

AUDITORS REPORT

CALENDAR YEAR 2017

SAN FRANCISCO HEALTH

PLAN RATE

DEVELOPMENT

TEMPLATE

July 16, 2020

Contents

- 1. Executive Summary 1
- 2. Procedures and Results..... 2
- 3. Summary of Findings 7

1

Executive Summary

Pursuant to federal requirements under Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations 438.602(e), the 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)¹. DHCS contracted with Mercer Government Human Services Consulting (Mercer) to fulfill this requirement for the financial data submitted in the Medi-Cal Rate Development Template (RDT) for calendar year (CY) 2017 by San Francisco Health Plan (SFHP). Mercer designed and DHCS approved procedures to test the accuracy, truthfulness and completeness of self-reported financial data in the RDT.

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 Bridge Year rating period (July 1, 2019 – December 31, 2020). The RDT tested was the final version, including any revisions stemming from resubmissions as a result of the RDT Q&A discussion guide process with the MCO.

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

- Schedule 1 Utilization and Cost Experience
- Schedule 1A – Global Subcontracted Health Plan Information
- Schedule 1C – Base Period Enrollment by Month
- Schedule 5 – Large Claims Report
- Schedules 6a and 6b – Financial Reports
- Schedule 7 – Lag Payment Information

The data collected in the RDT is reported on a modified accrual (incurred) basis for CY 2017 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 calendar year reported.

The procedures and results of the test work are enumerated in Table 1 of Section 2.

¹ 42 CFR 438.602(e)

2 Procedures and Results

We have performed the procedures enumerated in Table 1 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 SFHP for the CY 2017. SFHP's management is responsible for the content of the RDT and responded timely to all requests for information.

Table 1: Procedures

Category	Description	Results
Utilization and Cost Experience	We compared summarized total net cost data from amounts reported in Schedule 1 to Direct Medi-Cal category of service (COS) totals from Schedule 6a and to total incurred claims by COS for Schedule 7 for consistency.	No variance noted.
Global Subcontracted Payments	We reviewed the contractual arrangement with SFHP's global subcontractor and tested the overall net payments made to the global subcontractor by comparing the payment amounts to the net amount reported in Schedule 1A.	Variance: Net capitation paid amounts are overstated by 22.34%, or \$5.3 million, when compared to the amount reported in the RDT. This amount represents only 1.13% of total medical expenses.
	We reviewed the contractual arrangement with SFHP's global subcontractor and calculated results using the capitation rates included in the relevant contract amendment. We then compared the calculated contract results against the net capitated amount reported in Schedule 1A.	Variance: RDT understated by 2.18%, or \$514K.
	We selected the three highest months of payment and five randomly selected additional months of payment to obtain membership rosters for each month selected. Twenty randomly selected members from each month were checked to ensure eligibility. The same members were compared against claims included in the fee-for-service (FFS) data provided by SFHP to see if both SFHP and the global subcontractor paid claims.	No FFS claims paid for capitated services. All sampled members eligible.
	We reviewed members included on the member roster to ensure there were no Coordinated Care Initiative members or payments provided in the step above.	None identified.

Category	Description	Results
Member Months	We compared MCO reported member months from Schedule 1C to eligibility and enrollment information provided by the State. Our procedures are to request explanations for any member months with greater than 1% variance in total or greater than 2% variance by major category of aid.	Variance: RDT overstated by 0.15% in total.
Capitation Revenue	We discussed how capitation was recorded. SFHP records capitation revenue on an accrual basis using eligibility from the 834 data multiplied by rates established on the most current rate sheet received from DHCS.	RDT understated by 1.25% based on estimated revenue calculation using the known capitation rates in place during 2017.
Interest and Investment Income	We requested interest and investment income for the MCO entity as a whole and information regarding how the income provided in Schedule 6a was allocated to the Medi-Cal line of business.	No variance noted.
Fee For Service Medical Expense	Using data files (paid claims files) provided by SFHP, we sampled and tested transactions for each major category of service (COS) (Inpatient, Outpatient, Physician, Pharmacy, Facility-Long Term Care (LTC), and All Others) and traced sample transactions through SFHP claims processing system, the payment remittance advice, and the bank statements.	No variance observed.
	We compared detailed lag tables for each major COS (Inpatient, Outpatient, Physician, Pharmacy, Facility- (LTC), and All Others) created from the data files provided by SFHP and compared the information reported in Schedule 7. We compared the paid claims amounts from Schedule 7, line 35 to total paid claims prior to the additional runout detail included in the data files, expecting no changes.	Variance: RDT understated in total by 0.35%.
	We compared total final incurred amounts including incurred but not reported (IBNR) estimates from Schedule 7 to total paid amounts from all months reported in the data files to verify the accuracy/reasonableness of IBNR for each COS. Allowable absolute value variances were deemed to be not greater than 2% for inpatient claims and 1% for all other COS.	Variance: RDT over/(understated): Inpatient (0.22%); Outpatient (0.86%); LTC (3.12%); Physician (1.06%); Pharmacy (0.01%); All Other (0.68%); In Total (0.23%).

