

State Fiscal Year 2021 CalViva Health Plan Mainstream Rate Development Template

Auditor's Report

California Department of Health Care Services August 8, 2024

Contents

| Section 1: Executive Summary | 3 |
|---|----|
| Section 2: Procedures and Results | 4 |
| Section 3: Summary of Findings | 10 |
| Appendix A: Administrative Duties in Subcontracted Arrangements | 11 |

Section 1: Executive Summary

Pursuant to federal requirements under Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations 438.602(e), the State of California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) must periodically, but no less frequently than once every three years, conduct, or contract for the conduct of, an independent audit of the accuracy, truthfulness, and completeness of the encounter and financial data submitted by, or on behalf of, each managed care organization (MCO). DHCS contracted with Mercer Government Human Services Consulting (Mercer), part of Mercer Health & Benefits LLC, to fulfill this requirement for the financial data submitted in the Medi-Cal rate development template (RDT) for state fiscal year (SFY) 2021 by CalViva Health Plan (CVH). Mercer designed and DHCS approved procedures to test the accuracy, truthfulness, and completeness of self-reported financial data in the RDT. The resulting procedures are limited due to the nature of expenses reported on CVH's RDT. CVH has a global subcontract for all their members and maintains a limited scope of services paid for by CVH. Therefore, the procedures are limited to those services, as well as testing the global subcontracted expense and administrative expenses.

The specific financial schedules selected for testing are used by Mercer as a critical part of the base data development process for capitation rate development related to the calendar year 2023 rating period. The RDT tested was the final version, including any revisions stemming from resubmissions as a result of the RDT Question and Answer discussion guide process with the MCO.

The key schedules subject to testing from the RDT included, but were not limited to:

Schedules 6a and 6b — Financial Reports

The data collected in the RDT is reported on a modified accrual (incurred) basis for SFY 2021 and does not follow generally accepted accounting principles with regards to retroactivity from prior year activity, including claim or capitation accruals, retroactive enrollment, or termination of enrollment of members from prior years. The data provided is designed to report only financial and enrollment activity incurred for the SFY reported.

The procedures and results of the test work are enumerated in the Table(s) of Section 2.

Section 2: Procedures and Results

Mercer has performed the procedures enumerated in the Table(s) below, which were designed by Mercer and were reviewed and agreed to by DHCS, solely to test the completeness, accuracy, and truthfulness of information reported in the Medi-Cal RDT from CVH for SFY 2021. CVH's management is responsible for the content of the RDT and has responded in a timely manner to all requests for information.

Table(s): Procedures

| Fee-For-Service (FFS) Medical Expense | |
|---|---|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed all paid claims data for each category of service (COS) to verify control totals, verify eligibility and enrollment in the Mainstream Medi-Cal program, confirm the COS grouping was correct, confirm the year reported was correct, and confirm enrollment with the MCO for date of service. | Control totals: No variance noted. Eligibility: Verified for 99.94% of claims submitted. COS Map: Review of all COS showed 99.82% match for all COS. Service Year: No variance noted. All dates of service fall within SFY 2021. |
| Using data files (paid claims files) provided by the MCO, Mercer sampled and tested 36 transactions and traced them through the MCO's claims processing system, the payment remittance advice, and the bank statements. | No variance noted. |

| Global Subcontracted Payments | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed the global contractor's | Variance: RDT reported global |
| RDT submitted to DHCS and compared | subcontracted expense is 2.61%, or |
| the reported capitation revenue to the | \$27,253,120, greater than the amount |
| CVH reported global subcontracted | reported by the global subcontractor. The |
| expense. | variance is primarily due to the timing of |
| | CVH RDT submission as compared to the |
| | global subcontractor RDT submission. |
| Mercer selected the three highest months | Variance: The RDT reported global |
| of payment by globally subcontracted | subcontracted amount is understated by |
| health plan/provider and five randomly | 3.63%, or \$25,951,249, as |

