Appendices

Appendices A through P present each NQTL, the member scenarios, benefit categories (IP - Inpatient; OP - Outpatient; EC - Emergency Care; PD - Prescription Drugs), a comparative analysis of the policies and procedures applied to the MH/SUD and M/S benefits in the identified member scenario, and whether or not compliance was determined. Appendix O presents the Availability of Information analysis.

Appendix A - Prior Authorization

Description: Prior authorization review (PAR) requires a provider submit a request before performing a service and may only render it after receiving approval. *Note that no emergency services require prior authorization*.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing utilization management policies, timelines for the processing of authorizations, documentation requirements, methods of document submission, and reviewer qualifications.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | Used by | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, PD | No | ✓ Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, PD | No | √ Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | ✓ Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | ✓ Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | ✓ Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | ✓ Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, PD | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP & OP |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Prior Authorization

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Inpatient Services | | | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | No IP MH/SUD services are subject to PAR. | IP PAR is used for select M/S procedures or services to establish medical necessity. ⁹ | | |
| | | Excluded from PAR requirement are long term rehab facilities and maternity related services. | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 1 business day. | 1 business day. | | |
| Strategy | ' | ' | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes ¹⁰ | Yes ¹¹ | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize inpatient services? | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | | |

⁹ The codes and services that the Department primarily focuses on when determining whether to PAR are those procedures, services, or supplies that may or may not be medically necessary, have a more appropriate lower level of care, or have a more appropriate setting and/or have a higher risk for waste, fraud, and abuse. For those services and benefits that are primarily elective and/or are rarely medically necessary, the Department may utilize methods other than prior authorization to decrease unnecessary or inappropriate utilization such as claim edits, closing or placing limits on codes, etc. Procedures that are medically necessary the vast majority of the time with a lower risk for waste, fraud, and abuse are rarely subject to PAR.

¹⁰ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same. ¹¹ Ibid.

PARITY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS REPORT

Prior Authorization

Findings: Scenario 1 - Inpatient Services

The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting.

The inpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Furthermore, no inpatient MH/SUD services are subject to PAR so the policies for MH/SUD are much less stringent than those for inpatient M/S.

| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Outpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | PAR is only required for OP pediatric behavioral therapy (PBT) services. | There are thousands of codes that require PAR, including conditional PAR requirements. ¹² Some conditional PAR requirements exist where in certain circumstances a PAR would not be needed (ie: | | | |
| | | diapers under unit limit 250) but these are all listed on the fee schedule. | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 10 business days | 10 business days | | | |

¹² The utilization management vendor for the Department's fee-for-service benefit is responsible for reviewing the majority of codes in the following benefit categories: Durable Medical Equipment (DME), Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Pediatric Behavioral Therapy, Speech Therapy, Synagis, select medical surgeries, transgender services, bariatric surgeries, EPSDT Exceptions, Audiology, Vision, Diagnostic Imaging, Molecular Testing, Out of State Inpatient Admissions, Private Duty Nursing, Pediatric Long Term Home Health, Pediatric Personal Care Services. To view the PAR requirements for each code, see the Fee Schedule(s).

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes ¹³ | Yes ¹⁴ | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize outpatient services? | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | | | |
| | PBT is the only OP MH/SUD service subject to internally developed criteria | 1328 REV codes and CPT codes that utilize in whole or in part internally developed, state developed criteria. | | | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 1 - Outpatient Services

The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting.

The outpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Furthermore, only 1 outpatient MH/SUD service is subject to PAR so the policies for MH/SUD are much less stringent than those for outpatient M/S.

¹³ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same. ¹⁴ Ibid.

| SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Pharmacy Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Medications that are listed as non-preferred agents on the preferred drug list require PAR. Drug products requiring a prior authorization for the Health First Colorado pharmacy benefit are listed in Appendix P - Pharmacy Benefit Prior Authorization Procedures and Criteria ¹⁵ . Exceptions exist within drug category and can be found in Appendix P. Some physician administered drugs (PADs) are subject to PAR as of 2021. Exceptions exist within drug category and can be found in Appendix P. | Medications that are listed as non-preferred agents on the preferred drug list require PAR. Drug products requiring a prior authorization for the Health First Colorado pharmacy benefit are listed in Appendix P - Pharmacy Benefit Prior Authorization Procedures and Criteria ¹⁶ . Exceptions exist within drug category and can be found in Appendix P. Some physician administered drugs (PADs) are subject to PAR as of 2021. Exceptions exist within drug category and can be found in Appendix P. | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 24 hours | 24 hours | | | |
| Does the plan impose any prior authorization requirements or step therapy requirements as a prerequisite to authorizing coverage for any prescription medication approved by the Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of substance use disorders? If so, please explain. | Νο | No | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine | Internally developed guidelines are used. | Internally developed guidelines are used. | | | |

¹⁵ The Department of Health Care Policy & Financing Pharmacy Resources webpage: https://hcpf.colorado.gov/pharmacy-resources ¹⁶ Ibid.

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| whether to prior authorize pharmacy services? | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Yes. Criteria are based on FDA product labeling, CMS approved compendia, clinical practice guidelines, and peer-reviewed medical literature. All reviews go to the Drug Utilization Review Board who review and act as an advisory council. Criteria are updated as new best practices are established. | Yes. Criteria are based on FDA product labeling, CMS approved compendia, clinical practice guidelines, and peer- reviewed medical literature. All reviews go to the Drug Utilization Review Board who review and act as an advisory council. Criteria are updated as new best practices are established. | | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 1 - Pharmacy Services

Colorado Medicaid requires prior authorization for all drugs not listed on the preferred drug list (PDL). The PDL is developed based on safety, effectiveness, and clinical outcomes from classes of medications where there are multiple drug alternatives available and supplemental rebates from drug companies, allowing Colorado the ability to provide medications at the lowest possible costs. The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting.

The pharmacy services prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Prior Authorization

| Prior Authorization | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | | |
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | | |
| Inpatient Services | | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | | |

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | All IP MH/SUD services except two require PAR | Yes, most IP M/S services require PAR. ¹⁷ | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 10 days standard, 72 hours expedited | 10 days | | |
| Strategy | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, all OON IP services require PAR except emergency services. | No, all OON IP services require PAR except emergency services. | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize inpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | Yes, in some situations to supplement MCG criteria as needed. Updated annually a minimum. | | |

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

Prior Authorization

Findings: Scenario 2 - Inpatient Services

Rocky Mountain Health Plan uses PAR for both their RAE 1 and Prime MCO lines of business to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization; manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services; ensure enrollee safety; determine the appropriate level of care; and determine whether the service or item is medically necessary. This rationale is applied to both MH/SUD services and M/S services.

The inpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, innetwork vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services and in a few situations they are less restrictive or more favorable for MH/SUD services than M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. MH/SUD services and M/S services both require authorization for inpatient services that follow current best practices. The authorization determination timeframes used for MH/SUD and M/S services are based upon timeframes set by state and

¹⁷ RMHP Prime policy document "RMHP_Clinical_Preauth_List_20220101 V3" provides a full list of service codes that do require prior authorization. Any service code that is not on this list does not require prior authorization.

federal, as well as nationally-recognized industry standards of practice. So while the timeframes for determination may be different, these policies and procedures applied to MH/SUD and M/S services have not been found to be more stringent nor create a barrier to access to care for members.

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | |
| Outpatient Services | - | * | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Most services do not require PAR. | Most services do not require PAR. | | |
| | Some specialized, longer term, non-routine services do require PAR. ¹⁸ | Some specialized, longer term, non-routine services do require PAR. ¹⁹ | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 10 days standard, 72 hours expedited | 10 days standard, 72 hours expedited | | |
| Strategy | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | No, all OON OP services require PAR except emergency services. | No, all OON OP services require PAR except emergency services. | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize outpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | Yes, in some situations to supplement MCG criteria as needed. Updated annually at minimum. | | |

¹⁸ RAE 1 outpatient services that require prior authorization: Intensive Outpatient Programing (IOP), Partial Hospitalization Programming (PHP), Psychiatric testing, and Electroconvulsive therapy.

¹⁹ A full list of Rocky Prime MCO outpatient services that require prior authorization can be found on the document

[&]quot;RMHP_Clinical_Preauth_List_20220101 V3". Any service code that is not on this list does not require prior authorization.

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 2 - Outpatient Services

Rocky Mountain Health Plan uses PAR for both their RAE 1 and Prime MCO lines of business to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization; manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services; ensure enrollee safety; determine the appropriate level of care; and determine whether the service or item is medically necessary. This rationale is applied to both MH/SUD services and M/S services.

As of Jan 1, 2022, the RAE is no longer requiring prior authorization for 60 min psychotherapy (90837). The remaining services that do require prior authorization (Intensive Outpatient Programming, Partial Hospitalization Programming, Psychiatric testing, and Electroconvulsive therapy) are longer term or specialized types of services that few members would need or benefit from and therefore PAR is in place to ensure proper member care.

The outpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. MH/SUD services and M/S services both require authorization for a select set of outpatient services that follow current best practices. The outpatient prior authorization timeframes for determination are 10 days for standard and 72 hours for expedited. These timeframes are industry standard, are the same or faster than federal requirements (14 days standard/72 hours expedited) and are consistent with Colorado State Rule (10 days standard/72 hours expedited).

| PRIOR AUTHORIZATION SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Pharmacy Services | | | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Only a select set of pharmacy services are subject to PAR Any drug that has limits on coverage is eligible for an exception request. | Only a select set of pharmacy services are subject to PAR Any drug that has limits on coverage is eligible for an exception request. | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 24 hours | 24 hours | | |
| Does the plan impose any prior authorization requirements or step therapy requirements as a prerequisite to authorizing coverage for any prescription medication approved by the | No | No | | |

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | |
| Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of substance use disorders? If so, please explain. | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | Yes | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize pharmacy services? | No | Νο | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Yes. All drugs that require PAR are subject to internally developed guidelines. Updated on an ad hoc basis. | Yes. All drugs that require PAR are subject to internally developed guidelines. Updated on an ad hoc basis. | | |

Prior Authorization

Findings: Scenario 2 - Pharmacy Services

Drugs that are determined to need extra safety monitoring, are FDA indicated as 2nd/3rd/4th line or are high cost low utilization/high utilization and moderate cost may get prior authorization criteria added to the drug when placed on formulary to ensure safe/effective use of the drug. This policy is applied equally to both MH/SUD and M/S.

