|                   |  |   |                     |  | 2017 C                     | Consolidated 60-day comments for  | Part C Application  |          |  |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|----------|--|
| Comment<br>Number | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part | Application Section<br>(Number/ Header)                              | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question  | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source   |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
| 1                 | America's<br>Health<br>Insurance Plan      | 60 day  | Instructions        | 2.7 Types of Applications<br>-Service Area Expansion<br>Applications |                            | Service Area Expansion (SAE)applications<br>will require Health Service Delivery (HSD)<br>Tables for the entire network not just the<br>counties that an applicant is proposing to<br>expand into with the SAE request. | As a result of CMS' proposed requirement,<br>the number of counties for which SAE<br>applicants would be required to submit<br>HSD Tables could increase dramatically.<br>For example, a plan with an existing service<br>area that covers 50 counties that is seeking<br>to expand into 2 additional counties would<br>be required to submit HSD Tables for 52<br>counties instead of just 2. This is extremely<br>problematic because we understand that<br>HSD Table submissions require<br>preparation, review, and transmittal of large<br>volumes of data tables into the Health Plan<br>Management System (HPMS) through a<br>time-intensive, manual process that requires<br>substantial MA organization resources. | Deletion | Reject. CMS has an expectation that MAOs are<br>routinely monitoring their networks to confirm<br>that networks are in compliance with the current<br>network adequacy standards. Therefore, the<br>requirement to upload HSD tables for the entire<br>network at the contract level with a SAE<br>application submission is consistent with CMS's<br>expectations that MAOs are meeting network<br>standards. |
| 2                 | America's<br>Health<br>Insurance Plan      | 60 day  | Instructions        | 2.7 Types of Applications<br>-Service Area Expansion<br>Applications |                            | Request delay in implementation of SAE<br>requirement for MAO with large networks<br>beyond the CY 2017 application year  | To ensure the most cost-effective process<br>possible, we believe SAE applicants —<br>particularly those with large existing service<br>areas — require adequate time before the<br>implementation of such a new requirement<br>to explore how they could most efficiently<br>submit large amounts of network data<br>across multiple service areas and to<br>consider and implement changes to their<br>processes and systems. Accordingly, if<br>CMS decides to expand its HSD submission<br>requirement, we urge the agency to delay<br>implementation of any new requirement<br>beyond the CY 2017 application year.  | Revision | Reject. CMS has an expectation that MAOs are<br>routinely monitoring their networks to confirm<br>that networks are in compliance with the current<br>network adequacy standards. Therefore, the<br>requirement to upload HSD tables for the entire<br>network at the contract level with a SAE<br>application submission is consistent with CMS's<br>expectations that MAOs are meeting network<br>standards. |

| Comment<br>Number | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part |  | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question  | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source  |           | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|----------------------------|---|--|-----------|--|
| 3                 | Kaiser<br>Permanente                       | 60 day  | Instructions        | 2.7 Types of Applications-<br>Service Area Expansion<br>Applications | 17                         | Service Area Expansion (SAE)applications<br>will require Health Service Delivery (HSD)<br>Tables for the entire network not just the<br>counties that an applicant is proposing to<br>expand into with the SAE request. | We believe this requirement is<br>unnecessarily burdensome for the plan<br>sponsors and would not provide CMS with<br>any additional information related to the<br>purpose of the application – i.e., the<br>expansion of the MAO into a particular<br>county or counties. It would be very time<br>consuming for an MAO to submit HSD<br>tables for an entire network while at the<br>same time collecting the data and<br>information required for the 132 page Part<br>C (and 143 page Part D) SAE application<br>itself. We believe that the better process for<br>CMS to use to monitor network adequacy is<br>to include network adequacy as part of a<br>regular audit schedule for MAOs rather than<br>piggy-backing on the SAE application.   | Deletion  | Reject. CMS has an expectation that MAOs are<br>routinely monitoring their networks to confirm<br>that networks are in compliance with the current<br>network adequacy standards. Therefore, the<br>requirement to upload HSD tables for the entire<br>network at the contract level with a SAE<br>application submission is consistent with CMS's<br>expectations that MAOs are meeting network<br>standards. |
| ł                 | Kaiser<br>Permanente                       | 60 day  | Instructions        | 2.7 Types of Applications-<br>Service Area Expansion<br>Applications |                            | What is the intended impact/ramifications<br>to MAOs related to the SAE change?   | It is unclear what the ramifications of such<br>review by CMS would be as it relates to the<br>SAE itself. For example, would CMS deny<br>the MAO's application for the SAE even if<br>it met the access standards in the SAE<br>county but happened not to meet one of the<br>standards in an unrelated geographic area?<br>Would the MAO have the opportunity to<br>correct any deficiencies in non-SAE<br>counties separately from the application for<br>the SAE if it met network adequacy in the<br>SAE county? If CMS imposes the<br>requirement of concurrent submission of the<br>HSD tables for the entire network, we<br>recommend that CMS bifurcate the review<br>of the SAE from the review of the network<br>itself and address any deficiencies<br>separately from the approval of the SAE<br>application. | Insertion | Clarify. CMS is developing the process to<br>implement the SAE application change.<br>Additional information will be provided to the<br>industry prior to the CY 2017 application cycle.   |

