



***Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit (APTC) Program Assessment Report***

***for***

***Medica Health Plans (Minnesota)***

***November 19, 2020***

## Table of Contents

<b>I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. RESULTS OF REVIEW .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV. FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>V. MANAGEMENT RESPONSES .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix 1 – Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix 2 – Applicable Regulations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix 3 – Glossary of Terms and Acronyms .....</b>	<b>20</b>

---

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Background

Medica Health Plans (Medica) is a health insurance issuer that offered qualified health plans (QHPs) in the individual market State-Based Exchange (SBE) in Minnesota during the 2015 benefit year. Medica submitted its final restated 2015 benefit year data in the July 2016 Enrollment and Payment Data Workbook (EPDW). The issuer received a total of \$3,260,441.56 in advance payments of the premium tax credit (APTC) from CMS and reported a total of \$9,489,896.40 in premiums for its 2015 benefit year individual market plans.

This report is an assessment, conducted in coordination with the SBE, of Medica's compliance with the APTC program established in sections 1401 and 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. L. 111–148) enacted on March 23, 2010 and further amended and revised by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–152) enacted on March 30, 2010 (collectively referred to throughout as PPACA), and implementing regulations. This report also details the results of the assessment of premiums for information purposes only as CMS did not charge user fees to issuers offering QHPs through SBEs during the 2015 benefit year.

### Audits to Determine Compliance with the Administration of APTC Program

Under title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) sections §§ [155.1210](#) and [156.480](#), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) may audit<sup>1</sup> issuers that offer a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange to assess the degree of compliance with the APTC program requirements. HHS designates the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to conduct these audits and to achieve the following objectives:

- Safeguard Federal funds;
- Instill confidence amongst regulated entities of data quality, soundness, and robustness;
- Evaluate health insurance issuer compliance with program rules and regulations; and
- Develop a successful and coordinated risk-based, multi-year audit program that maximizes resources.

This audit is part of CMS's program to validate the enrollment and payment data reported in the final 2015 EPDW submitted by the issuer, and to analyze controls and policies of selected issuers pursuant to the authority defined in 45 CFR §§ 155.1210 and 156.480.

The findings and observations are documented below. If CMS found an instance of issuer non-compliance with APTC program requirements that requires correction to the APTC reported in

---

<sup>1</sup> To provide the flexibility needed when standing up a new oversight program and to ensure that issuers are able to provide CMS with their most accurate data, audit protocols allow for dialog between auditor and issuer to identify and correct errors in data submission that differ somewhat from some independence and reporting standards laid out under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). These procedures were defined and executed consistent with the competence, integrity, and analytical discipline required for performance audits as defined by GAGAS.

the final EPDW, then CMS classified it as a *finding*. If CMS found a deviation from CMS or Exchange requirements that we are calling to the attention of management for purposes of improving compliance in future program years, but that does not require correction to payment, then CMS categorized it as an *observation*.

### **Results of Review**

CMS identified two (2) findings and one (1) observation for Medica. The net APTC financial impact of the two (2) findings is an understatement of \$1,369.98 in APTC in the final EPDW and therefore a payment to Medica of \$1,369.98, consisting of APTC paid to Medica. The net premium impact of the one (1) observation is an overstatement of \$24,874.29 in premiums in the final EPDW. The findings and observation include the following:

#### **Findings:**

1. Differences in APTC amounts identified in the comparison of the issuer's data included in the July 2016 EPDW submitted by Medica to a Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from Medica's systems; and
2. Inclusion of premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts and therefore incorrect APTC amounts for four (4) subscribers in the Payment Desk Audit File.

#### **Observation:**

1. Differences in premium amounts identified in the comparison of the issuer's data included in the July 2016 EPDW submitted by Medica to a Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from Medica's systems.

Please refer to section IV for details on the findings and observation listed above, including the condition, cause, effect, corrective actions, and the issuer's responses.