The pharmacy services prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 3: Prior Authorization

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Inpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | All IP services except 3.2WM (H0010) and 3.7WM (H0011) require | All IP services except 3.2WM (H0010) and 3.7WM (H0011) require PAR | All IP services except ASAM 3.2 and 3.7WM require PAR ²⁰ | All IP services except ASAM 3.2WM and 3.7WM require PAR | IP PAR is used for select M/S procedures or services to establish medical necessity. ²¹ |
| | PAR | | | | Excluded from PAR requirement are long term rehab facilities and maternity related services. |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 72 hours | 72 hours | 72 hours | 72 hours | 1 business day |

²⁰ Inpatient WM (3.7WM) does not require prior authorization (per contract), but requires concurrent review after day five (5). COA does not require prior authorization or concurrent review on 3.2WM services (considered an outpatient service). COA monitors utilization patterns for these services and can perform retrospective review as needed.

²¹ The codes and services that the Department primarily focuses on when determining whether to PAR are those procedures, services, or supplies that may or may not be medically necessary, have a more appropriate lower level of care, or have a more appropriate setting and/or have a higher risk for waste, fraud, and abuse. For those services and benefits that are primarily elective and/or are rarely medically necessary, the Department may utilize methods other than prior authorization to decrease unnecessary or inappropriate utilization such as claim edits, closing or placing limits on codes, etc. Procedures that are medically necessary the vast majority of the time with a lower risk for waste, fraud, and abuse are rarely subject to PAR.

| | Prior Authorization SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, all OON inpatient services require prior authorization with the exception of emergency services. | Yes | Yes | No, all OON inpatient services require prior authorization with the exception of emergency services. | Yes | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize inpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual and MCG for M/S | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | No | No | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 3 - Inpatient Services

Prior authorization policies and procedures seek to ensure that members are receiving the safe and appropriate level of care that is necessary for their condition.

The inpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The authorization determination timeframes used for MH/SUD and M/S services are based upon timeframes set by state and federal, as well as nationally-recognized industry standards of practice. So while the timeframes for determination may be different, these policies and procedures applied to MH/SUD and M/S services have not been found to be more stringent nor create a barrier to access to care for members. M/S requires prior authorization on select procedures to make sure the procedures and services are medically necessary. MH/SUD does not have procedures, but they do also require prior authorization for services to ensure medical necessity. Both M/S and MH/SUD, most often do not require prior authorization for services that are deemed to be always medically necessary. Additionally, while both look at medical necessity, M/S also looks at less costly options (i.e. does the procedure need to be done in the hospital, convenience of member/caregiver, duplication, timeliness, experimental/investigational/FDA approved). MH/SUD looks to avoid overly invasive services or institutionalizing a member. So, while differences in the policies and procedures exist, the requirements, processes, and rationale for requiring prior authorization review are comparable and applied no more stringently.

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| Outpatient Services | _ | | _ | _ | _ | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Most services do not require PAR. Some specialized, longer term, non- routine services do require PAR. ²² | Most services do not require PAR. Some specialized, longer term, non- routine services do require PAR. ²³ | Most services do not require PAR. Some specialized, longer term, non- routine services do require PAR. ²⁴ | Most services do not require PAR. Some specialized, longer term, non-routine services do require PAR. ²⁵ | There are thousands of codes that require PAR, including conditional PAR requirements. ²⁶ Some conditional PAR requirements exist in certain circumstances where a PAR would no be needed (ie: diaper under unit limit 250) | |

²² RAE 1 outpatient services that require prior authorization: MH services include Intensive Outpatient Programing (IOP), Partial Hospitalization Programming (PHP), Psychiatric testing, Electroconvulsive therapy, IOP and PHP are PA because they are longer term services. They naturally need to be concurrently reviewed to ensure members are still meeting medical necessity. Psych testing and electroconvulsive therapy are specialized types of services that not everyone needs or would benefit from so need to make sure that providers asking for these services are asking for them so that it is going to benefit the member and their diagnosis.

²³ RAE 2 & 4 routine services that do not require prior authorization: 0510, 0513, 90791, 90792, 90832, 90834, 90837, 90839, 90846, 90847, 90849, 90853, 96372, H0001, H0002, H0004, H0005, H0006, H0018, H0020, H0023, H0025, H0031-34, H0036-38, H2000, H2014-18, H2021, H2022, H2027, H2030, H2031, S9445, S9453, S9454, T1017, T1023 and all E&M codes.

²⁴ RAE 3 & 5 outpatient services that require prior authorization: Acute Treatment unit, Mental health residential treatment, SUD residential treatment, Intensive Outpatient, Partial hospitalization, Psychological testing, Electroconvulsive therapy, Day treatment.

²⁵ RAE 6 & 7 outpatient services that do not require prior authorization: 90785, 90832, 90833, 90834, 90836, 90837, 90838, 90846, 90847, 90849, 90853, 90875, 90876, 96116, 96121, 96130-96138, 96372, 97535, h0001-h0006, h0010 (No PAR for first five days of treatment), h0020, h0033, h0034, h0035, h0045, h2014, h2023-h2037, s9445, s9485, t1005, t1017, 90791, 90792, 90839, 98966-98968,h0001-h0005, h0023, h0025, h0031, t1016, h0032, h0034, h2000, h2011, s9453, s9454, 99241-99245, 99201-99443, 90833-90838.

²⁶ The utilization management vendor for the Department's fee-for-service benefit is responsible for reviewing the majority of codes in the following benefit categories: Durable Medical Equipment (DME), Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Pediatric Behavioral Therapy, Speech Therapy, Synagis, select medical surgeries, transgender services, bariatric surgeries, EPSDT Exceptions, Audiology, Vision, Diagnostic Imaging, Molecular Testing, Out of State Inpatient Admissions, Private Duty Nursing, Pediatric Long Term Home Health, Pediatric Personal Care Services. To view the PAR requirements for each code, see the Fee Schedule(s).

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| | | | | | but these are all listed on the fee schedule. If a service is being provided emergently then a PAR requirement would be overridden. | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for expedited | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for expedited | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for expedited | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for expedited | 10 days | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | All OON OP services require PAR | All OON OP services require PAR | All OON OP services require PAR | All OON OP services require PAR | Yes. ²⁷ | |
| Evidentiary Services | | ' | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize outpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual and MCG for M/S | |

²⁷ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.

| | Prior Authorization SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | No | No | Yes. If there is no InterQual or MCG criteria available, state-specific criteria, based in industry best practice and evidenced based research, is utilized. In addition, for any members aged 20 and under, the Vendor must utilize EPSDT guidelines and definition when determining a review outcome. 1328 REV codes and CPT codes that utilize in whole or in part internally developed, state developed criteria. | | |

Prior Authorization

Findings: Scenario 3 - Outpatient Services

The outpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. MH/SUD services and M/S services both require authorization for a select set of outpatient services that follow current best practices. The authorization determination timeframes used for MH/SUD and M/S services are based upon timeframes set by state and federal, as well as nationally-recognized industry standards of practice. So while the timeframes for

determination may be different, these policies and procedures applied to MH/SUD and M/S services have not been found to be more stringent nor create a barrier to access to care for members.

Scenario 4: Prior Authorization

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Inpatient Services | • | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | All IP services except ASAM 3.7WM require PAR | No PAR is required in- network | | | |
| | | All out-of-network care requires PAR | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 72 hours | 24 hours for admission notification | | | |
| Strategy | · | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | No, authorizations are not required in-network, all out-of-network care requires authorization. | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize inpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? | No | No | | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | | | | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 4 - Inpatient Services

Prior authorization used to assure the member is being treated in the least restrictive environment appropriate for their condition.

The inpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The authorization determination timeframes used for MH/SUD and M/S services are based upon timeframes set by state and federal, as well as nationally-recognized industry standards of practice. So while the timeframes for determination may be different, these policies and procedures applied to MH/SUD and M/S services have not been found to be more stringent nor create a barrier to access to care for members.

However, no M/S in-network services are subject to authorization, while all MH/SUD innetwork services are subject to prior authorization. Therefore, the policies applied to MH/SUD are more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|---|--|---|
| Outpatient Services | - | |
| Process | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Only the following OP services require PAR: Acute Treatment unit, Mental health residential treatment, SUD residential treatment, Intensive Outpatient, Partial hospitalization, Psychological testing, Electroconvulsive therapy, Day treatment | In-network services subject to PAR: DME rental and purchase if greater than \$500, Home health care greater than day 31-59, Autism evaluation, Respiratory equipment (cpap and bipap), Early intervention services. All out-of-network services require PAR. |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for expedited | 10 calendar days |

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | No, all OP out-of-network services require PAR. | No authorization is required for in-network care. Authorizations are required for all out-of- network care. | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | , | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize outpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG, Hayes Knowledge Center, and Uptodate | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | Yes. Oral nutrition and CPAP bipap have internal criteria. All other types of care DHMC uses MCG. Reviewed annually. | | | | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 4 - Outpatient Services

Routine MH/SUD outpatient services do not require prior authorization. Some specialty and/or higher acuity outpatient services do require prior authorization, consistent with industry standards, to ensure that the member cannot be treated in a less restrictive environment.

