



Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit (APTC) & Federally-facilitated Exchange (FFE) User Fee (UF) Program Assessment Report

for

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City (Missouri) (BCBS of KC (MO))

December 11, 2019

Table of Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	5
III. RESULTS OF REVIEW	8
IV. FINDINGS	10
V. OBSERVATIONS.....	16
VI. MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	17
Appendix 1 – Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment	18
Appendix 2 – Applicable Regulations	19
Appendix 3 – Glossary of Terms and Acronyms	21

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City (Missouri) (BCBS of KC (MO)) is a health insurance issuer that offered qualified health plans (QHPs) in the individual market Federally-facilitated Exchange (FFE) in Missouri during the 2015 benefit year. BCBS of KC (MO) submitted its final restated 2015 benefit year data in the November 2016 Enrollment and Payment Data Workbook (EPDW). The issuer received a total of \$50,265,718.72 in advance payments of the premium tax credit (APTC) from CMS, and paid a total of \$2,876,800.90 in FFE user fees (UF) to CMS for its 2015 benefit year individual market plans.

This report is an assessment of BCBS of KC (MO)'s compliance with the APTC and FFE user fee programs established in sections 1311 and 1401 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.

Audits to Determine Compliance with the Administration of APTC and FFE User Fee Programs

Under title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) sections §§ [156.480](#) and [156.705](#), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) may audit¹ issuers that offer a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange to assess the degree of compliance with the APTC and FFE user fee 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 on the final 2015 EPDW, and to analyze controls and policies of selected issuers pursuant to the authority defined in the regulations.

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

¹ 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.

payment, then CMS classified it as a *finding*. If CMS found a deviation from APTC and FFE user fee program 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 three (3) findings and no observations for BCBS of KC (MO). The net financial impact of the three audit findings is a payment to BCBS of KC (MO) of \$134,961.04, consisting of \$166.37 in FFE user fees owed to CMS and \$135,127.41 in APTC paid to BCBS of KC (MO). The findings include the following:

1. Differences in premium/FFE user fee and APTC amounts identified in the comparison of the issuer's data included in the EPDW to a UF/APTC Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from BCBS of KC (MO)'s systems;
2. Inclusion of premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File; and
3. Inclusion of enrollment and payment data for one (1) subscriber with a coverage period of five (5) days or fewer that was not effectuated in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File.

Please refer to section IV for details on the findings 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. Additionally, section 1311 of the PPACA allows the FFEs to charge participating issuers user fees to support FFE operations.

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

Interim Payment Process

Since automated payment systems were not yet developed during the first years of FFE implementation, CMS implemented an interim payment process to calculate and make monthly payments of APTC and advance Cost-sharing Reduction (CSR) amounts, and to collect FFE user fees. The interim payment process required issuers 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.

For the 2015 benefit year, CMS used this interim payment process to calculate and make monthly payments based on 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 FFE User Fee amount
9. Total effectuated enrollment groups
10. Total effectuated enrollment groups with APTC
11. Total effectuated enrollment groups with advance CSR
12. Total effectuated members
13. Total effectuated members with APTC
14. Total effectuated members with advance CSR

FFE issuers were required to calculate the QHP enrollment and payment amounts and submit that information in the EPDW template using their internal source data.

B. Regulations Governing APTC and FFE User Fee Programs

CMS established an audit protocol to assess health insurance issuers' compliance with the following regulations governing APTC and FFE user fee programs:

- 45 CFR § [156.50](#): Financial Support;
- 45 CFR § [156.460](#): Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit;
- 45 CFR § [156.480](#): Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs; and
- 45 CFR § [156.705](#): Maintenance of records for Federally-facilitated Exchanges.

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 the APTC and FFE user fee programs;
- (2) Identify potential CMS APTC payment and FFE user fee collection errors resulting from issuer data reporting errors; and
- (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 BCBS of KC (MO) for an audit on issuer compliance with the aforementioned regulations. CMS evaluated BCBS of KC (MO)'s activities related to the 2015 benefit year (January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015) individual market data reported on the final EPDW submitted in November 2016 by the issuer to CMS to support APTC and FFE user fee collections.

CMS sent BCBS of KC (MO) an electronic letter on May 11, 2018 to notify them of the scope of this audit. CMS's audit contractor sent a follow-up letter to BCBS of KC (MO) on May 14, 2018 that identified data requirements required to conduct the audit. CMS's audit contractor reviewed the audit data file submitted by BCBS of KC (MO) and used CMS's audit procedures to assess compliance with APTC and FFE user fee program rules and regulations.