| Global Subcontracted Payments | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| selected additional months of payment. | compared to the detailed sampled |
| Mercer observed proof of payments via | payment support. The variance is |
| relevant bank statements, clearinghouse | primarily due to capitation retroactivity. |
| documentation, or other online financial | No additional testing deemed necessary. |
| institution support for the sampled global | |
| capitated payments. The proof of | |
| payment information was greater than | |
| the supporting detail provided for the | |
| sampled global capitated providers. | |
| If applicable, Mercer reviewed Full Dual | Confirmed reduced rates as compared to |
| member global contracted PMPMs to | the non-Full Dual COA groups. |
| determine whether the amount(s) are at a | |
| reduced rate as compared to the | |
| non-Full Dual category of aid (COA) | |
| groups. | |
| Mercer reviewed the sampled global | Mercer reviewed the global capitated |
| capitated contracts to determine | contract to determine the level of |
| delegated administrative duties. Using | administrative functions included. See |
| this information, Mercer then reviewed | Appendix A for details. Related |
| the amount of administrative dollars | administrative dollars were not |
| reported in the RDT as compared to the | segregated out and reclassified as |
| delegated administrative functions. | administrative expense. |

| Sub-Capitated Medical Expense | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed a sample of the five | Variance: Detailed support for |
| highest provider payments and 10 | sub-capitated amounts in the sample test |
| random payments, reviewed the related | work is overstated by 0.08%, or |
| contractual arrangements, and | \$1,514. This amount is 0.00% of total |
| recalculated the total payment amounts | medical expense. |
| by sub-capitated provider using roster | |
| information provided by the MCO. The | |
| recalculated amounts were less than the | |
| sub-capitation amount reported in the | |
| supporting detail provided. | |
| Mercer observed proof of payments via | |
| relevant bank statements, clearinghouse | No variance noted. |
| documentation, or other online financial | |

| Sub-Capitated | Medical Expense |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| institution support for the sampled sub- | |
| capitated provider payments in the | |
| previous step. The proof of payment | |
| information validated the supporting | |
| detail provided for the sampled sub- | |
| capitated providers. | |
| For sub-capitated arrangements 5% or | CVH did not have any sub-capitated |
| more of total medical expense or major | arrangements that exceeded the 5% or |
| COS, Mercer reviewed the sampled sub- | more of total medical expense threshold. |
| capitated contracts to determine | |
| delegated administrative duties. Using | |
| this information, Mercer then reviewed | |
| the amount of administrative dollars | |
| reported in the RDT as compared to the | |
| delegated administrative functions. | |

| Member Months | |
|---|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer compared MCO-reported | CVH was not required to submit member |
| member months to eligibility and | month information for the period under |
| enrollment information provided by the | review. |
| State. Mercer's procedures are to request | |
| explanations for any member months | |
| with greater than 0.5% variance in total or | |
| greater than 1.0% variance by major COA. | |

| Provider Incentive Arrangements | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer requested a listing of all provider | Per CVH, no provider incentive |
| incentive arrangements, by provider and | arrangements were in place for the |
| by month, and compared the amounts to | period under review. |
| Schedule 6a. | |

| Reinsurance | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer requested reinsurance supporting | Per CVH, no reinsurance arrangements |
| detail. Mercer compared the support | were in place for SFY 2021. |
| provided to the amount reported in the | |
| RDT. | |

| Settlements | |
|--|---|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer inquired of the MCO whether they incurred any settlement amounts with providers related to SFY 2021 dates of service. If settlements existed, Mercer noted whether the amounts are actual or estimates based on the status of the settlements and where the amount(s) are | Per CVH, no settlements were paid for SFY 2021. |
| reported in the RDT. | |

| Third-Party Liability (TPL) | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed information submitted | Per review of the support provided and |
| by the MCO as how TPL is identified and | confirmation with DHCS, CVH is |
| reported. Per DHCS All Plan Letter (APL) | submitting TPL information as required |
| 21-007, the MCO is not required to | by APL 21-007. No further testing |
| collect TPL, however, they are required to | necessary. |
| report to DHCS service and utilization | |
| information for covered services related | |
| to TPL. | |

| Administrative Expenses | |
|---|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer benchmarked administrative | The administrative percentage reported |
| expenses as a percentage of net revenue | by CVH was within an acceptable range |
| across all Two-Plan plans and compared | as compared to industry standards. |
| to the amount reported in the RDT, | |
| taking into consideration the | |
| membership size of the plan when | |
| reviewing the results. | |