The outpatient prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

However, while there are a few M/S in-network services subject to authorization including rental services, there are not comparable MH/SUD in-network services subject to prior authorization making the policies applied to MH/SUD more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

| PRIOR AUTHORIZATION SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| Pharmacy Services | - | - | | | | |
| Process | | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to prior authorization? | Few MH drugs are subject to prior authorization ²⁸ . No SUD drugs are. Treatments that are supported by CMS approved compendia can be approved without meeting specific criteria. If a member has contraindications to required medications, then exceptions can be made. | DHMC reviews for injectable or IV medications that are non-formulary. An exception exists where a 72 hour emergency supply can be obtained if necessary. | | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a prior authorization request? | 24 hours | 48 hours | | | | |
| Does the plan impose any prior authorization requirements or step therapy requirements as a prerequisite to authorizing coverage for any prescription medication approved by the Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of substance use disorders? If so, please explain. | No | No | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are prior authorization policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | Yes | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | 1 | 1 | | | | |

²⁸ DHMC only requires prior authorization for the following mental health drugs: Abilify Maintena, Daytrana, Fanapt, Invega Sustenna, Kapvay, Saphris, Zyprexa Relprevv. No substance use disorder drugs are subject to prior authorization.

| Prior Authorization SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to determine whether to prior authorize pharmacy services? | No. Internally developed guidelines are used for the pharmacy benefit. | No. Internally developed guidelines are used for the pharmacy benefit. | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior authorize services? | Yes. The development of these internal guidelines use clinical evidence from | Yes. The development of these internal guidelines use clinical evidence from many | | | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | many sources, such as Micromedex, package labeling information, UptoDate or maybe even MCG. They are updated annually. | sources, such as Micromedex, package labeling information, UptoDate or maybe even MCG. They are updated annually. | | | | |

Prior Authorization Findings: Scenario 4 - Pharmacy Services

Prior authorization review policies for Prescription Drug services are used for member safety and cost containment.

The pharmacy services prior authorization policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix B - Concurrent Review

Description: Concurrent review (CCR) requires services be periodically reviewed as they are being provided in order to continue the authorization for the service. *Note that no emergency services require prior authorization*.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing CCR utilization management policies, frequency of review, and reviewer qualifications.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | Used by | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | COMPLIANCE DETERMINED |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP | Yes. Frequency of review is different. | ✓Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | No, for IP & OP |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Concurrent Review

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Inpatient Services | | - | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | No IP MH/SUD services are subject to CCR. | While IHRP is on hold, no IP M/S services are subject to CCR. | | | |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | N/A | N/A | | | |
| Are concurrent reviews performed by the direct treatment provider, or does the plan require secondary assessment to complete the authorization? | N/A | N/A | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | N/A | N/A | | | |
| Strategy | , | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | N/A | N/A | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for inpatient services? | N/A | N/A | | | |
| "Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines | N/A | N/A | | | |
| updated? | | | | | |

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 1 - Inpatient Services

Concurrent review is not currently used for inpatient fee-for-service MH/SUD or M/S services. Therefore, requirements for inpatient MH/SUD services are comparable to and not more stringent than for M/S services.

| Concurrent Review SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Outpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | Services that are subject to PAR are subject to CCR. For MH/SUD, the only service subject to PAR is PBT. ²⁹ | Services that are subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁰ | | | |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | The UM Vendor has 10 days business days to complete the review, upon receipt of all necessary documentation from the provider or facility. | The UM Vendor has 10 days business days to complete the review, upon receipt of all necessary documentation from the provider or facility. | | | |
| Strategy | ' | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for outpatient services? | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | | | |
| | | 1328 REV codes and CPT codes that utilize in whole | | | |

²⁹ The Department does not refer to the authorization as a "concurrent review" authorization, but as a new "prior authorization". The process followed by provider submitting the request, and the UM Vendor internally, for an ongoing OP service resembles a PAR process. For example, if a member is authorized for 6 months of physical therapy, and they need 6 months more, then the process is considered internally as a new PAR but is a continued service as far as the member is concerned. ³⁰ Ibid.

| Concurrent Review SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| | PBT is the only OP MH/SUD service subject to internally developed criteria | or in part internally developed, state developed criteria. | | | |

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 1 - Outpatient Services

The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting.

The outpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding frequency of review, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

| Scenario | 2: | Concurrent | Review |
|----------|----|------------|--------|
| | | | |

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|---|--|--|
| Inpatient Services | | - |
| Process | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | All services that require PAR are subject to CCR. | All services that require PAF are subject to CCR. |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. |
| | 3-7 days generally | Daily or less frequently, depending on clinical presentation and discharge planning need. |

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 24 hours | 24 hours | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | No, OON providers need CCR for ANY ongoing service. In- network providers only CCR for services on PAR list. | No, OON providers need CCR for ANY ongoing service. In- network providers only CCR for services on PAR list. | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for inpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No. | Yes, for some IP M/S services. Updated annually at a minimum. | | | | |

CONCURRENT REVIEW

Concurrent Review Findings: Scenario 2 - Inpatient Services

The health plan uses concurrent review to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization, manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services, ensure enrollee safety, determine the appropriate level of care, and determine whether the service or item continues to be medically necessary.

The inpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, frequency of review, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services and in a few situations they are less restrictive or more favorable for MH/SUD services than M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The estimated timeframes for frequency of concurrent review are different, but they are both established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations.

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| Outpatient Services | | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | All services that require PAR are subject to CCR. | All services that require PAR are subject to CCR. | | | | |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. ~5-10 days | Frequency of CCR is established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations. -Every 1-2 months | | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 24 hours | 24 hours | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | No, OON providers need CCR for ANY ongoing service. In- network providers only CCR for services on PAR list. | No, OON providers need CCR for ANY ongoing service. In-network providers only CCR for services on PAR list. | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for outpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM SUD | MCG | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? | No | No | | | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | | | | | |

CONCURRENT REVIEW

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 2 - Outpatient Services

The health plan uses concurrent review to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization, manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services, ensure enrollee safety, determine the appropriate level of care, and determine whether the service or item continues to be medically necessary.

The outpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, frequency of review, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The estimated timeframes for frequency of concurrent review are different, but they are both established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations.

Scenario 3: Concurrent Review

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Inpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | All IP services that require PAR are subject to CCR | All IP services that require PAR are subject to CCR ³¹ | All IP services that require PAR are subject to CCR (this also includes 3.7 WM). | All IP services that require PAR are subject to CCR (this also includes 3.2 and 3.7 WM ³²) | While IHRP is on hold, no IP M/S services are subject to CCR. |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | ~3-7 days | ~3-5 days | ~3-7 days | ~2-3 days ³³ | N/A |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 24 hours | 72 hours | 72 hours | 72 hours | N/A |
| Strategy | 1 | | | 1 | |

³¹ In extremely rare situations (only 2 inpatient facilities currently), RAE 2 & 4 contract with case rate agreements where concurrent reviews are conducted less frequently. These case rate agreements have not been found to improve quality of care and are being phased out. Under this arrangement, authorizations are typically longer and require concurrent review approximately every 14 days rather than the general 3-5 day timeframe.

³² For 3.2 and 3.7 WM CCR is required if admissions are longer than 5 days for 3.2 WM and 4 days for 3.7 WM per the 1115 waiver

³³ Frequency varies by the member's clinical presentation, but typically reviews are required every 2-3 days. Withdrawal management (3.2 WM and 3.7 WM) occurs at Day 5 +. CCHA doesn't have any facilities on a DRG model, therefore they utilize MCG criteria. If a course of treatment is recommended for 5 days, and 3 days is received then they will review the course of treatment on the 2nd day. CCR time periods are based off the MCG recommendations for the course of care to ensure the member is receiving the right level of care and they are seeing improvement.

| Concurrent Review SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, all out-of- network ongoing services are subject to CCR and in-network services only CCR ongoing services from PAR list. | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for inpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | N/A |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | No | No | N/A |

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 3 - Inpatient Services

The Department suspended the physical health fee-for-service Inpatient Hospital Review Program (IHRP) requirement for medical/surgical hospital admissions, initially to support hospitals to focus on COVID-19 care and then to enable the Department to redesign the IHRP process. This suspension pertains to admission reviews, admission notifications, concurrent review, and complex case concurrent review. IHRP is currently suspended, but when it is in operation, Inpatient FFS M/S Concurrent/Continued Stay Reviews are required under IHRP.

The inpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding frequency of review, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services all follow standard industry practice. There are some differences seen between the RAEs on typical frequency of concurrent reviews. However, all plans base timeframes upon a member's clinical presentation and the requested service, and follow timeframes set by their clinical decision support systems which are industry standard.

However, since IHRP is temporarily suspended while undergoing program improvements, there is no comparable medical/surgical concurrent review process.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

| Concurrent Review SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Outpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | Only OP services subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁴ | Only OP services subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁵ | Only OP services subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁶ | Only OP services subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁷ | Only OP services subject to PAR are subject to CCR. ³⁸ |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | ~5-10 days | ~3-5 days | Depends on the service. 3-5 days for acute / short-term services, 7-30 days | ~1 week-6 months | The frequency of CCR depends on member presentation and progress made, and depending on the service. |

³⁴ RAE 1 outpatient services that require prior authorization: MH services include Intensive Outpatient Programing (IOP), Partial Hospitalization Programming (PHP), Psychiatric testing, Electroconvulsive therapy, IOP and PHP are PA because they are longer term services. They naturally need to be concurrently reviewed to ensure members are still meeting medical necessity. Psych testing and electroconvulsive therapy are specialized types of services that not everyone needs or would benefit from so need to make sure that providers asking for these services are asking for them so that it is going to benefit the member and their diagnosis.

³⁵ RAE 2 & 4 routine services that do not require prior authorization: 0510, 0513, 90791, 90792, 90832, 90834, 90837, 90839, 90846, 90847, 90849, 90853, 96372, H0001, H0002, H0004, H0005, H0006, H0018, H0020, H0023, H0025, H0031-34, H0036-38, H2000, H2014-18, H2021, H2022, H2027, H2030, H2031, S9445, S9453, S9454, T1017, T1023 and all E&M codes. The outpatient services that do require authorization are generally considered non-routine or more complex interventions such as IOP, in-home services, respite, ECT or psych testing.

³⁶ RAE 3 & 5 outpatient services that require prior authorization: Acute Treatment unit, Mental health residential treatment, SUD residential treatment, Intensive Outpatient, Partial hospitalization, Psychological testing, Electroconvulsive therapy, Day treatment.

