

Email on my behalf from my Health Advocate to (HF)

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED].org.au>

20 Feb. 2015 at 9:46 am

Good morning [REDACTED]

I trust that you are well and have had a productive week.

Further to my previous communication last Friday (13th February 2015), Monte and I are working together to fulfil all requirements and conditions of [REDACTED], as well as member benefits. We are both assessing the APA guidelines to ensure consistency and efficiency across the board.

Julie, I am a-bit puzzled by the meeting we had with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on 11th February 2015 and am wondering whether you can shed some light onto this? Whilst the meeting was very welcoming and advantageous in many ways, I was of the understanding that the meeting would also include a review of [REDACTED]'s file management of [REDACTED] members.

Also, Monte and I would like to discuss a separate matter with you (directly affects [REDACTED]), and I appreciate your time is valuable. Therefore, if the opportunity does arise for either a meeting or a tele-conference, I will definitely send you an outline and material which Monte needs to discuss. Again, this will definitely go towards reinstating the partnership between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

I look forward to your reply.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Community Relations Coordinator

[REDACTED]

Woolloomooloo

T: [REDACTED]

M: [REDACTED]

F: 02 [REDACTED]

[www.\[REDACTED\].org.au](http://www.[REDACTED].org.au)

This was the response from the (HF)

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED].com.au>
To: [REDACTED].com.au
Cc: [REDACTED].org.au, [REDACTED].com.au
30 Mar. 2015 at 8:33 am

Dear Monte

Thank you for this note. We will take up the matter with [REDACTED], but we will not be discussing their affairs outside of that.

We have exchanged information and I have had detailed correspondence with you over a number of years, and you met with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] again last month. You do not need our direction or guidance in your practice –we only encourage you to refer you to your professional guidelines - as we do with all [REDACTED] recognised clinicians.

[Now this is very confusing as (HF) didn't follow these professional guidelines with business X and didn't advise me of this before the onsite audit. Business X had multiple meetings with (HF) to negotiate, understand, explain and compromise. Contact with (HF) with me was suppressive and dismissive. (HF) had no intention of understanding what I did and reinstating Group Physiotherapy. There was never an amicable meeting where I was fully heard or validated by (HF). It is also interesting that I contacted (HF) directly with registered mail. I heard nothing back]

With good wishes
[REDACTED]

Another email sent to (HF) with my Health Advocate included in communication.

From: Monte Elissa [mailto:[REDACTED]@yahoo.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 March 2015
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Msg for [REDACTED] from Monte Elissa - Clarification sought

Dear [REDACTED]

I hope that you are well and thank you for extending your time to review my case. The purpose of following up from previous correspondence regarding an ‘unnamed’ physiotherapist is to clarify any misunderstandings, to maintain my duty of care and to also ensure that my business complies with Private Health Insurance and other relevant bodies’ guidelines.

I have also been working towards revising our practice and where needed, making changes along the way to evolve our processes.

The unnamed physiotherapist so far is [REDACTED] ([http://www.\[REDACTED\].com.au/](http://www.[REDACTED].com.au/)) and although I do not wish to compromise anybody’s privacy or integrity, I have noticed that there have been some differences between the way that [REDACTED] (HF) administers service descriptors with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Even though it is noted that [REDACTED] does classes and [REDACTED] does groups.

Please find the following examples and short summaries;

•(Item A) [REDACTED] patients can claim for physiotherapy **classes** and it has been stated to me that [REDACTED] do not cover these costs. Please note that for the period of 3rd February 2014 to 23rd June 2014, the total cost of a client's [REDACTED] reimbursement total to \$306. This would suggest that [REDACTED] Health Management annual limit (P560) of \$150 has not been adhered to and it seems that classes are being rebated under Group Physiotherapy.

•(Item B) I have a mutual client who attends both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] e and has reported to me that she has been attending [REDACTED] for over eight years, with only having three assessments completed within that period.

•(Item C) I also refer to my patient, who has advised me that there are definitely more than twelve people attending classes through [REDACTED], and the class size has been anywhere up-to twenty people. (Definitely over 12 people as required)

•(Item D) I also confirm my correspondence from [REDACTED] CEO of APA confirming that physiotherapist needs to regularly assess patients throughout their course of treatment and not just once or twice over an eight year period of treatment.

•(Item E) is a newsletter from [REDACTED] with the following announcements –

“we have had a number of productive meetings (with HF)”, “existing rebate (item 560) continue for clients”.

Would it be possible to clarify the nature of the meetings and explain why [REDACTED] was unable to be offered a productive meeting when requested at the end of last year. It is my understanding that three [REDACTED] representatives at the same time were able to find time to assist [REDACTED].

Advanced and Athlete Programs- maintenance phase of therapy- and can no longer claim a rebate under item 560.

I am not sure why [REDACTED] has been isolated and treated in the way it had been from [REDACTED]. I believe that the discrepancies are significant as well as the administration as listed above seemed to comply with [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] was even promoted on page 16 in the [REDACTED] publication [REDACTED] magazine, 5th of June 2014.

This has made me feel very uneasy and I have been unsure which direction to take, hence I have exhausted myself with my enquiries. Could you therefore please clarify each of my points raised as I have honestly felt, to a large extent unfairly done by. If by any chance, I have misunderstood any situation, please allow me to be the first person to apologise.

I sincerely hope this information is provided in good faith and I look forward to having an amicable meeting with you. I am very willing and able to take and accept your lead as well as anticipate, that you can assist me with finding a resolution.

Warm Regards,
Monte Elissa

This was the response from the (HF) to another email pointing out issues I had with Business X.

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]com.au>
To: [REDACTED] @yahoo.com.au
Cc: [REDACTED].org.au 18 Mar. 2015 at 6:37 pm

Dear Monte

Thank you for your email and this information. We cannot discuss our dealings with individual providers, with other providers, but I have passed this information to the Investigations Team for their review. [**I have no evidence this action was done, I doubt it happened as 'Jody' was involved in the meetings that allowed code switching with Business X. I was never contacted by the investigations team to provide or clarify any of my claims with evidence.**]

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]
Ancillary Benefits Manager

Sydney NSW
P [REDACTED] F [REDACTED] M [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].com.au
