

## Responses received

We received questions and/or feedback in response to the advance notice from 23 individuals and groups as follows:

- Professional Associations: PodiatryNZ and Orthotist and Prosthetist Association raised questions from members. Neither provided formal feedback.
- DHBs: Northland and Tairāwhiti DHBs asked questions about the contract.
- Orthotists: Eight responses
- Podiatrists: Nine responses
- Other: We received a response from the NZ Artificial Limbs Service and questions from one physiotherapist.

The questions and feedback is summarised below and questions answered either in the webinar notes, or the Questions & Answers.

Following consideration of the feedback, changes will be made to the draft Service Schedule and the draft operational guidelines before they are released with the formal request for application later this month.

## Response content

### General

Overall there was a positive response to the contract, especially in the context of it being a first step towards a fuller pricing framework. A number of respondents offered assistance in developing the contract in the future especially around quality measures and orthoses description and pricing.

Comments are summarised under the draft Service Schedule Clauses.

### Pricing (Part A, Clause 4)

Two respondents asked whether travel would be covered when a client's disability or situation (especially in a rural area) meant they couldn't travel to the supplier's premises.

#### Consultations:

- There were only two comments around pricing of consultations from Orthotists. These were about whether the price was intended to cover administrative costs and the cost of extra long consultations.
- Podiatrists were concerned that the Orthotist consultation price was higher than Podiatrist's consultation price under the COTR.

#### Orthoses:

- A large number of comments focused on the meaning of 'Actual & Reasonable' from respondents concerned that it meant ACC would only pay the cost of orthoses with no margin.
- There were a number of queries about what was meant by footwear. What constituted modification and whether prescription footwear was included.

### Service Eligibility (Part B, Clause 2)

- A number of Podiatrists were uncomfortable being in the same contract as Orthotists and expressed preference for a podiatry only contract.
- One Orthotist asked that time be allowed for an Orthotist to gain accreditation with NZOPA.

### **Consultations (Part B, Clause 3)**

- There was support for two Orthotist initial consultation rates.
- A number of respondents asked whether gait analysis was included in the consultation price.

### **Orthoses (Part B, Clause 4)**

- Questions were asked about how the average cost of orthoses per claim (\$315) was reached.
- Three respondents expressed concern about potential supplier abuse of a prior approval threshold while supporting the initiative. Involvement of the professional associations and monitoring of contract compliance was considered important to prevent abuse.
- There were a number of queries about footwear entitlements and descriptions and whether prescription footwear is included.

### **Service requirements (Part B, Clause 5)**

- No comments received.

### **Service commencement (Part B, Clause 6)**

- It was suggested that approved referrers also include rehabilitation specialists and musculoskeletal specialists.

### **Quality (Part B, Clause 7)**

- Three suppliers commented that improved quality standards should be included in the Service Schedule. However, no suggestions were provided.

### **Performance (Part B, Clause 8 and Appendix 2)**

- One respondent commented that the KPI timeframes were not practical.

### **Reporting (Part B, Clause 9 and Appendix 1)**

- Three respondents commented that the reporting required was a “one way street”, asked if ACC would pay and felt reporting was ACC’s responsibility.
- One respondent asked to have input into the report template.

### **Payment and Invoicing (Part B, Clause 4)**

- One respondent indicated that e-billing would be difficult for the company.

### **Other**

- There was one question about incorporating a process for dealing with urgent requests for prior approval.
- Two respondents thought the consultation time was too short.