³⁷ RAE 6 & 7 outpatient services that do not require prior authorization: 90785, 90832, 90833, 90834, 90836, 90837, 90838, 90846, 90847, 90849, 90853, 90875, 90876, 96116, 96121, 96130-96138, 96372, 97535, h0001-h0006, h0010 (No PAR for first five days of treatment), h0020, h0033, h0034, h0035, h0045, h2014, h2023-h2037, s9445, s9485, t1005, t1017, 90791, 90792, 90839, 98966-98968,h0001-h0005, h0023, h0025, h0031, t1016, h0032, h0034, h2000, h2011, s9453, s9454, 99241-99245, 99201-99443, 90833-90838.

³⁸ The Department does not refer to the authorization as a "concurrent review" authorization, but as a new "prior authorization". The process followed by provider submitting the request, and the UM Vendor internally, for an ongoing OP service resembles a PAR process. For example, if a member is authorized for 6 months of physical therapy, and they need 6 months more, then the process is considered internally as a new PAR but is a continued service as far as the member is concerned.

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| QUESTION | | | | | |
| | | | for long-term / intensive services ³⁹ | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 24 hours internal goal (10 days standard / 72 hours urgent required) | 10 days for standard / 72 hours urgent | 10 days for standard / 72 hours urgent | 10 days for standard / 72 hours urgent | 10 business days |
| Strategy | | ' | | ' | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, any OON ongoing service is subject to CCR. In- network services only CCR services on PAR list. | Yes, once OON providers have secured a single case agreement for services. | Yes | No, any OON ongoing service is subject to CCR. In-network services only CCR services on PAR list. | Yes ⁴⁰ |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual and MCG for M/S |

⁴⁰ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.

³⁹ RAE 3 & 5 standard concurrent review periods vary depending on the services being rendered: Acute Treatment unit: review every 3-5 days, Short-term Mental health residential treatment: 3-5 days, Long-term Mental health residential treatment: 14-30 days, SUD residential treatment: 7-30 days, Intensive Outpatient: 14-30 days, Partial hospitalization: 7 days, Electroconvulsive therapy: 14-60 days, Day treatment: 30 days

| Concurrent Review SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| review for outpatient services? | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | No | No | Yes. If there is no InterQual or MCG criteria available, state-specific criteria, based in industry best practice and evidenced based research, is utilized. In addition, for any members aged 20 and under, the Vendor must utilize EPSDT guidelines and definition when determining a review outcome. 1328 REV codes and CPT codes that utilize in whole or in part internally developed, state developed criteria. | |

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 3 - Outpatient Services

The Department suspended the physical health fee-for-service Inpatient Hospital Review Program (IHRP) requirement for medical/surgical hospital admissions, initially to support hospitals to focus on COVID-19 care and then to enable the Department to redesign the IHRP process. This suspension pertains to admission reviews, admission notifications, concurrent review, and complex

case concurrent review. IHRP is currently suspended, but when it is in operation, Inpatient FFS M/S Concurrent/Continued Stay Reviews are required under IHRP.

The outpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding frequency of review, required determination timeframes, innetwork vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services all follow standard industry practice. There are some differences seen between the RAEs on typical frequency of concurrent reviews. However, all plans base timeframes upon a member's clinical presentation and the requested service, and follow timeframes set by their clinical decision support systems which are industry standard. Additionally, RMHP RAE 1 has set an internal requirement for determination timeframes at 24 hours, while it is required in Colorado State Rule that RAEs complete determinations within 10 days for standard requests and 72 hours for urgent requests.

Scenario 4: Concurrent Review

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | | |
| Inpatient Services | | | | | | | |
| Process | Process | | | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | All IP services are subject to CCR | No authorizations required in- network, all out-of-network care requires authorization. | | | | | |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | 3-7 days generally, dependent on member's presentation, progress made, and care needed | CCR occurs prior to lapse of previously approved timeframe if continued length of stay is required. Timeframe is dependent on member's presentation, progress made, and care needed | | | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for urgent | 10 days for standard. 72 hours for urgent | | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | Yes | No authorizations required in- network, all out-of-network care requires authorization. | | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for inpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | | | | | |

Concurrent Review Findings: Scenario 4 - Inpatient Services

Text

The inpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding exception policies and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The authorization determination timeframes used for MH/SUD and M/S services are based upon timeframes set

by state and federal, as well as nationally-recognized industry standards of practice. So while the timeframes for determination may be different, these policies and procedures applied to MH/SUD and M/S services have not been found to be more stringent nor create a barrier to access to care for members. The estimated timeframes for frequency of concurrent review are different, but they are both established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations.

However, no M/S in-network services are subject to authorization, while MH/SUD in-network services that are subject to prior authorization are subject to concurrent review. Therefore, the policies applied to MH/SUD are more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Outpatient Services | - | - | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to concurrent review? | Only the following OP services require ongoing review for continued need of services: Acute Treatment unit, Mental health residential treatment, SUD residential treatment, Intensive Outpatient, Partial hospitalization, | In-network services subject to authorization: DME rental and purchase if greater than \$500, Home health care greater than day 31-59, Autism evaluation, Respiratory equipment (cpap and bipap), Early intervention services. All out-of-network services require authorization. | | |

| CONCURRENT REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | | |
| | Electroconvulsive therapy, Day treatment | | | | | |
| How frequently is concurrent review required for services in this classification? | Depends on the service. 3-5 days for acute / short-term services, 7-30 days for long- term / intensive services | OP M/S services are approved for the initial requested time period. If additional services are needed after that time period, an additional authorization request would need to be submitted. Timeframe is dependent on member's presentation, progress made, and service needed. | | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a concurrent review request? | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for urgent | 10 days for standard, 72 hours for urgent | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | | |
| Are concurrent review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | No authorizations required in- network, all out-of-network care requires authorization. | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | | |
| Does the plan use nationally recognized evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding concurrent review for outpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG, Hayes Knowledge Center, and Uptodate | | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to concurrently review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | Oral nutrition and CPAP bipap have internal criteria. All other types of care DHMC uses MCG. Reviewed annually. | | | | |

Concurrent Review

Findings: Scenario 4 - Outpatient Services

Routine MH/SUD outpatient services do not require authorization. Some specialty and/or higher acuity outpatient services do require authorization, consistent with industry standards, to assure that the member cannot be treated in a less restrictive environment. The health plan subjects certain M/S services to concurrent review to ensure a member continues to meet the criteria for medical necessity.

The outpatient concurrent review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially

similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The estimated timeframes for frequency of concurrent review are different, but they are both established based on the type of service, intensity of the service, and member acuity, and verified against clinical decision support product recommendations.

However, there are very few M/S in-network services subject to authorization including rental services, while a larger number of MH/SUD in-network services are subject to concurrent review. Therefore, the policies applied to MH/SUD are more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

Appendix C - Retrospective Review

Description: Retrospective review (RR) is a protocol for approving a service after it has been delivered. *Note that no emergency services require prior authorization.*

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing services/conditions that trigger RR, utilization management policies, reviewer qualifications.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | COMPLIANCE DETERMINED |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP | Yes. See tables | No, for IP & OP |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Retrospective Review

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Inpatient Services | | | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | Time limits for RR are currently waived. | Time limits for RR are currently waived. | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | All benefits that require a PAR may be considered for RR on a case by case basis | All benefits that require a PAR may be considered for RR on a case by case basis | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | 10 business days | 10 business days | | |
| Strategy | ' | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes ⁴¹ | Yes ⁴² | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for inpatient services? | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG. | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG. | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior retrospectively review services? | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | | |

Retrospective Review Findings: Scenario 1 - Inpatient Services

The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting. In some situations, the Department's guidance overrides and allows a retrospective review. And in some cases, a member may not be eligible for

⁴¹ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.
⁴² Ibid.

Colorado Medicaid at the time of admission, but retroactive eligibility is obtained while the member is hospitalized or post discharge. A retrospective authorization will be required as soon as the inpatient facility becomes aware of the member's eligibility.

The inpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding time limits, exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Outpatient Services | - | - | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | Time limits for RR are currently waived. Two exceptions to this policy is that, by rule, DME has 90 days and long term health has 10 days. | Time limits for RR are currently waived. Two exceptions to this policy is that, by rule, DME has 90 days and long term health has 10 days. | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | All benefits that require a PAR may be considered for an exception to establishes timeliness rules to allow for a retrospective review on a case by case basis. | All benefits that require a PAR may be considered for an exception to establishes timeliness rules to allow for a retrospective review on a case by case basis. | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | There is no established maximum | There is no established maximum | | |
| Strategy | | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | Yes | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for outpatient services? | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG. | The FFS UM Vendor uses InterQual and MCG. | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. | | |
| retrospectively review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. | | |

Retrospective Review Findings: Scenario 1 - Outpatient Services

The goals of Colorado Medicaid's Utilization Management Program are to improve members' quality of care and ensure members are receiving the right service at the right time for the right duration in the right setting. In some situations, the Department's guidance overrides and allows a retrospective review. And in some cases, a member may not be eligible for Colorado Medicaid at the time of admission, but retroactive eligibility is obtained while the member is hospitalized or post discharge. A retrospective authorization will be required as soon as the inpatient facility becomes aware of the member's eligibility.

The outpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding time limits, exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW

| Scenario | 2: | Retrospective Review |
|----------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Scenario | _ • | Recospective Review |

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Inpatient Services | - | - | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | No, but claims must be submitted within 120 days | No, but claims must be submitted within 120 days | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | Only services that require PAR would need RR. | Only services that require PAR would need RR. | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | 30 days | 30 days | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, in-network providers only RR services that require PAR if PAR was not obtained. OON providers must RR for any service not PAR'd. | No, in-network providers only RR services that require PAR if PAR was not obtained. OON providers must RR for any service not PAR'd. | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD. | MCG for M/S | | | |

RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--------|---|
| regarding retrospective review for inpatient services? | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior retrospectively review services? | No | Yes, for some IP M/S services. Updated annually at minimum. |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | |

Retrospective Review

Findings: Scenario 2 - Inpatient Services

The health plan uses retrospective review to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization, manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services, ensure enrollee safety, determine the appropriate level of care was utilized, and determine whether the service or item was medically necessary.

The inpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding time limits, exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO MH/SUD M/S **OUESTION Outpatient Services** Process Is there a time limit on how far in the past No, but claims must be No, but claims must be services can be retrospectively reviewed? submitted within 120 days submitted within 120 days If so, what is that limit? of services being rendered. of services being rendered. Are services in this classification subject Only services that require Only services that require to retrospective review? PAR would need RR. PAR would need RR. What is the maximum amount of time 30 days 30 days allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? Strategy Are retrospective review policies the same No, in-network providers No, in-network providers for both in-network and out-of-network only RR services that only RR services that providers? require PAR if PAR was not require PAR if PAR was not obtained. OON providers obtained. OON providers

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
| | must RR for any service not PAR'd. | must RR for any service not PAR'd. | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for outpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to retrospectively review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | Yes, for some OP M/S services. Updated annually at minimum. | | | |

Retrospective Review Findings: Scenario 2 - Outpatient Services

The health plan uses retrospective review to monitor and prevent potential overutilization and underutilization, manage high-cost and prolonged-duration services, ensure enrollee safety, determine the appropriate level of care was utilized, and determine whether the service or item was medically necessary.

The outpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding time limits, exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 3: Retrospective Review

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Inpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | 120 days ⁴³ | 120 days | 120 days | 120 days | Time limits for RR are currently waived. |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | All services subject to PAR may be considered for RR if PAR was not obtained. | All IP services may be considered for RR | All IP services may be considered for RR ⁴⁴ Occasionally the IMD retro enrollment process requires COA to waive RR timeframes | All IP services may be considered for RR There are extensions when members become retroactively eligible for Medicaid | All services subject to PAR may be considered for RR if PAR was not obtained. These are considered on a case by case basis |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | 10 days |

⁴³ There is not a specific time limit on retrospective review. However, there is a time limit on claims submission for payment. Claims must be submitted within 120 days of services being rendered, so a provider submitting the review after 120 days wouldn't result in RMHP being able to pay for that review.

⁴⁴ COA can retrospectively review any service to determine if medical necessity was met. However, this is fairly uncommon and would be initiated by COA based on utilization patterns or outliers, not requested by the provider or member. Typically, the only retrospective requests initiated by the provider are situations in which prior authorization was not requested, either by provider error or due to confusion around the member's eligibility.

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| retrospective review request? | | | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of- network providers? | No, for in-network providers only those services that require PAR would need RR if PAR was not obtained. OON providers must submit RR for any service not PAR'd. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ⁴⁵ |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for inpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual and MCG for M/S |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior | No | No | No | No | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. |

⁴⁵ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|
| RAE 1 RAE 2&4 RAE 3&5 RAE 6&7 QUESTION MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD DEPARTMENT M/S | | | | | |
| retrospectively review services? | | | | | Reviewed regularly and updated as |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | | | | evidence/best practices change. |

Retrospective Review

Findings: Scenario 3 - Inpatient Services

The inpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The time limit policies on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed are different, but are industry standard with appropriate lengths for providers to receive payment.

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Outpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | No, but claims must be submitted within 120 days of services being rendered. | 30 days | 120 days | 30 days | Time limits for RR are currently waived. Two exceptions to this policy is that, by rule, DME has 90 days and long term health has 10 days. |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | All services subject to PAR may be considered for RR if PAR was not obtained. | All services subject to PAR may be considered for RR if PAR was not obtained. Exceptions are reviewed by the UM Director, Provider Relations Director and VP of Ops for extenuating circumstances. | All services subject to PAR may be considered for RR if PAR was not obtained. | Yes. There are extensions when members become retro actively eligible for Medicaid. The provider has 30 days from the date that they learn of the eligibility to submit a retrospective review request. | All benefits that require a PAR may be considered for an exception to establishes timeliness rules to allow for a retrospective review on a case by case basis. |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | 30 days | There is no established maximum |
| Strategy | | | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both | No, for in-network providers only | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| in-network and out-of- network providers? | those services that require PAR would need RR if PAR was not obtained. OON providers must submit RR for any service not PAR'd. | | | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for outpatient services? | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for MH and ASAM for SUD | InterQual and MCG for M/S |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to retrospectively review services? IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | No | No | No | No | Yes, when no InterQual or MCG criteria is available. Reviewed regularly and updated as evidence/best practices change. |

Retrospective Review

Findings: Scenario 3 - Outpatient Services

The outpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, in-network vs out-of-network policies, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures

of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The time limit policies on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed are different, but are industry standard with appropriate lengths for providers to receive payment.

Scenario 4: Retrospective Review

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Inpatient Services | - | - | | |
| Process | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | 120 days | 12 calendar months | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | All IP services may be considered for RR | All IP services may be considered for RR | | |
| | Occasionally the IMD retro enrollment process requires waiving of RR timeframes. | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | 30 calendar days | 30 calendar days | | |
| Strategy | 1 | 1 | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | No authorizations required in-network, all out-of- network care requires authorization. | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for inpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG for M/S | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to prior retrospectively review services? | No | No | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | | | |

Retrospective Review Findings: Scenario 4 - Inpatient Services

Consistent with industry standards, the health plan performs reviews of MH/SUD to assure the member is being treated in the least restrictive environment appropriate for their condition. Typical M/S retrospective reviews allow for extenuating circumstances such as unconscious at arrival, no identification at time of admission, or the facility being unable to determine correct payer.

The inpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

The time limit policies on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed are different, but are appropriate lengths for providers to receive payment.

However, no M/S in-network services are subject to authorization, while MH/SUD in-network services that are subject to prior authorization are subject to retrospective review. Therefore, the policies applied to MH/SUD are more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Outpatient Services | | | | | |
| Process | | | | | |
| Is there a time limit on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed? If so, what is that limit? | 120 days | 12 calendar months | | | |
| Are services in this classification subject to retrospective review? | Only services subject to PAR are subject to RR | Yes, services provided by out-of-network providers may be considered for RR | | | |
| What is the maximum amount of time allowed to issue a determination on a retrospective review request? | 30 calendar days | 30 calendar days | | | |
| Strategy | | | | | |
| Are retrospective review policies the same for both in-network and out-of-network providers? | Yes | No authorizations required in-network, all out-of- network care requires authorization. | | | |

| RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Evidentiary Services | | | | |
| Does the plan use evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) to make decisions regarding retrospective review for outpatient services? | InterQual for MH and ASAM for SUD | MCG, Hayes Knowledge Center, Uptodate | | |
| Does the plan use internally developed guidelines to determine whether to retrospectively review services? | No | No | | |
| IF YES: How frequently are those guidelines updated? | | | | |

Retrospective Review Findings: Scenario 4 - Outpatient Services

Routine MH/SUD outpatient services do not require authorization. Some specialty and/or higher acuity outpatient services do require authorization, consistent with industry standards, to assure that the member cannot be treated in a less restrictive environment. Typical M/S retrospective reviews allow for extenuating circumstances such as unconscious at arrival, no identification at time of admission, or the facility being unable to determine correct payer.

The outpatient retrospective review policies and procedures regarding exception policies, determination timeframes, and evidentiary standards for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. The time limit policies on how far in the past services can be retrospectively reviewed are different, but are industry standard with appropriate lengths for providers to receive payment.

However, no M/S in-network services are subject to authorization, while MH/SUD in-network services that are subject to prior authorization are subject to retrospective review. Therefore, the policies applied to MH/SUD are more stringent than those applied to M/S.

Through their efforts to reduce administrative hurdles for providers in their preferred provider network, they inadvertently created a situation where their M/S services authorization policies were less stringent than comparable MH/SUD policies specific to the Denver Health hospital system. DHMC engages in a risk based sub-capitation arrangement with Denver Health Hospital Authority. DMHC is a staff-model MCO, where it's medical/health providers are employees rather than independent providers who contract with the health plan. As part of the risk based arrangement, Denver Health Hospital Authority providers do not need to submit any services for authorization. All out-of-network M/S care requires authorization.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are out of compliance with parity requirements.

The Department immediately began work with DHMC to address the issues and bring their policies back into compliance. DHMC is currently finalizing the policy changes which should be implemented by July 1, 2022. These changes will be evaluated by the Department to ensure the policies meet parity compliance prior to implementation.

Appendix D - Medical Necessity Criteria

Description: Use and applicability of health plan standards and review policies that determines enrollment and authorization for benefits/services. *Note that emergency care is not subject to review for authorization*.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing protocols for selection of criteria (i.e., utilization of industry-standard criteria) to assess medical necessity for M/S and MH/SUD benefits. Review of compliance with Department-defined medical necessity criteria and directives.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | Used by | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | Yes. See tables below. | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, PD | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Medical Necessity Criteria

MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--|---|
| Which evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) does the plan use to determine the medical necessity of services and to which benefit | IP and OP MH/SUD: InterQual and MCG | IP and OP M/S: InterQual, MCG, and internal guidelines. |
| classifications do these criteria apply? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | | If there is not existing criteria available in MCG, InterQual or state specific criteria developed, the medical necessity review is completed at the Physician Review Level (in most instances by a physician specialized in that area of the benefit being requested). |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals age 21 and over follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals UNDER the age of 21 follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes |

Medical Necessity Criteria Findings: Scenario 1

The medical necessity criteria policies and procedures regarding evidentiary standards and medical necessity definitions for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Medical Necessity Criteria

MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| Which evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) | IP and OP MH: MCG All SUD: ASAM | IP and OP M/S: MCG and internal guidelines |
| does the plan use to determine the medical necessity of services and to which benefit classifications do these criteria apply? | | |

| Medical Necessity Criteria SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | Pharmacy: Criteria is based on internally developed guidelines. ⁴⁶ | Pharmacy: Criteria is based on internally developed guidelines. ⁴⁷ | | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals age 21 and over follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes | | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals UNDER the age of 21 follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes | | |

Medical Necessity Criteria Findings: Scenario 2

The health plan's process to evaluate medical necessity criteria drugs does not consider if the drug is a behavior health or medical indication. All drugs are evaluated based on the same criteria which includes clinical information of the specific drug, tertiary sources (e.g. National guidelines, FDA), expert opinion, pharmacoeconomic evaluations/health outcomes, and quality of life studies.

