 23 PDPPC submits a recommendation to HCPF. HCPF would receive that recommendation between January 24-28. Therefore HCPF would need to respond by February 14-18. The PDPPC would then answer questions if any by March 6, one week after the February 27 meeting. Hopefully this will result in HCPF providing a final decision and implementation plan by the March 27 meeting. There may be some rare occasions where an additional cycle is required, and the group agreed to monitor progress without requesting a more rigid response deadline with an expectation that recommendations will be prioritized and move with appropriate speed. The group will monitor the effectiveness of this regularly.*

<b>Date HCPF Response:</b> <b>Date: PDPPC Response:</b> <b>Date: HCPF Final Response:</b>	
---	--