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

- Validations of the UF/APTC Desk Audit File² data submitted to CMS:
 - EPDW Validations: Review and comparison of the issuer's final submitted 2015 EPDW to the UF/APTC Desk Audit File from the issuer's systems.

² The UF/APTC Desk Audit File is CMS's standard document for issuers to provide information in support of this audit.

- Unreconciled Subscribers Review: Review and comparison of the subscribers reported on the UF/APTC Desk Audit File to the subscribers included in CMS's systems 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 UF/APTC 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 on the file twice in the same month with full month or incorrectly prorated payment data) were not reported on the file.
- Premium Less than APTC Validation: Review of the UF/APTC Desk Audit File to verify that the subscribers' premium amounts reported on the file were not less than the APTC amounts reported on the file.
- Coverage Days Validation: Review of the UF/APTC Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported on 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 CMS's systems 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.

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. Below are the results of this review.

EPDW Validation

One (1) finding and no observations resulted from the comparison of the final 2015 EPDW to BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File. Please refer to Finding No. 1 included in section IV for details on the finding.

Unreconciled Subscribers Review

No findings or observations resulted from the review of BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File to determine if the subscribers reported on 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 BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File to verify that duplicate Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs were not reported on the file.

Premium Less than APTC Validation

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

Coverage Days Validation

One (1) finding and no observations resulted from the review of BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported on the file were effectuated and had active coverage in the issuer's systems. Refer to Finding No. 3 included in section IV for details on the finding.

Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review

No findings or observations resulted from the review and comparison of the data from BCBS of KC (MO)'s systems to the corresponding data included in CMS's systems 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 BCBS of KC (MO)'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 BCBS of KC (MO)'s APTC policies and procedures.

IV. FINDINGS

A finding is an identification of an instance of issuer non-compliance with APTC and FFE user fee program requirements that requires correction to payment. CMS's audit procedures identified three (3) findings that resulted in a change to BCBS of KC (MO)'s reported EPDW for individual market plans for the 2015 benefit year. In light of the three (3) findings, the adjusted 2015 benefit year EPDW APTC and FFE user fee amounts for individual market plans are shown in the following table.

Recalculated EPDW for the 2015 Benefit Year

	FFE User Fees	APTC
EPDW as Filed in November 2016	\$(2,876,800.90)	\$50,265,718.72
Finding No. 1 – EPDW Validations Adjustment	\$(134.17)	\$134,509.44
Finding No. 2 – Premium Less Than APTC Validation Adjustment	\$(32.60)	\$627.00
Finding No. 3 – Coverage Days Validation Adjustment	\$0.40	\$(9.03)
EPDW As Recalculated	\$(2,876,967.27)	\$50,400,846.13
Total Financial Impact	\$(166.37)	\$135,127.41

Note: Positive values indicate funds owed to the issuer.

The net financial impact of the three audit findings is a payment to BCBS of KC (MO) of \$134,961.04, consisting of \$166.37 in FFE user fees owed to CMS and \$135,127.41 in APTC paid to BCBS of KC (MO).

For the three (3) audit findings, CMS documented the criteria, cause, effect, corrective actions, and BCBS of KC (MO)'s responses as seen in the charts below.

Finding No. 1 – EPDW Validations	Condition:	<p>Premium and FFE User Fee Differences – For one or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in seven (7) QHPs, the net "Total Premium Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in BCBS of KC (MO)'s EPDW was less than the total premium amount included in BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File, resulting in an understatement of \$3,833.44 in premiums and therefore underpayment of \$134.17 in FFE user fees. For the one or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in seven (7) QHPs, the EPDW was overstated by eight (8) enrollment groups and one hundred ninety-three (193) members.</p> <p>APTC Differences – For one or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in forty-six (46) QHPs, the net "Total APTC Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in BCBS of KC (MO)'s EPDW was less than the total APTC amount included in BCBS of KC (MO)'s UF/APTC Desk Audit File, resulting in an underpayment of \$134,509.44 in APTC. For the one or more months of 2015 benefit year enrollment in forty-six (46) QHPs, the EPDW was overstated by seventy-six (76) APTC enrollment groups and understated by one thousand and ninety-nine (1,099) APTC members.</p>
	Criteria:	<p>Per CMS guidance and EPDW submission requirements:</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" and the Total User Fee Amount by QHP ID is "the total FFE user fee amount the issuer can expect to incur for participation in the Federally-facilitated Exchange."</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>Additionally, the premium and APTC amounts reported in the EPDW and in the enrollment group</p>