---

## **II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY**

---

### **A. Background**

Sections 1401 and 1412 of the PPACA established the APTC program to support the provision of affordable health care coverage to individuals.

CMS has the responsibility to confirm successful implementation of, and adherence to, the PPACA provisions and implementing regulations governing the APTC program. As such, CMS established this audit program.

#### **Interim Payment Process**

In 2015, CMS implemented a temporary process (“interim payment process”) to calculate and make monthly payments of APTC and advance cost-sharing reduction (CSR) amounts. CMS used this interim payment process to calculate payments for all SBE issuers for the 2014-2017 benefit years. CMS transitioned most SBE issuers to policy-based payments (PBP) in 2018 and transitioned the last SBE to PBP in 2020.

For the 2015 benefit year, the interim payment process required SBE issuer submitters, including issuers in Minnesota, to self-report enrollment and payment data on a monthly basis, including any adjustments to previous months’ requests, via manual submission of an EPDW, and to attest to the accuracy of the data. SBE issuer submitters were required to calculate the QHP enrollment and payment amounts and to submit that information in the EPDW using their internal source data.

CMS calculated and made monthly payments based on the QHP data submitted in the EPDW. While using this interim process, CMS designed and implemented a robust set of internal controls within a larger program integrity framework to ensure payment accuracy. CMS required submitters to send the following QHP plan information at the variant level via the password-protected template:

1. State
2. Tax Identification Number (TIN)
3. Health Insurance Oversight System (HIOS) ID
4. QHP ID
5. Total premium amount for all enrollments
6. Total APTC amount
7. Total advance CSR amount
8. Total effectuated enrollment groups
9. Total effectuated enrollment groups with APTC
10. Total effectuated enrollment groups with advance CSR
11. Total effectuated members
12. Total effectuated members with APTC
13. Total effectuated members with advance CSR

CMS conducted a SBE payment close-out process for the 2015 benefit year in which CMS compared the EPDW data against the policy-level reporting (PLR) data submitted by the SBE. The PLR data was based on the monthly submissions that SBEs sent to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for reporting purposes and contained cumulative individual market enrollment APTC data. CMS requested that SBEs append an additional field for the QHP ID for each policy and separately submit the data to CMS for this purpose. CMS asked SBEs or SBE issuers to explain any outlier discrepancies between EPDW and PLR data and to re-submit the EPDW, if necessary, or to verify that payment data was accurate despite discrepancies with PLR data.

## **B. Regulations Governing APTC Program**

CMS established an audit protocol to assess health insurance issuers' compliance with the following regulations governing APTC program:

- [45 CFR § 155.1210](#): Maintenance of Records;
- [45 CFR § 156.460](#): Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit; and
- [45 CFR § 156.480](#): Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs.

Please refer to Appendix 2 for the specific requirements established under the authorities listed above.

## **C. Objectives**

The objectives of this audit are to:

- (1) Evaluate the accuracy and integrity of issuer-generated EPDW data reported for premiums and the APTC program;
- (2) Identify potential CMS APTC payment errors resulting from issuer data reporting errors;
- (3) Test accuracy and integrity of issuer processes for reducing an enrollee's share of premium to account for APTCs.

## **D. Scope and Methodology**

CMS selected Medica for an audit to assess the issuer's compliance with 45 CFR §§ 155.1210, 156.460 and 156.480. CMS evaluated Medica's activities related to the 2015 benefit year (January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015) individual market data reported in the final EPDW submitted in July 2016 by the issuer to CMS to support APTC payments and premium amounts.

CMS sent Medica an electronic letter on February 15, 2019 to notify them of the scope of this audit. CMS's audit contractor sent a follow-up letter to Medica on February 20, 2019 that identified data requirements required to conduct the audit. CMS's audit contractor reviewed the audit data file submitted by Medica, as well as the final 2015 EPDW submitted by the issuer to CMS and the PLR data submitted by the SBE to CMS, and used CMS's audit procedures to assess compliance with APTC program rules and regulations.