| Comment<br>Number | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part          | Application Section<br>(Number/ Header)  | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question  | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source  | <br>CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)                                    |
|-------------------|--|---|------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|--|--|
| 5                 | United<br>Healthcare                       | •   | Due Dates for<br>Application | 1.8 Due Dates for<br>Applications – Medicare<br>Advantage and Medicare<br>Cost Plans |                            | Timeline for CMS Application, forms and<br>HSD Instructions are problematic for this<br>organization as the timeline does not allow<br>for the volume of HSD table submissions<br>anticipated with the SAE application<br>change. | We respectfully ask that CMS provide HSD<br>criteria and final instruction/forms earlier in<br>the process, with an October timetable<br>being optimal. Last year, the final CMS<br>Application, forms, and HSD instructions<br>were issued on January 14, 2015 with<br>applications due February 18, 2015. As a<br>high volume HSD table submitter, this<br>timeline is extremely problematic for our<br>organization. In order to develop HSD<br>Tables by the CMS deadline, UHC begins<br>to build them well in advance of the CMS<br>deadline and has tables largely built by<br>early December, several weeks before the<br>date that final application information is<br>made available by CMS. As a result, this<br>requires revising/repeating work and could<br>also require programming changes that are<br>difficult to accomplish in advance of the<br>CMS application deadline. | Clarify. CMS will accommodate the review of<br>additional counties within the annual application<br>cycle. |

| Comment<br>Number | Comment:<br>(Company | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part                |  | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question  | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source  |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
|-------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|--|----------|--|
| 6                 | United<br>Healthcare | 60 day  | Instructions                       | 2.7 Types of Applications<br>-Service Area Expansion<br>Applications |                            | Service Area Expansion (SAE)applications<br>will require Health Service Delivery (HSD)<br>Tables for the entire network not just the<br>counties that an applicant is proposing to<br>expand into with the SAE request.   | We strongly recommend that CMS omit this<br>new requirement from the CMS Application<br>process. It is unduly burdensome to require<br>that MAOs complete HSD Tables for the<br>entire existing MAO contract service area in<br>addition to those counties included in the<br>expansion application. We believe that this<br>new requirement will have the unintended<br>result of MAOs not expanding into new<br>service areas, thereby reducing the number<br>of MAO choices available to Medicare<br>beneficiaries. The purpose of submitting<br>HSD Tables to CMS during the application<br>process is to demonstrate to CMS the<br>MAO's ability to meet CMS network<br>adequacy standards for the service areas in<br>which the MAO is proposing to expand. We<br>believe that this new requirement goes<br>beyond the intent of the expansion<br>application process. |          | Reject. CMS has an expectation that MAOs are<br>routinely monitoring their networks to confirm<br>that networks are in compliance with the current<br>network adequacy standards. Therefore, the<br>requirement to upload HSD tables for the entire<br>network at the contract level with a SAE<br>application submission is consistent with CMS's<br>expectations that MAOs are meeting network<br>standards. |
| 7                 | United<br>Healthcare | 60day   | CMS State<br>Certification<br>Form | 4.4 CMS State<br>Certification Form                                  |                            | Request deletion of question #3 which<br>requests from the applicant to identify the<br>type of application filed with CMS. The<br>applicant is required to circle all of the<br>appropriate types which include: HMO,<br>PPO, MSA, PFFS and Religious/Fraternal. | We recommend CMS amend the state<br>certification form to delete question 3.<br>Specifically, the nomenclature creates<br>confusion for states that use different<br>terminology for benefit plans. For example,<br>a state may use the terms "closed panel" to<br>describe products, rather than the term<br>"HMO." From a state's perspective, an<br>HMO is typically a type of entity license.<br>The certification form is effective without<br>the question in that the state's obligation is<br>to certify that the applying entity is licensed<br>and solvent. Alternatively, regulatory<br>changes could be made to describe the<br>products more broadly to improve the<br>alignment with the terminology used by the<br>states.  | Deletion | Reject. The current language will be maintained in<br>the CMS State Certification form.  |