		<p>enrollment records of the UF/APTC Desk Audit File must be prorated using the proration formulas set forth in the 2015 payment notice and outlined in 45 CFR § 155.240.</p>
	<p>Cause:</p>	<p>CMS noted the UF/APTC Desk Audit file included correctly prorated amounts; however, the final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW did not include correctly prorated amounts as \$0.00 APTC amounts were reported for mid-month re-enrollments with APTC. As a result, CMS concluded the APTC amounts reported on the final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW were understated by \$134,509.44 as the final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW did not include the correctly prorated amounts, per CMS guidance. Additionally, CMS concluded the premium amounts reported on the final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW were understated by \$3,833.44, therefore resulting in an understatement of \$134.17 in FFE user fees, as a result of premium amount updates reported in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File.</p> <p>The net overstatements in enrollment groups and members and understatements in APTC members identified in the condition represent aggregated differences, i.e., the aggregated overstatements and understatements include QHP-level overstatements in some months and QHP-level understatements in other months. The differences may have resulted from incorrect reporting of the enrollment groups and members reported on the EPDW due to the lack of guidance, uncertainty around EPDW reporting requirements, and/or differences in the approaches for calculating and reporting enrollment groups and members on the EPDW versus the approaches for calculation and reporting enrollment groups and members for audit purposes.</p>
	<p>Effect:</p>	<p>The premium/FFE user fee and APTC differences resulted in a change to BCBS of KC (MO)'s final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW data.</p>
	<p>Corrective Action Required:</p>	<p>The net financial impact of this finding is a payment to BCBS of KC (MO) of \$134,375.27, consisting of \$134.17 in FFE user fees owed to CMS and \$134,509.44 in APTC paid to BCBS of</p>

		KC (MO). BCBS of KC (MO) should confirm the financial impact and coordinate on resolution with CMS as indicated in section VI of this report.
	Management Response:	Management concurs.

Finding No. 2 - Premium Less than APTC Validation	Condition:	BCBS of KC (MO) reported premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File. As a result, BCBS of KC (MO) understated the 2015 benefit year premium and APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File.
	Criteria:	Issuers cannot report a premium amount that is less than an APTC amount. Per CMS guidance, the premium amount reported on the EPDW is the premium amount by 16 digit QHP ID for the effectuated enrollment within a qualified health plan.
	Cause:	<p>The issuer indicated "Premium record (not eligibility) was incorrectly terminated as of 3/8/15. This data error resulted in the issue shown here. Member has eligibility and paid in full for coverage through 6/30/15. The issuer provided an updated desk audit file and the last three months (months 04 – 06) were removed from the updated desk audit file. Additionally, the updated desk audit file included a premium amount that was less than the APTC amount for month 03." The issuer further noted "The desk audit file should include enrollment from 1/1/2015 through 6/30/2015 with a premium amount of \$248.94 and APTC amount of \$209.00 for all months of enrollment. This reflects the information in our billing system and the actual consumer interaction."</p> <p>Based on the feedback that the premium and APTC amounts should be reported for all months of enrollment, CMS concluded that the 2015 benefit year premium and APTC amounts reported for the one (1) subscriber in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File were understated.</p>

	Effect:	The inclusion of the incorrect premium amount and the exclusion of the premium and APTC amounts for the one (1) subscriber resulted in a change to BCBS of KC (MO)'s final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW data.
	Corrective Action Required:	The net financial impact of this finding is a payment to BCBS of KC (MO) of \$594.40, consisting of \$32.60 in FFE user fees owed to CMS and \$627.00 in APTC paid to BCBS of KC (MO). BCBS of KC (MO) should confirm the financial impact and coordinate on resolution with CMS as indicated in section VI of this report.
	Management Response:	Management concurs.