CMS's audit contractor applied CMS's audit protocol to identify the findings and observations listed in section IV of this report. CMS's audit contractor performed the following procedures:

- Validations of the Payment Desk Audit File<sup>2</sup> data submitted to CMS:
  - EPDW Validations: Review and comparison of the issuer's final submitted 2015 EPDW to the Payment Desk Audit File from the issuer's systems.
  - Unreconciled Subscribers Review: Review and comparison of the subscribers reported in the Payment Desk Audit File to the subscribers included in the SBE's PLR data to determine if the subscribers existed and their coverage was effectuated in the issuer's system (i.e., the amount the subscriber is responsible to pay toward the first month's total premium amount has been paid in full by the subscriber).
  - Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from the issuer's systems to verify that duplicate Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs (i.e., Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs that were reported in the file twice in the same month with full month or incorrectly prorated payment data) were not reported in the file.
  - Premium Less than APTC Validation: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File to verify that the subscribers' premium amounts reported in the file were not less than the APTC amounts reported in the file.
  - Coverage Days Validation: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported in the file were effectuated and had active coverage in the issuer's systems.
- Validations on samples of issuer's systems data:
  - Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review: Review and comparison of the coverage periods, premium and APTC amounts from the issuer's systems to the corresponding data included in the SBE's PLR data for a selected sample of forty-five (45) subscribers.
  - Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review: Analysis and review of data and documentation from the issuer's systems to verify effectuation and the appropriate application of premium and APTC amounts to policies for a selected sample of fifteen (15) subscribers.
- Policy and Procedure Review: Review of issuer APTC policies and procedures for completeness and clarity.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Payment Desk Audit File is CMS's standard document for issuers to provide information in support of this audit.

---

### **III. RESULTS OF REVIEW**

---

CMS assessed issuer compliance with regulations using the following procedures: EPDW Validations, Unreconciled Subscribers Review, Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check, Premium Less than APTC Validation, Coverage Days Validation, Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review, Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review, and Policy and Procedure Review.

To build collaborative relationships and identify process improvements that support program integrity goals, CMS conducted a discrepancy phase following the review of the initial audit data submission to work with the issuer to resolve or reduce audit findings, thereby improving compliance. Additional follow-up with the SBE was performed as necessary to confirm or resolve the identified audit findings. Below are the results of this review following the discrepancy phase.

#### **EPDW Validation**

One (1) finding and one (1) observation resulted from the comparison of the final 2015 EPDW submitted by the issuer to Medica's Payment Desk Audit File. Please refer to Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 included in section IV for details on the finding and observation.

#### **Unreconciled Subscribers Review**

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Medica's Payment Desk Audit File to determine if the subscribers reported in the file existed and their coverage was effectuated in the issuer's systems.

#### **Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check**

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Medica's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that duplicate Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs were not reported in the file.

#### **Premium Less than APTC Validation**

One (1) finding and no observations resulted from the review of Medica's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that subscribers were not reported in the file with premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts. Please refer to Finding No. 2 included in section IV for details on the finding.

#### **Coverage Days Validation**

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Medica's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported in the file were effectuated and had active coverage in the issuer's systems.

#### **Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review**

No findings or observations resulted from the review and comparison of the data from Medica's systems to the corresponding data included in the SBE's PLR data to determine accuracy of the reported enrollment months and the application of premium and APTC for a selected sample of forty-five (45) subscribers.



**Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review**

No findings or observations resulted from the review of the data and documentation from Medica's systems to verify effectuation and the appropriate application of premium and APTC amounts to policies for a selected sample of fifteen (15) subscribers.

**Policy and Procedure Review**

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Medica's APTC policies and procedures.

---

#### IV. FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

---

A finding is an identification of an instance of issuer non-compliance with APTC program requirements that requires correction to payment. CMS's audit procedures identified two (2) findings, which resulted in a change to the APTC amounts reported in Medica's EPDW for individual market plans for the 2015 benefit year.