| Comment<br>Number | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part | Application Section<br>(Number/ Header)                   | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question   | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source  |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|---|----------------------------|--|--|----------|--|
| 8                 | United<br>Healthcare                       | 2   | HSD<br>Instructions | MA Provider Table -<br>Columns Explanations               |                            | Delete references to Column N -<br>Employment Status from section - Contract<br>Type descriptions because CMS deleted<br>Employment Status from the MA Provider<br>HSD tables. | We recommend that the HSD Instructions<br>be revised to omit the explanation and<br>reference to the Employment Status column<br>under this section.   | Deletion | Accept. CMS will delete references to column N-<br>Employment status as it has been deleted from the<br>MA Provider HSD table.   |
| 9                 | United<br>Healthcare                       | 5   | HSD<br>Instructions | Transplant Facilities List<br>Format                      |                            | Request for CMS to provide transplant<br>facilities list in file format such as .txt or<br>Excel/Access format instead of PDF file   | UHC appreciates CMS's inclusion of a<br>downloadable certified transplant facilities<br>list. However, the list is currently only<br>available in a PDF format, which requires<br>considerable manual manipulation to<br>convert to Microsoft Excel or Access for<br>automated reporting. We request that CMS<br>produce the certified transplant list in a .txt<br>or Excel/Access format similar to the other<br>website posted downloadable files of CMS<br>certified providers (e.g., Hospital, Home<br>Health, Suppliers) in order to streamline<br>this process and eliminate the need for<br>manual manipulation.   | Revision | Reject. The MAO has identified that the file is<br>only provided in a PDF format. We are unable to<br>confirm that another file format can be made<br>available for this document.   |
| 10                | United<br>Healthcare                       | 5   | HSD<br>Instructions | Facility Table Services –<br>Access to CMS<br>Information |                            | 1 9  | CMS often requires information that is not<br>readily available for use in an automated<br>fashion. For example, the number of<br>Medicare certified beds for hospitals,<br>skilled nursing facilities, intensive care<br>units, and inpatient psychiatric facilities is<br>not readily available to managed care<br>organizations (MCO). We request that CMS<br>provide information so that it is<br>downloadable in Excel or other data<br>formats. This will assist plans in their<br>automated production of HSD tables and<br>population of these fields with accurate<br>CMS information. For example, CMS could<br>provide a resource from which MCOs can<br>obtain bed counts, by hospital location, so<br>that this information is consistent and<br>available to all health plans. |          | Reject: We would suggest that MAOs identify<br>sources for obtaining and confirming this<br>information such as facility websites. No<br>government data base is going to be as current and<br>up to date as the facility's own official record in<br>the CEO or CFO's office. |

| Comment<br>Number | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part |  | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question  | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source   |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|----------|--|
| 11                | United<br>Healthcare                       | 60day   | HSD<br>Instructions | Facility Table Services –<br>Inaccurate Information<br>on Medicare Website |                            | Inaccuracy of data regarding facility<br>services identified on Medicare.gov  | Through our research, we have noticed that<br>Medicare's website often lists services<br>available at an acute inpatient hospital even<br>though the hospital operating certificate<br>may not be approved by Department of<br>Health to provide those services.<br>Additionally, it appears that hospitals can<br>remain on these lists even after the hospital<br>confirms that it does not actually provide<br>those services. This is especially<br>problematic when these providers are being<br>considered by CMS to determine MAO<br>network adequacy and accessibility or when<br>a network exception is being requested by a<br>MAO. We ask that CMS not utilize the<br>Medicare.gov website when the data has<br>been verified by the MAO as being<br>inaccurate or that CMS clarify how to best<br>address the situation when a service or<br>provider is incorrectly posted to<br>Medicare.gov as being a Medicare<br>participating provider. |          | Clarify- Medicare.gov information is not the sole<br>source of information about the Medicare status of<br>individual services or components operated by a<br>hospital. MAOs are encouraged to identify other<br>resources that are currently utilized within the<br>industry. |
| 12                | United<br>Healthcare                       | 60 day  | HSD<br>Instructions | Appendix A – CY 2017<br>HSD Submission<br>Frequently Asked<br>Questions    | 13                         | Request for Automated Criteria Checks<br>(ACC) be available on demand instead of<br>scheduled pre-checks for HSD tables | Appendix A of the HSD Instructions for CY<br>2017 Applications states that HSD pre-<br>checks are only allowed on specific dates<br>and times, Thursdays by 8:00pm ET. Since<br>Automated Criteria Checks (ACC) are<br>automated, we request that CMS create an<br>open window for on-demand pre-checks in<br>lieu of date/time specific limitations. This<br>would allow table editing work to remain<br>more fluid and timely.  | Revision | Clarify. CMS is developing the process to<br>implement the SAE application change.<br>Additional information will be provided to the<br>industry prior to the CY 2017 application cycle  |