Finding No. 3 - Coverage Days Validation	Condition:	BCBS of KC (MO) overstated the 2015 benefit year premium and APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the UF/APTC Desk Audit File by incorrectly reporting a cancelled enrollment.
	Criteria:	Per CMS guidance and EPDW submission requirements, the issuer must create a single Inbound UF/APTC Desk Audit File consisting of detailed enrollment group effectuated enrollment records (one per enrollment group, per month) with the corresponding payment data.
	Cause:	The issuer indicated "Enrollment was cancelled for nonpayment of premium. One day of eligibility remained in the system. This was an error."
	Effect:	The inclusion of the premium and APTC amounts for the one (1) subscriber resulted in a change to BCBS of KC (MO)'s final, restated 2015 benefit year EPDW data.
	Corrective Action Required:	The net financial impact of this finding is a payment to CMS of \$8.63, consisting of \$0.40 in FFE user fees returned to BCBS of KC (MO) and \$9.03 in APTC owed to CMS. BCBS of KC (MO) should confirm the financial impact and coordinate

		on resolution with CMS as indicated in section VI of this report.
	Management Response:	Management concurs.

V. OBSERVATIONS

An observation is a deviation from APTC and FFE user fee program 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 no observations.

VI. MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

Please provide management's response to the three (3) findings 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 three (3) findings, complete the "Management Response" field of the findings 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. CMS will process the final adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

Disagreement

If management disagrees with any of the three (3) findings and corrective actions, complete the "Management Response" field of the findings 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 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.

CMS will provide an updated audit report, including the stated final adjustment amount along with an updated Appendix 1, following receipt and review of management's response. Please return the updated audit report with management responses and signed Appendix 1 within fifteen (15) calendar days. Upon receipt of the signed Appendix 1, CMS will finalize and publish the report and process the final adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

Appendix 1 – Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment

Issuer HIOS ID: 34762

Issuer Name: Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City (Missouri) (BCBS of KC (MO))

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 and FFE UF program participation, resulting in a payment to BCBS of KC (MO) of \$134,961.04, consisting of \$166.37 in FFE user fees owed to CMS and \$135,127.41 in APTC paid to BCBS of KC (MO), and:

(INITIAL) SM Agrees with the audit net adjustment amount above, confirming the audit finding(s) and observations(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: Scott Mc Adams
(Signature of authorized person acting on behalf of the issuer.)

Printed Name: Scott Mc Adams
(Print name of signature)

Title: SVP, Chief Audit, Compliance & Risk Officer
(Title of authorized person acting on behalf of the Issuer)

Telephone Number: 86-395-3650
(Direct Telephone Number)

Date: 01/07/2020

Appendix 2 – Applicable Regulations

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

Regulation	Guidance
<p>45 CFR § 156.50 – Financial Support</p>	<p>(a) <i>Definitions.</i> The following definitions apply for the purposes of this section: <i>Participating issuer</i> means any issuer offering a plan that participates in the specific function that is funded by user fees. This term may include: health insurance issuers, QHP issuers, issuers of multi-State plans (as defined in § 155.1000(a) of this subchapter), issuers of stand-alone dental plans (as described in § 155.1065 of this subtitle), or other issuers identified by an Exchange.</p> <p>(b) <i>Requirement for State-based Exchange user fees.</i> A participating issuer must remit user fee payments, or any other payments, charges, or fees, if assessed by a State-based Exchange under § 155.160 of this subchapter.</p> <p>(c) <i>Requirement for Federally-facilitated Exchange user fee.</i> To support the functions of Federally-facilitated Exchanges, a participating issuer offering a plan through a Federally-facilitated Exchange must remit a user fee to HHS each month, in the timeframe and manner established by HHS, equal to the product of the monthly user fee rate specified in the annual HHS notice of benefit and payment parameters for the applicable benefit year and the monthly premium charged by the issuer for each policy under the plan where enrollment is through a Federally-facilitated Exchange.</p>
<p>45 CFR § 156.460 - Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit</p>	<p>(a) Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit. 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (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; (2) Notify the Exchange of the reduction in the portion of the premium charged to the individual in accordance with § 156.265(g); and (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.

Regulation	Guidance
<p>45 CFR § 156.480 - Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs.</p>	<p>(a) Maintenance of records. 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) Annual reporting requirements. 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>(c) Audits. 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>
<p>45 CFR § 156.705 – Maintenance of records for Federally-facilitated Exchanges</p>	<p>(a) General standard. 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) Records. 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) Record retention timeframe. 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) Record availability. 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

Terms & Acronyms	Definition
APTC	Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMS	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
CSR	Cost-sharing Reduction
EPDW	Enrollment and Payment Data Workbook
FFE	Federally-facilitated Exchange
GAGAS	Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HIOS	Health Insurance Oversight System
PPACA	Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act
QHP	Qualified Health Plan
SBE	State-based Exchange
TIN	Tax Identification Number