An observation is a deviation from CMS or Exchange requirements that we are calling to the attention of management for purposes of improving compliance in future program years but that does not require correction to payment. CMS's audit procedures identified one (1) observation that resulted in a change to the premium amounts reported in Medica's EPDW for individual market plans for the 2015 benefit year.

In light of the two (2) findings and one (1) observation, the adjusted 2015 benefit year EPDW APTC and premium amounts for individual market plans are shown in the following table.

##### Recalculated EPDW for the 2015 Benefit Year

	APTC	Premium (Observations)
EPDW as Filed in July 2016	\$3,260,441.56	\$9,489,896.40
Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 - EPDW Validations Adjustment	\$6,287.34	\$(24,874.29)
Finding No. 2 – Premium Less Than APTC Validation Adjustment	\$(4,917.36)	\$0.00
EPDW As Recalculated	\$3,261,811.54	\$9,465,022.11
<b>Total Impact</b>	<b>\$1,369.98</b>	<b>\$(24,874.29)*</b>

**Note:** Positive APTC values indicate funds owed to the issuer.

The net financial impact of the two (2) findings is a payment of \$1,369.98, consisting of APTC paid to Medica.

\*Note: The premium impact of the one (1) observation is an overstatement of \$24,874.29 in premiums. The premium impact is noted for purposes of improving compliance in future program years.

For the two (2) findings and one (1) observation, CMS documented the criteria, cause, effect, corrective actions, and Medica's responses as seen in the charts below.

<b>Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations</b>	
<b>Condition:</b>	<p><b>APTC Differences (Finding):</b> For one (1) or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in eleven (11) QHPs, the net "Total APTC Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in Medica's EPDW was less than the total APTC amount included in Medica's Payment Desk Audit File, resulting in an underpayment of \$6,287.34 in APTC. For the one (1) or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in eleven (11) QHPs, the total net enrollment in the EPDW was overstated by three (3) APTC enrollment groups and understated by six (6) APTC members.</p> <p><b>Premium Differences (Observation):</b> For one (1) or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in twenty-six (26) QHPs, the net "Total Premium Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in Medica's EPDW was greater than the total premium amount included in Medica's Payment Desk Audit File, resulting in an overstatement of \$24,874.29 in premiums. For the one (1) or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in twenty-six (26) QHPs, the net total enrollment in the EPDW was overstated by forty-six (46) enrollment groups and fifty-two (52) members.</p>
<b>Criteria:</b>	<p>Pursuant to CMS guidance and EPDW submission requirements:</p> <p>The "Total APTC amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" submitted on the EPDW is the "total APTC toward the total premium amount for effectuated enrollments within a 16-digit QHP ID."</p> <p>The "Total premium amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" submitted on the EPDW is the "total premium amount for the health coverage for all effectuated enrollments within that plan."</p>
<b>Cause:</b>	<p>For the APTC differences, the issuer indicated the "identified discrepancies are due in large part to a file coding error when the data was pulled for the final restated 2015 EPDW which was submitted for the last time in July of 2016, as well as an enrollment issue." The issuer provided the following additional information about the discrepancies that caused the differences and resulted in the Payment Desk Audit File having the correct, updated APTC data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the file coding error, the issuer indicated "The 2015 EPDW workbook which was pulled from our data warehouse did not accurately represent that the APTC was capped at the total premium amount due, because of a coding error within the file. In our actual production billing system, the premium was indeed capped, and members received invoices which reflected accurate amounts."</li> </ul>

**Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations**

- For the enrollment issue, the issuer indicated that a “member appealed an enrollment decision with CMS, and won. The 2018 decision by CMS resulted in instruction from MNsure to Medica to enroll this particular family onto a Medica plan retroactively from 3/1/2015 to 11/30/2015. This family had APTC during the 2015 timeframe.” The issuer further indicated “When this appeal decision from CMS arrived in late 2018 there was no way for Medica to request payment from CMS for the 2015 APTC amounts. Medica provided the APTC to the family as instructed by our state exchange MNsure, and also reduced the family’s monthly premium amounts accordingly. Medica did not have a mechanism to request that CMS supply the APTC dollars to Medica for that family during the 2015 timeframe.”