|    | Source of<br>Comment:<br>(Company<br>Name) | 2017 MA<br>Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part                     | Application Section<br>(Number/ Header) | Application Page<br>Number | Description of the Issue or Question   | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source   |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with Modification, Reject, Clarify)                             |
|----|--|---|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|----------|--|
| 13 | United<br>Healthcare                       | 60day   | HSD<br>Exception<br>Request<br>Template |   |                            | Duplicative and Redundant language<br>regarding the listing of contracted<br>providers/facilities on the Exception request<br>template | The Exception form currently reads, "List<br>the contracted providers/facility that will<br>ensure access (they must be listed in the<br>HSD Table under the country in which they<br>are providing services). Also, list the closest<br>contracted provider/facility of the specialty<br>code type." UHC believes that this<br>requirement for health plans to list the<br>contracted providers/facilities "that will<br>ensure access" is both duplicative and<br>redundant as this information is already<br>listed on the HSD table. For that reason, we<br>suggest that the Exception form be edited to<br>read "List the closest contracted<br>provider/facility of the specialty code type." |          | Accept with Modification: CMS is considering<br>revisions to the Exception Request template. |
| 14 | United<br>Healthcare                       | 60day   | MA Provider<br>HSD Table                | N/A                                     |                            | Request to remove the column M - CMS<br>Model MA Contract from the table and<br>correspondence HSD instructions                        | The MA Provider table has the required<br>data element of "Uses CMS MA Contract<br>Amendment? Y for yes, N for no." We<br>believe that this is unnecessary as this is<br>already addressed as an attestation. Since<br>this included in the attestation, we request<br>that CMS remove this question from the<br>HSD tables.  | Deletion | Reject. CMS will maintain the current format of<br>the MA Provider HSD Table.                |
| 15 | United<br>Healthcare                       | 60day   | MA Facility<br>HSD Table                | N/A                                     |                            | Request to remove the column L - CMS<br>Model MA Contract from the table and<br>correspondence HSD instructions                        | The MA Facility table has the required data<br>element of "Uses CMS MA Contract<br>Amendment? Y for yes, N for no." We<br>believe that this is unnecessary as this is<br>already addressed as an attestation. Since<br>this included in the attestation, we request<br>that CMS remove this question from the<br>HSD tables.  | Deletion | Reject. CMS will maintain the current format of<br>the MA Facility HSD Table.                |

| Comment<br>Number | Name)                                 | Application<br>60 day or<br>30 day | Application<br>Part | (Number/ Header)   | Number |   | Comments & Recommendation(s) from<br>Source  |          | CMS Decision (Accept, Accept with<br>Modification, Reject, Clarify)  |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|---|--|----------|--|
| 16                | Health Care<br>Service<br>Corporation | 60day                              | Instructions        | 2.7 Types of Applications<br>-Service Area Expansion<br>Applications |        | will require Health Service Delivery (HSD)<br>Tables for the entire network not just the<br>counties that an applicant is proposing to<br>expand into with the SAE request. | Completion and review of the HSD tables,<br>as well as the required accompanying<br>exceptions process when providers are not<br>available in certain areas, entails substantial<br>time and effort for the applicant and for<br>CMS reviewers. We are concerned about<br>the additional time and effort for applicants<br>and CMS that this proposed<br>requirement would entail and suggest that<br>CMS not move forward with the<br>requirement. If CMS<br>does decide to implement the requirement<br>despite these concerns, we recommend that<br>for SAEs in contracts that include more<br>than one state, CMS limit the HSD<br>submission to only the state in which the<br>expansion is proposed. | Deletion | Reject. CMS has an expectation that MAOs are<br>routinely monitoring their networks to confirm<br>that networks are in compliance with the current<br>network adequacy standards. Therefore, the<br>requirement to upload HSD tables for the entire<br>network at the contract level with a SAE<br>application submission is consistent with CMS's<br>expectations that MAOs are meeting network<br>standards. |
|                   |                                       |                                    |                     |  |        |   |  |          |  |