| Administrative Expenses | |
|--|--------------------|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer compared detailed line items | |
| from the plan's trial balance for | |
| reasonableness when mapped to line | |
| items in Schedule 6a and/or Schedule 6b. | No variance noted. |
| If applicable, Mercer | |
| reviewed allocation methodologies and | |
| recalculated for reasonableness. | |

| Taxes | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed to ensure proper | CVH is exempt from income taxes; |
| reporting of federal, State, and local taxes | therefore, no taxes were reported on the |
| on line 59 of Schedule 6a. If no taxes | RDT. |
| were reported on Schedule 6a, we | |
| confirmed the organization is not subject | |
| to taxes. | |

| Related Party Transactions | |
|---|---|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer obtained related party | CVH related party transactions are less |
| agreements for medical services and | than 0.03% of total medical expense, thus |
| reviewed to determine whether the terms | no additional testing deemed necessary. |
| are at fair market value. Mercer | |
| compared the terms (e.g., PMPM or other | |
| payment rate amounts) to other similar | |
| non-related party terms for | |
| reasonableness. | |

| UM/QA/CC | |
|---|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer benchmarked UM/QA/CC | Not applicable. CVH did not incur any |
| expenses as a percentage of total medical | UM/QA/CC expenses as all were |
| expense across all Two-Plan plans and | performed by the global subcontractor. |
| compared to the amount reported on | |
| Schedule 6a, taking into consideration | |
| the membership size of the plan when | |
| reviewing the results. | |

| Capitation Revenue | |
|---|---|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer compared capitation amounts | Variance: RDT is overstated by 4.69%, or |
| reported in Schedule 6a for calendar year | \$79,034,548. The reason for the variance |
| 2020 plus January-June 2021 (1H2021) | is due to the timing of the RDT |
| with the Capitation Management System | submission as compared to the timing of |
| (CAPMAN) file received from DHCS for | the CAPMAN file. |
| the same period. The CAPMAN file | |
| contains all amounts paid to the health | |
| plan by DHCS. | |

| Interest and Investment Income | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer requested interest and investment | Variance: RDT is understated by 116.86% |
| income for the MCO entity as a whole | or \$301,564. Medi-Cal line of business is |
| and information regarding how the | the only line of business. |
| income provided in Schedule 6a was | |
| allocated to the Medi-Cal line of | |
| business. | |

| Other Information | |
|--|--|
| Description of Procedures | Results |
| Mercer reviewed the plan's audited financial statements for SFY 2021 for a clean audit opinion or identification of significant deficiencies or material weaknesses. | Clean audit opinion confirmed. |
| Mercer compared reported expenses, including IBNR and administrative expenses, to audited financial statements for consistency. | No material variances noted. |
| Mercer requested information on the efforts to identify and recover provider overpayments and on how the recoveries are recorded in the RDT. | CVH provided the written policy for the identification and recovery of overpayments. Based on a review of that policy, CVH is appropriately not reporting any provider overpayments in the RDT medical expenses. |

Section 3: Summary of Findings

Based on the procedures performed, the total amount of capitation revenue for the SFY 2021 RDT was overstated by \$79,034,548, or 4.69%.

Based on the procedures performed, the total amount of gross medical expenditures in the RDT was understated by \$27,253,120, or 2.61%, of total medical expenditures in the SFY 2021 RDT.

Based on the procedures performed, administrative expenditures in the SFY 2021 RDT showed no variance. In addition, the plan should prepare for properly recording a portion of their global and provider sub-capitation expense as administrative, thus reducing their medical expense.

Based on the limited scope of the audit, the results do not warrant corrective action.

CVH reviewed and accepted this report.

Appendix A: Administrative Duties in Subcontracted Arrangements

| Administrative Task | Health Net (Global) |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Quality Management | X |
| Quality Measure Tracking | X |
| Member Grievance | X |
| Encounter Submission | X |
| Claims Adjudication and Payment | X |
| Member Services | X |
| Provider Services | X |
| Case Management | X |
| Claims Processing | X |
| Utilization Management | X |
| Provider Relations and Education | X |
| Provider Contracting | X |
| Credentialing and Re-Credentialing | X |



Mercer Health & Benefits LLC 2325 East Camelback Road, Suite 600 Phoenix, AZ 85016 www.mercer-government.mercer.com

Services provided by Mercer Health & Benefits LLC.

Copyright © 2023 Mercer Health & Benefits LLC. All rights reserved.