For the premium differences, the issuer indicated the “identified discrepancies in nearly all instances are due to rating demographic restatements, (changes in gender, address changes, smoking status, etc.) all components which have an effect on the premium charged. The other instance of discrepancy involves human error.” The issuer provided the following additional information about the discrepancies that caused the differences and resulted in the Payment Desk Audit File having the correct, updated premium data:

- For the demographic restatements that resulted in the corrected premium amounts in the Payment Desk Audit File, the issuer further indicated, “In 2017 MNsure resolved the demographic issue which contributed to the wrong rate.” The issuer further indicated that “Medica did not issue a corrected invoice to the affected members in 2017, relating to their 2015 policy, as this was an Exchange error and several members had since terminated their policies for various reasons.”
- For the discrepancy related to human error, the issuer indicated that for one (1) member, “the smoking status was listed inaccurately. It was corrected in 2017 per direction from MNsure, but this was after the last 2015 EPDW production file was submitted to CMS in July of 2016 - thus restatement was not possible then, but the change now appears in the 2019 data.”

**Effect:**

The APTC and premium differences resulted in a change to Medica’s final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW data.

<b>Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations</b>	
<b>Corrective Action Required:</b>	<p>The net financial impact of this finding is a payment of \$6,287.34, consisting of APTC paid to Medica. Medica should confirm the financial impact and coordinate on resolution with CMS.</p> <p>The premium impact of this observation is an overstatement of \$24,874.29 in premiums. CMS notes this observation for purposes of improving compliance in future program years.</p>
<b>Management Response:</b>	Medica agrees with Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations

<b>Finding No. 2 - Premium Less than APTC Validation</b>	
<b>Condition:</b>	Medica reported 2015 benefit year premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts for four (4) subscribers in the Payment Desk Audit File resulting from Medica overstating the 2015 benefit year APTC amounts for those subscribers in the Payment Desk Audit File.
<b>Criteria:</b>	Issuers cannot report an APTC amount that exceeds the premium amount for a policy.
<b>Cause:</b>	<p>The issuer indicated the following explanations for the four (4) subscribers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "This is a mid-month partial member termination (5/17/15) scenario." The issuer further indicated "Medica is required to adjust the premium amount to account for only the 15 days the spouse was covered, but the APTC is not prorated accordingly."</li> <li>• The Payment Desk Audit File "did not accurately represent that the APTC was capped at the total premium amount due, because of a coding error within the file. In our actual production billing system, the premium was indeed capped, and members received invoices which reflected accurate amounts. In this example, the APTC amount listed in MNsure's ST file was listed as \$1009.36 but Medica capped the APTC amount at the premium amount due of \$573.96."</li> <li>• "Medica received a MNsure ST file on 9/03/15 instructing to remove the spouse and APTC of \$1047.58 as of 9/1/2015. Therefore the member was only billed \$545.23, his premium amount for the month of September."</li> <li>• "Medica received another MNsure ST file to adjust the APTC on 3/01/15. This member was billed correctly in March and April of</li> </ul>

<b>Finding No. 2 - Premium Less than APTC Validation</b>	
	<p>2015; and billed \$0 for February 2015, as his APTC covered the full premium owed."</p> <p>The issuer provided the correct APTC amounts that were capped at the premium amounts for the four (4) subscribers.</p>
<b>Effect:</b>	The inclusion of the APTC amounts that exceeded the premium amounts for the four (4) subscribers resulted in a change to Medica's final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW data.
<b>Corrective Action Required:</b>	The net financial impact of this finding is a payment of \$4,917.36, consisting of APTC owed to CMS. Medica should confirm the financial impact and coordinate on resolution with CMS.
<b>Management Response:</b>	Medica agrees with Finding No. 2 - Premium Less than APTC Validation

---

## **V. MANAGEMENT RESPONSES**

---

Please provide management's response to the two (2) findings and one (1) observation identified in the draft audit report and complete the attached Appendix 1 - Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment (Appendix 1), within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. Management's response should indicate agreement or disagreement.