The medical necessity criteria policies and procedures regarding evidentiary standards and medical necessity definitions for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

⁴⁶ Pharmacy for both MH/SUD and M/S: Criteria for medical necessity is determined during P&T (pharmacy & therapeutics committee) review of the drug. Utilization management (UM) strategies include PA (prior authorization, ST (step therapy/fail first), QL (quantity limit), Age, etc. Criteria is developed from various sources including but not limited to FDA approved PI, clinical guidelines (e.g. ADA, NCCN, ACIP, etc.), clinical trials, and professional opinion. Requirements are communicated via the formulary and drug specific forms that outline criteria. There is also an exception process that allows members/providers to ask for a drug that is not included on the formulary called a formulary exception (FE). When either a UM or FE is submitted, review of the case occurs to decide if coverage is supported. UM has more specific guidelines to follow whereas an FE requires a provider to make the case that either formulary options would not be appropriate due to specific member requirements (contraindicated) or that at least two formulary options have already been tried and failed due to lack of efficacy or adverse effect. Pharmacy guidelines are internally developed within RMHP.

| MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| Which evidence-based clinical decision support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) does the | IP & OP MH: MCG IP & OP SUD: ASAM Criteria | IP & OP MH: InterQual IP & OP SUD: ASAM | IP & OP MH: InterQual IP & OP SUD: ASAM | IP & OP MH: MCG IP & OP SUD: ASAM Criteria | IP and OP M/S: InterQual, MCG, and internal guidelines. | |
| plan use to determine the medical necessity of services and to which benefit classifications do these criteria apply? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | Emergency care is not reviewed | Emergency care is not reviewed | Emergency care is not reviewed | Emergency care is not reviewed | If there is not existing criteria available in MCG, InterQual or state specific criteria developed, the medical necessity review is completed at the Physician Review Level (in most instances by a physician specialized in that area of the benefit being requested). | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals age 21 and over follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes ⁴⁸ | Yes | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | |

⁴⁸ RAE 6 & 7 use the state's EPSDT definition for medical necessity for both under and over 21 years of age, as the language is appropriate for both populations.

| | SCI | | essity Criteria AND DEPARTMENT I | FFS | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| individuals UNDER the age of 21 follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | | | | | |

Medical Necessity Criteria

Findings: Scenario 3

The medical necessity criteria policies and procedures regarding evidentiary standards and medical necessity definitions for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. RAE 6 & 7 use the state's EPSDT definition for medical necessity for both adults and individuals under 21 years of age. This difference in policy was not found to apply greater stringency for MH/SUD services nor create a barrier to access to care for members.

Scenario 4: Medical Necessity Criteria

| MEDICAL NECESSITY CRITERIA SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Which evidence-based clinical decision | IP/OP MH: InterQual | IP/OP/PD: MCG | | | |
| support products (InterQual, Milliman, etc.) does the plan use to determine the medical necessity of services and to which benefit classifications do these criteria apply? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP/OP SUD: ASAM | | | | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals age 21 and over follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Does the plan's definition for medical necessity for individuals UNDER the age of 21 follow the state's definition for medical necessity? | Yes | Yes | | | |

Medical Necessity Criteria Findings: Scenario 4

The medical necessity criteria policies and procedures regarding evidentiary standards and medical necessity definitions for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix E - Medical Appropriateness Review

Description: The policy and process the health plan utilizes to determine participant services and benefits. *Note that emergency care is not subject to review for authorization.*

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing utilization of clinically-validated medical necessity criteria, reviewer qualifications, and availability of medical necessity criteria.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

| N | EDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Which benefit classifications does the plan have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP | IP, OP | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals OVER the age of 21? | Review submitted information for completeness, compliance and medical appropriateness utilizing specific Department inpatient policy, guidelines, and the appropriate criteria by the first and second level reviewers. ⁴⁹ | Review submitted information for completeness, compliance and medical appropriateness utilizing specific Department inpatient policy, guidelines, and the appropriate criteria by the first and second level reviewers. ⁵⁰ | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals UNDER the age of 21? | Same as above, but also follows EPSDT guidance in any review for a member under 21. This process is built into every PAR review for a member 20 and under automatically. | Same as above, but also follows EPSDT guidance in any review for a member under 21. This process is built into every PAR review for a member 20 and under automatically. | | |
| Do you use a two-level review process? | Yes | Yes | | |
| Who performs the medical appropriateness reviews? Please include who can approve/deny and the qualifications of the reviewers. | 1st level: BCBA can pend, approve, technically deny, refer to 2nd level.2nd level- BCBA-D can deny for medical necessity or technical, can approve or pend. | 1st level: RN or other appropriately licensed personnel for certain benefits can pend, approve, technically deny, refer to 2nd level. | | |

Scenario 1: Medical Appropriateness Review

⁵⁰ First Level Reviewers consist of Registered Nurses who may: Approve the service as requested based on MCG/InterQual or Department approved criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request. Refer the request to a physician reviewer-If the nurse reviewer believes that the request may not meet medical necessity, should be denied for medical necessity, or would like further input from a physician reviewer, they will refer it for further review and determination (2nd level Physician Review)., Deny the request for technical reasons, including failing to provide the necessary documentation, not submitting the request timely, and/or if the request is a duplicate, etc. First Level Reviewers cannot deny for lack of medical necessity. Second Level Reviewers consist of Physicians who may: Approve the service as requested based on MCG/InterQual or Department approved Criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request, Render either a full or partial denial for lack of medical necessity.

⁴⁹ First Level Reviewers for PBT consist of a Board-Certified Behavioral Analyst (BCBA) who may: Approve the service as requested based Department approved criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request, Refer the request to a physician reviewer-If the nurse reviewer believes that the request may not meet medical necessity, should be denied for medical necessity, or would like further input from a physician reviewer, they will refer it for further review and determination (2nd level Review), Deny the request for technical reasons, including failing to provide the necessary documentation, not submitting the request timely, and/or if the request is a duplicate, etc. First Level Reviewers cannot deny for lack of medical necessity. Second Level Reviewers for PBT consist of Board-Certified Behavior Analyst-Doctoral (BCBA-Doctoral) who may: Approve the service as requested based on Department approved Criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request, Render either a full or partial denial for lack of medical necessity.

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | |
| | | 2nd level- physician can deny for medical necessity or technical, can approve or pend. | | |

Medical Appropriateness Findings: Scenario 1

The medical appropriateness review policies and procedures regarding classifications, processes for determination, two-level review, and reviewer qualifications for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Medical Appropriateness

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | | |
| Which benefit classifications does the plan have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, PD | IP, OP, PD | | | | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals OVER the age of 21? | IP/OP: Clinical Coordinators (CC) receive and review clinical documentation from the provider or facility requesting services for the member and compares it to the appropriate medical necessity guidelines (MCG or ASAM Criteria) and the Colorado Medicaid medical necessity criteria to determine if the request is medically appropriate. CCs cannot deny cases for medical necessity. The process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S. | IP/OP: Clinical Coordinators (CC) receive and review clinical documentation from the provider or facility requesting services for the member and compares it to the appropriate medical necessity guidelines (MCG or ASAM Criteria) and the Colorado Medicaid medical necessity criteria to determine if the request is medically appropriate. CCs cannot deny cases for medical necessity. The process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S. | | | | | |
| | Pharmacy: Medical necessity reviews are completed at a variety of medical professional levels. The initial case review | Pharmacy: Medical necessity reviews are completed at a variety of medical professional levels. The initial case review | | | | | |

MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO M/S MH/SUD QUESTION is completed by a certified is completed by a certified pharmacy tech (CPhT) that pharmacy tech (CPhT) that identifies applicable identifies applicable information from what the information from what the prescriber provided. If the prescriber provided. If the CPhT is able to approve, the CPhT is able to approve, the pharmacy tech will approve. If pharmacy tech will approve. If the CPhT cannot approve based the CPhT cannot approve based on the guideline criteria, the on the guideline criteria, the case is forwarded to a case is forwarded to a Pharmacist for further review. Pharmacist for further review. The initial review is completed The initial review is completed by the pharmacist. CPhTs by the pharmacist. CPhTs cannot deny cases for medical cannot deny cases for medical necessity. necessity. IP/OP: Clinical Coordinators IP/OP: Clinical Coordinators What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for (CC) receive and review (CC) receive and review individuals UNDER the age of 21? clinical documentation from clinical documentation from the provider or facility the provider or facility requesting services for the requesting services for the member and compares it to the member and compares it to the appropriate medical necessity appropriate medical necessity guidelines (MCG or ASAM guidelines (MCG or ASAM Criteria) and the Colorado Criteria) and the Colorado Medicaid medical necessity Medicaid medical necessity criteria for youth under 20 to criteria for youth under 20 to determine if the request is determine if the request is medically appropriate. CCs medically appropriate. CCs cannot deny cases for medical cannot deny cases for medical necessity. The process is the necessity. The process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S. same for MH/SUD and M/S. Pharmacy: Medical necessity Pharmacy: Medical necessity reviews are completed at a reviews are completed at a variety of medical professional variety of medical professional levels. The initial case review levels. The initial case review is completed by a certified is completed by a certified pharmacy tech (CPhT) that pharmacy tech (CPhT) that identifies applicable identifies applicable information from what the information from what the prescriber provided. If the prescriber provided. If the CPhT is able to approve, the CPhT is able to approve, the pharmacy tech will approve. If pharmacy tech will approve. If the CPhT cannot approve based the CPhT cannot approve based on the guideline criteria, the on the guideline criteria, the case is forwarded to a case is forwarded to a Pharmacist for further review. Pharmacist for further review. The initial review is completed The initial review is completed by the pharmacist. CPhTs by the pharmacist. CPhTs