Category	Description	Results
	We reviewed a sample of claims from each COS to verify control totals, verify eligibility, confirm the COS grouping was correct, and confirm the year reported was correct.	Control totals: No variance noted. Eligibility: Verified for all members selected. COS Mapping: No variance noted. Service Year: No variance noted.
Sub-capitated Medical Expense	We compared reported sub-capitation payments to amounts reported in Schedule 7.	Variance: RDT overstated by 1.81%
	We sampled membership from three subcontractors, verified eligibility of members and analyzed claims to verify none of the FFS claims paid should have been paid by the sub-capitated provider.	No variance noted.
	We reviewed subcontract agreements and recalculated payment amounts for reasonableness.	No variance noted.
	We observed proof of payments for a sample of sub-capitated provider payments.	Variance: Sub-capitated medical expense payments are overstated by 0.01% based on proof of payments.
Provider Incentive Arrangements	We reviewed incentive arrangements and observed sample calculations for contractual compliance and reasonableness.	Variance: RDT understated by 0.71%.
Reinsurance	We reviewed the reinsurance contract and compared the amount on the RDT to the requested supporting schedule.	Variance: RDT medical expenses are overstated by 142.42%. SFHP did not offset premium expenses with reinsurance recoveries on the RDT. The variance is \$3.0 million, or 0.65% of total medical expenses.
	We recalculated reinsurance premiums, based on 2017 membership as of April 2019, to compare to reported amounts.	No variance noted.
	We recalculated recoveries for a sample of members.	No variance noted.

Category	Description	Results
Administrative Expenses	We benchmarked administrative expenses as a percentage of capitation across all Two-Plan/GMC plans and compared to the amount reported in Schedule 6a, taking into consideration the membership size of the plan under review when reviewing the results.	The benchmark administrative percentage was 5.50% and SFHP reported 7.02%. It should be noted that SFHP ranks as one of the smallest Two-Plan/GMC plans in terms of enrollment base (out of 14 plans). Therefore, it is expected that SFHP administrative expense percentage would be somewhat higher than the overall average.
	We compared detailed line items from the plan's trial balance mapped to line items in Schedule 6a for reasonableness. We reviewed allocation methodologies and recalculated for reasonableness.	Variance: RDT overstated by 0.01%.
Utilization Management, Quality Assurance, Care Coordination (UM/QA/CC)	We interviewed financial management to determine how health care quality improvement activities such as care coordination are isolated from general administrative expenses in the general ledger. We compared UM/QA/CC costs as a percentage of revenue to a benchmark for reasonableness across All Two-Plan/GMC plans. Confirmed with SFHP management via interview that UM/QA/CC costs were not also included in general administrative expenses.	The benchmark UM/QA/CC percentage was 1.23% and SFHP reported 2.95%. No variance noted when confirming UM/QA/CC costs were not also included in general administrative expenses.
Pharmacy	We confirmed and observed pharmacy benefit manager fees were recorded as administrative expenses and not included in pharmacy claims expenses in the RDT.	No variance noted.
Other Information	We reviewed the audited financial statements for the plan for the CY 2017 for a clean audit opinion or identification of significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.	No variance noted.

Category	Description	Results
	<p>We compared reported expenses, including IBNR and administrative expenses, to audited financial statements for consistency. A comparison to the audited financial statement medical expense was challenging due to lack of ability to split out SFHP separately, thus we compared the internal financial statement medical expenses compared to the reported RDT amounts. For administrative expenses, we were able to allocate the audited financial statement administrative based on member months between SFHP and other lines of business.</p>	<p>Variance: Both the audited and internal financial statements are on a June 30 fiscal year, whereas the RDT is reported on a calendar year. Therefore, estimations were used in order to compare RDT results to audited and internal financial statements. No significant issues were identified.</p>
	<p>We inquired how hospital-acquired conditions (HACs) were treated in the RDT and policies for payment.</p>	<p>SFHP reviews claims and encounter data to identify potentially preventable conditions (PPCs) and prepares a quarterly report that is reviewed by SFHP Fraud, Waste and Abuse workgroup. Report findings are presented to the Quality Improvement Committee and to the Physician Advisory Committee as appropriate to identify PPC trends and opportunities for improvement. PPC costs are not excluded from RDT results. A process should be developed in order to exclude these costs in future RDT reporting.</p>

Summary of Findings

Based on the procedures performed, the total amount of gross medical expenditures in the RDT were overstated by \$1,875,635 or 0.40% of total medical expenditures in the CY 2017 RDT.

Based on the procedures performed, administrative expenditures in the CY 2017 RDT were overstated by \$5,114 or 0.01%.

Based on the defined variance threshold, the results of the audit are determined to be immaterial and do not warrant corrective action.

SFHP has reviewed this report and has provided additional clarification on the findings but has no changes to the report.

Mercer (US) Inc.
2325 East Camelback Road, Suite 600
Phoenix, AZ 85016
www.mercer-government.mercer.com