### **Agreement**

If management agrees with the two (2) findings and one (1) observation, complete the "Management Response" field of the findings and observation in the draft audit report, and initial "Agree" and sign the attached Appendix 1. Return the draft audit report including Appendix 1 within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. Upon receipt of the signed Appendix 1, CMS will finalize and publish the report on the CCIIO webpage. CMS will process the final payment adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

### **Disagreement**

If management disagrees with either of the two (2) findings and corrective actions or one (1) observation, complete the "Management Response" field of the findings and observation in the draft audit report, and initial "Disagree" and sign the attached Appendix 1. Return the draft audit report including Appendix 1 and any supporting documentation that substantiates management's response within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. This will be the final opportunity to provide information or supporting documentation to correct any inaccuracies in the report before it is finalized.

CMS will review the written explanations in the "Management Response" field of the findings and observation and any supporting documentation to determine if the report can be amended in a mutually acceptable manner. If you and CMS are unable to come to a mutually acceptable result, your response to this report will be included in the final published audit report.

Please return the updated Appendix 1 within fifteen (15) calendar days. Upon receipt of the signed Appendix 1, CMS will finalize and publish the report on the CCIIO webpage. CMS will process the final payment adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

## Appendix 1 – Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment

Issuer HIOS ID: 65847

Issuer Name: Medica Health Plans (Medica)

The undersigned Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or other individual who can legally and financially bind this issuer has reviewed the information included in the audit report of the issuer's 2015 benefit year APTC program participation, resulting in a payment of \$1,369.98 to Medica and:

(INITIAL)     X     Agrees with the audit net adjustment amount above, confirming the audit finding(s) and observation(s), if applicable, and as such this report will be considered final and published.

**OR**

(INITIAL)            Disagrees and requests a review of additional information that may impact the audit net adjustment amount resulting from the 2015 benefit year audit. If review is requested, CMS will consider this draft only a preliminary audit report. If the review option is selected, you must provide a written explanation with any additional documentation when you return this response within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of this draft audit report. CMS will review the written explanation and any supporting documentation to determine if the report can be amended in a mutually acceptable manner. If you and CMS are unable to come to a mutually acceptable result, your response to this report will be included in the final published audit report.

Signed: Geoff Bartsh  
(Signature) acting on behalf of the issuer)

Printed Name: Geoff Bartsh  
(Print name of signature)

Title: SVP, Individual & Family Business  
(Title of authorized person acting on behalf of the Issuer)

Telephone Number: 952-992-2461  
(Direct Telephone Number)

Date: 12/1/2020



## Appendix 2 – Applicable Regulations

The following table identifies the specific regulatory requirements around which CMS has organized its audits.

Regulation	Rules
<b>45 CFR § 155.1210 – Maintenance of Records</b>	<p><b>(a) General.</b> The State Exchange must maintain and must ensure its contractors, subcontractors, and agents maintain for 10 years, documents and records (whether paper, electronic, or other media) and other evidence of accounting procedures and practices, which are sufficient to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Accommodate periodic auditing of the State Exchange's financial records; and</li><li>(2) Enable HHS or its designee(s) to inspect facilities, or otherwise evaluate the State- Exchange's compliance with Federal standards.</li></ul> <p><b>(b) Records.</b> The State Exchange and its contractors, subcontractors, and agents must ensure that the records specified in paragraph (a) of this section include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Information concerning management and operation of the State Exchange's financial and other record keeping systems;</li><li>(2) Financial statements, including cash flow statements, and accounts receivable and matters pertaining to the costs of operations;</li><li>(3) Any financial reports filed with other Federal programs or State authorities;</li><li>(4) Data and records relating to the State Exchange's eligibility verifications and determinations, enrollment transactions, appeals, and plan variation certifications; and</li><li>(5) Qualified health plan contracting (including benefit review) data and consumer outreach and Navigator grant oversight information.</li></ul> <p><b>(c) Availability.</b> A State Exchange must make all records and must ensure its contractors, subcontractors, and agents must make all records in paragraph (a) of this section available to HHS, the OIG, the Comptroller General, or their designees, upon request.</p>