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | cannot deny cases for medical necessity. | cannot deny cases for medical necessity. | | |
| Do you use a two-level review process? | Yes, RMHP uses a two level review process. CCs or CPhTs complete the first review and if it appears a request is not meeting medical necessity, it is sent to a medical director or pharmacist for a second level review. | Yes, RMHP uses a two level review process. CCs or CPhTs complete the first review and if it appears a request is not meeting medical necessity, it is sent to a medical director or pharmacist for a second level review. | | |
| Who performs the medical appropriateness reviews? Please include who can approve/deny and the qualifications of the reviewers. | Clinical Coordinators can approve authorizations but cannot deny authorizations for medical necessity. All Clinical Coordinators that work on the Prime line of business are licensed behavioral health clinicians (LPC, LMFT, LCSW) or RNs with psychiatric experience. All Clinical Coordinators are licensed in Colorado. Medical directors can approve or deny authorizations. Both Medical Directors that work on the Prime line of business are licensed physicians who hold an unrestricted license to practice in the state of Colorado and are board certified in psychiatry. One of the medical directors is also board certified in addiction medicine. Pharmacy: Medical necessity reviews are completed at a variety of medical professional levels. The initial case review is completed by a certified pharmacy tech (CPhT) that identifies applicable information from what the prescriber provided. If the CPhT is able to approve, the pharmacy tech will approve. If the CPhT cannot approve based on the guideline criteria, the | Clinical Coordinators can approve authorizations but cannot deny authorizations for medical necessity. All Clinical Coordinator that work on the Prime line of business are licensed RNs with licensure in Colorado. Medical directors can approve or deny authorizations. The Medical Directors that work on the Prime line of business are licensed physicians who hold an unrestricted license to practice in the state of Colorado. Pharmacy: Medical necessity reviews are completed at a variety of medical professional levels. The initial case review is completed by a certified pharmacy tech (CPhT) that identifies applicable information from what the prescriber provided. If the CPhT is able to approve, the pharmacy tech will approve. In the CPhT cannot approve based on the guideline criteria, the case is forwarded to a Pharmacist for further review. The initial review is completed by the pharmacist. | | |

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|-----|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | Pharmacist for further review. The initial review is completed by the pharmacist. | | | |

Medical Appropriateness Review Findings: Scenario 2

The medical appropriateness review policies and procedures regarding classifications, processes for determination, two-level review, and reviewer qualifications for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 3: Medical Appropriateness Review

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 RAE 2&4 RAE 3&5 RAE 6&7 QUESTION MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD DEPARTMENT M/S | | | | | | | |
| Which benefit classifications does the plan have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP and OP | IP and OP | IP and OP | IP and OP | IP and OP | | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals OVER the age of 21? | Clinical Coordinators review the submitted clinical documentation and compare it to the appropriate medical necessity guidelines and the Colorado Medicaid medical necessity criteria to determine if the request is | Review of clinical information, records, and lab work submitted by the treating provider. | Clinical info is first reviewed by licensed behavioral health clinician for medical appropriateness per medical necessity criteria and InterQual; a physician is consulted as needed. | Follows established procedures for applying clinical criteria based on the individual member's needs and the local delivery system for medical and behavioral health services. Reviewers collect and review relevant clinical information to determine if the | Review submitted information for completeness, compliance and medical appropriateness utilizing specific Department inpatient policy, guidelines, and the appropriate criteria by the first and second level reviewers. ⁵¹ | | | |

⁵¹ First Level Reviewers consist of Registered Nurses who may: Approve the service as requested based on MCG/InterQual or Department approved criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request. Refer the request to a physician reviewer-If the nurse reviewer believes that the request may not meet medical necessity, should be denied for medical necessity, or would like further input from a physician reviewer, they will refer it for further review and determination (2nd level Physician Review)., Deny the request for technical reasons, including failing to provide the necessary documentation, not submitting the request timely, and/or if the request is a duplicate, etc. First Level Reviewers cannot deny for lack of medical necessity. Second Level Reviewers consist of Physicians who may: Approve the service as requested based on MCG/InterQual or Department approved Criteria, and compliance to policies and federal guidelines, Request additional information from the Provider to support the request, Render either a full or partial denial for lack of medical necessity.

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | medically appropriate. | | | level-of-care /service requested meets medical necessity, considering the member circumstances. | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals UNDER the age of 21? | Same as above. The process followed is the same regardless of the age of the individual. | Same as above. The process followed is the same regardless of the age of the individual. | Same as above. The process followed is the same regardless of the age of the individual. | Same as above. The process followed is the same regardless of the age of the individual. | Same as above, but also follows EPSDT guidance in any review for a member under 21. This process is built into every PAR review for a member 20 and under automatically. |
| Do you use a two-level review process? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Who performs the medical appropriateness reviews? Please include who can approve/deny and the qualifications of the reviewers. | Clinical Coordinators can approve authorizations but cannot deny authorizations for medical necessity. All Clinical Coordinators are licensed behavioral health clinicians (LPC, LMFT, LCSW) or RNs with psychiatric experience. All | Clinical care managers are licensed behavioral health staff can approve services, but can't deny care. Licensed, doctoral- level staff with appropriate education and experience related to the requested services. PhD or PsyD staff are | Licensed behavioral health clinicians may approve authorization requests. Board-certified psychiatrists are the only reviewers who may issue an adverse benefit determinations. | Behavioral Health Care Managers possess an active unrestricted license as an RN, LCSW, LMSW, LMHC, LPC, LBA (as allowed by applicable state laws), LMFT, or Clinical Psychologist, to practice as a health professional within the scope of licensure in | 1st level: RN or other appropriately licensed personnel for certain benefits can pend, approve, technically deny, refer to 2nd level. 2nd level- physician/BCBA-D can deny for medical necessity or technical, can approve or pend. |

| | SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|----------|---|--|-------------------|---|----------------|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| | Clinical Coordinators are licensed in Colorado. Medical directors can approve/deny authorizations. RAE Medical Directors are licensed physicians; hold an unrestricted license to practice in CO; board certified in psychiatry. One medical director is also board certified in addiction medicine. | permitted to deny/approve outpatient services, but not inpatient or residential services. MD or DO staff are permitted to deny/approve all levels of care. | | applicable states or territory of the U.S. Medical Directors possess M.D. or D.O.; Board certification; active unrestricted medical license; minimum 5 years clinical experience in BH and UM. Medical Director can approve/deny requested services based on medical necessity. | | |

Medical Appropriateness Review Findings: Scenario 3

The medical appropriateness review policies and procedures regarding classifications, processes for determination, two-level review, and reviewer qualifications for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 4: Medical Appropriateness Review

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | VER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVE | | | | |
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Which benefit classifications does the plan have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP | IP, OP | | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals OVER the age of 21? | When a request for authorization is received, the clinical information is first reviewed by a licensed behavioral health clinician, who reviews for medical appropriateness per medical necessity criteria and InterQual; a physician is consulted as needed. | Care within network does not require review or authorization and without benefit limit. Care outside of network requires medical necessity review and authorization. Outside requests are initially reviewed by licensed registered nurse, who validates medical necessity criteria based on MCG, if criteria is met the request is approved without secondary review. If criteria is not met, then physician review is mandatory | | | |
| What is the process for determining medical appropriateness for individuals UNDER the age of 21? | When a request for authorization is received, the clinical information is first reviewed by a licensed behavioral health clinician, who reviews for medical appropriateness per medical necessity criteria and InterQual; a physician is consulted as needed. EPSDT requirements are followed when making determinations. | Care within network does not require review or authorization and without benefit limit. Care outside of network requires medical necessity review and authorization. Outside requests are initially reviewed by licensed registered nurse, who validates medical necessity criteria based on MCG, if criteria is met the request is approved without secondary review. If criteria is not met, then physician review is mandatory EPSDT requirements are followed when making determinations. | | | |
| Do you use a two-level review process? | Yes | Yes | | | |
| Who performs the medical appropriateness reviews? Please include who can approve/deny and the qualifications of the reviewers. | Licensed behavioral health clinicians may approval authorization requests. Board- certified psychiatrists are the | Licensed registered nurse can review and approve all requests that meet criteria, they can also deny all administrative denials: not a benefit and no prior | | | |

| MEDICAL APPROPRIATENESS REVIEW SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
|--|------------|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD M/S | | | | |
| | | only reviewers who may issue an adverse benefit determinations. | authorization. Any denial not meeting criteria must have second level physician reviewer. | | |

Medical Appropriateness Review Findings: Scenario 4

The medical appropriateness review policies and procedures regarding classifications, processes for determination, two-level review, and reviewer qualifications for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix F - Fail First/Step Therapy Protocols

Description: Health plan policies and protocols that requires steps or failure on a less costly treatment before authorizing a more costly treatment.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing protocols used to determine fail first or step therapy protocols, including which services require these protocols.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | PD | Yes | √Yes |

Plans that do not utilize this NQTL are shown in italics in the above table.