Regulation	Rules
<p><b>45 CFR § 156.460 - Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit</b></p>	<p><b>(a) Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit.</b> A QHP issuer that receives notice from the Exchange that an individual enrolled in the issuer's QHP is eligible for an advance payment of the premium tax credit must—</p> <p>(1) Reduce the portion of the premium charged to or for the individual for the applicable month(s) by the amount of the advance payment of the premium tax credit;</p> <p>(2) Notify the Exchange of the reduction in the portion of the premium charged to the individual in accordance with § 156.265(g); and</p> <p>(3) Include with each billing statement, as applicable, to or for the individual the amount of the advance payment of the premium tax credit for the applicable month(s), and the remaining premium owed.</p>
<p><b>45 CFR § 156.480 - Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs.</b></p>	<p><b>(a) Maintenance of records.</b> An issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through a State Exchange must adhere to, and ensure that any relevant delegated entities and downstream entities adhere to, the standards set forth in § 156.705 concerning maintenance of documents and records, whether paper, electronic, or in other media, by issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange, in connection with cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit.</p> <p><b>(b) Annual reporting requirements.</b> For each benefit year, an issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange must report to HHS, in the manner and timeframe required by HHS, summary statistics specified by HHS with respect to administration of cost-sharing reduction and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs, including any failure to adhere to the standards set forth under § 156.410(a) through (d), § 156.425(a) through (b), and § 156.460(a) through (c) of this Part.</p> <p><b>(c) Audits.</b> HHS or its designee may audit an issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange to assess compliance with the requirements of this subpart.</p>

Regulation	Rules
<p><b>45 CFR § 156.705 – Maintenance of records for Federally-facilitated Exchanges</b></p>	<p>(a) <b>General standard.</b> Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must maintain all documents and records (whether paper, electronic, or other media) and other evidence of accounting procedures and practices, necessary for HHS to do the following:</p> <p>(1) Periodically audit financial records related to QHP issuers' participation in a Federally-facilitated Exchange, and evaluate the ability of QHP issuers to bear the risk of potential financial losses; and</p> <p>(2) Conduct compliance reviews or otherwise monitor QHP issuers' compliance with all Exchange standards applicable to issuers offering QHPs in a federally-facilitated Exchange as listed in this part.</p> <p>(b) <b>Records.</b> The records described in paragraph (a) of this section include the sources listed in § 155.1210(b)(2), (3), and (5) of this subchapter.</p> <p>(c) <b>Record retention timeframe.</b> Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must maintain all records referenced in paragraph (a) of this section for 10 years.</p> <p>(d) <b>Record availability.</b> Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must make all records in paragraph (a) of this section available to HHS, the OIG, the Comptroller General, or their designees, upon request.</p>

### Appendix 3 – Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

<b>Terms &amp; Acronyms</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>APTC</b>	Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit
<b>CEO</b>	Chief Executive Officer
<b>CFO</b>	Chief Financial Officer
<b>CFR</b>	Code of Federal Regulations
<b>CMS</b>	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
<b>CSR</b>	Cost-sharing Reduction
<b>DHHS</b>	Department of Health and Human Services
<b>EPDW</b>	Enrollment and Payment Data Workbook
<b>GAGAS</b>	Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards
<b>HIOS</b>	Health Insurance Oversight System
<b>IRS</b>	Internal Revenue Service
<b>PPACA</b>	Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act
<b>PLR</b>	Policy-level Reporting
<b>QHP</b>	Qualified Health Plan
<b>SBE</b>	State-based Exchange
<b>TIN</b>	Tax Identification Number