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 2: Fail First / Step Therapy Protocols

FAIL FIRST / STEP THERAPY PROTOCOLS SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|---|--|---|
| | MH/SUD: No. ⁵² | M/S: No. ⁵³ |
| Does the plan have any policies or processes that require steps or failure on a less costly treatment before authorizing a more costly treatment? If so, please list the benefit classifications of the services and detail the policies or procedures. | Pharmacy: Drugs that guideline supported to be 2nd/3rd/4th line therapies that have the potential to be prescribed as first line therapy may get restrictions that require prior use of certain drugs before approval. A drug that is indicated for first line use may also get a fail first strategy imposed on it if there are other options that are considered as safe and effective at a lower cost to ensure effective use of healthcare dollars. There is an exception process that will allow for the target drug to be used without first fail if the provider makes a case that alternatives would not be appropriate for the patient either tried and failed in a timeframe outside what the health plans records show or alternatives would be contraindicated. | Pharmacy: Drugs that guideline supported to be 2nd/3rd/4th line therapies that have the potential to be prescribed as first line therapy may get restrictions that require prior use of certain drugs before approval. A drug that is indicated for first line use may also get a fail first strategy imposed on it if there are other options that are considered as safe and effective at a lower cost to ensure effective use of healthcare dollars. There is an exception process that will allow for the target drug to be used without first fail if the provider makes a case that alternatives would not be appropriate for the patient either tried and failed in a timeframe outside what the health plans records show or alternatives would be contraindicated. |
| | MH/SUD: No. | M/S: No. |
| Does the plan have any policies or processes that apply steps or failure on a less costly treatment to medication- assisted treatment? | Pharmacy: The process to evaluate drugs that require Fail First/Step Therapy does not consider if the drug is a behavior health or medical indication. All drugs are evaluated based on the same | Pharmacy: The process to evaluate drugs that require Fail First/Step Therapy does not consider if the drug is a behavior health or medical indication. All drugs are evaluated based on the same |

APPENDIX F - FAIL FIRST/STEP THERAPY PROTOCOLS

⁵² RMHP does not have any specific policy or process regarding fail first or step therapy protocols for MH, SUD, or M/S services. However, for some services, MCG's guidelines do indicate that other services should be tried before a more invasive procedure is tried and it is something that is clinically considered when making UM decisions. This is unrelated to the cost of the treatments and is good clinical practice to consider. Instead, the consideration is given to ensure that members are placed in a level of care that meets their specific needs in the least intensive and restrictive way possible. It is also in line with the state's Medicaid medical necessity definition of providing the clinically appropriate treatment in the right place, time, frequency and type.
⁵³ Ibid.

FAIL FIRST / STEP THERAPY PROTOCOLS SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|----------|---|--|
| | criteria which includes clinical information of the specific drug, tertiary sources (e.g. National guidelines, FDA), expert opinion, pharmacoeconomic evaluations/health outcomes, and quality of life studies. | criteria which includes clinical information of the specific drug, tertiary sources (e.g. National guidelines, FDA), expert opinion, pharmacoeconomic evaluations/health outcomes, and quality of life studies. |

Fail First / Step Therapy Protocols Findings: Scenario 2

The fail first / step therapy policies and procedures regarding any requirements of steps or failure before authorization MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 4: Fail First / Step Therapy Protocols

FAIL FIRST / STEP THERAPY PROTOCOLS SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|---|--|--|
| Does the plan have any policies or processes that require steps or failure on a less costly treatment before authorizing a more costly treatment? If so, please list the benefit classifications of the services and detail the policies or procedures. | 9 of 56 drugs on Step Therapy protocols are MH drugs. No SUD drugs are on Step Therapy protocols. | For the required J codes, IV and injectable medications if there is a lower cost alternate or approved formulary drug, the DHMC pharmacy must review clinical justification/documentation from the provider verifying a failed response to the lower cost medication before a higher level drug will be approved. |
| Does the plan have any policies or processes that apply steps or failure on a less costly treatment to medication- assisted treatment? | No | For the required J codes, IV and injectable medications if there is a lower cost alternate or approved formulary drug, the DHMC pharmacy must review clinical justification/documentation from the provider verifying a failed response to the lower cost medication before a higher level drug will be approved. |

Fail First / Step Therapy Protocols Findings: Scenario 4

Of the 56 drugs DHMC has on Step Therapy protocols, only 9 of those are MH drugs and none of them are SUD drugs. The fail first / step therapy policies and procedures regarding any requirements of steps or failure before authorization of MH/SUD services are less stringent than the policies and procedures applied to M/S services, and they follow standard industry practice.

Appendix G - Conditioning Benefits on Completion of a Course of Treatment

Description: Health plan benefits/services conditional on previous treatment completion.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing presence of utilization and quality management policies that condition benefits on treatment completion and policy applicability to MH/SUD and M/S benefits.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | Used by | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | COMPLIANCE DETERMINED |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Plans that do not utilize this NQTL are shown in italics in the above table.

Analysis/Findings: No benefit category was shown to contain policies or procedures conditioning benefits on a completion of a course of treatment.

Appendix H - Outlier Management

Description: The health plan's utilization management policies and processes for determining when a participant's benefits requires additional clinical review and potentially service changes.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing outlier review and quality management policies and processes.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Outlier Management

| Outlier Management SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| How does the plan monitor over- and under-utilization of services? | The Department's outlier management program for FFS behavioral health has multiple components. These include utilizing a recovery audits contractor (RAC) to review certain claims for the medical appropriateness and billed services. Additionally, the FFS UM Vendor will notify the Department of any concerns regarding waste, fraud, abuse that are identified as a part of the normal review process. And finally, the Department reviews claims for use in future policy setting. | The Department's outlier management program for FFS physical health has multiple components. These include utilizing a recovery audits contractor (RAC) to review certain claims for the medical appropriateness and billed services. Additionally, the FFS UM Vendor will notify the Department of any concerns regarding waste, fraud, abuse that are identified as a part of the normal review process. And finally, the Department reviews claims for use in future policy setting. | | | | |
| Are all services subject to outlier monitoring? IF NO, list all services by benefit classification subject to monitoring. | Outliers are brought to the attention of the Department by the UM Vendor across all benefits. | Outliers are brought to the attention of the Department by the UM Vendor across all benefits. | | | | |
| Are there any exceptions to these policies for reviews of services for members under the age of 21? | EPSDT requirements are followed when making determinations. | EPSDT requirements are followed when making determinations. | | | | |
| What actions are taken based on information from outlier reports? (policy change, payment recovery, additional analysis, etc) | In reviewing outliers, there may be a necessary change in clinical criteria, or policy, additional analysis or referrals to Program Integrity. | In reviewing outliers, there may be a necessary change in clinical criteria, or policy, additional analysis or referrals to Program Integrity. | | | | |

Outlier Management Findings: Scenario 1

Outlier management is the health plan's utilization management policies and processes for determining when a participant's benefits requires additional clinical review and potentially service changes.

The outlier management policies and procedures regarding monitoring over- and underutilization, monitored services, exceptions, and actions taken for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 2: Outlier Management

OUTLIER MANAGEMENT SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO M/S QUESTION MH/SUD How does the plan monitor over-RMHP monitors over and RMHP monitors over and and under-utilization of services? underutilization of services to underutilization of services to ensure that Members receive ensure that Members receive necessary and appropriate care. necessary and appropriate Data are collected from multiple care. Data are collected from sources including HEDIS® results multiple sources including and Member surveys, appeals and HEDIS® results and Member grievance data, quality of care surveys, appeals and grievance reports, utilization management data, quality of care reports, reports and pharmacy utilization utilization management reports reports. Data are reviewed, and pharmacy utilization trended, analyzed and reports. Data are reviewed, interventions are developed and trended, analyzed and implemented based on outcomes interventions are developed of the analysis.54 and implemented based on outcomes of the analysis.55 MH/SUD: Yes Are all services subject to outlier M/S: Yes monitoring? IF NO, list all services by benefit classification subject to monitoring. Are there any exceptions to these No No policies for reviews of services for members under the age of 21? What actions are taken based on Creation of new programs, Creation of new programs, information from outlier reports? change in processes, change in change in processes, change in (policy change, payment policies, payment recovery in the policies, payment recovery in recovery, additional analysis, event of inappropriate billing, the event of inappropriate etc) and further specific analysis to billing, and further specific look at cause and effects. analysis to look at cause and effects. Pharmacy: Programs work with member and prescribers to bring Pharmacy: Programs work with outliers into more standard of member and prescribers to care. bring outliers into more standard of care.

Outlier Management

⁵⁴ Areas of focus include: MONITORING OF OVERUTILIZATION: Concurrent reviews, Pre-authorizations, High ER utilization for non-emergent conditions, Hospitalization for preventable conditions, Hospital readmission within 30 days of discharge, Pharmacy overutilization (Opioids), Colorado Overutilization Project (COUP)- Medicaid; MONITORING OF UNDERUTILIZATION: Members identified with Preventative Care and Screening Gaps, Gaps in Care Reporting (providers), Member Education and Incentives, Encourage annual Wellness Visit, Provider Attribution Reports, Pharmacy Underutilization/Medication Management Program, Disease Management Program(s) ⁵⁵ Ibid.

Findings: Scenario 2

The purpose of the health plan's outlier management is to ensure members have access to appropriate care and are receiving services they need while managing healthcare quality, efficiency, and cost.

For pharmacy, the goal of Drug Safety Program is to support prescribers who provide controlled medications to Members by decreasing the risk of duplicate therapy and/or other prescribers of these higher risk medications. In addition, Members enrolled received additional support with medical and social determinants of health issues. The goal of MAP is to increase adherence to chronic medications that have evidence of improving long term outcomes. The goal of MRP is to improve treatment for higher risk and complex members to improve long term outcomes. These programs aim to provide value for our Members/prescribers and the community. These are not intended to limit services but rather for RMHP to facilitate improved communication between the Member, prescriber, and pharmacy.

The outlier management policies and procedures regarding monitoring over- and underutilization, monitored services, exceptions, and actions taken for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

| OUTLIER MANAGEMENT SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| How does the plan monitor over- and under-utilization of services? | RMHP monitors over and underutilization of services to ensure that Members receive necessary and appropriate care. Data are collected from multiple sources including HEDIS® results and Member surveys, appeals and grievance data, quality of care reports, utilization management reports and pharmacy utilization reports. Data are reviewed, trended, analyzed and interventions are developed and implemented based | NHP/HCI monitors utilization trends and identifies outliers related to high service volume, high cost, unusual lengths of stay, and 7- and 30-day readmissions. | COA monitors for outliers with frequent utilization of IP/OP services. COA considers frequent utilization on a case-by-case basis when evaluating whether continued or additional services will (or is reasonably expected to) benefit the member in the treatment of their MH/SUD condition(s). Per the definition of medical necessity, this is only one of many factors to consider when medical necessity is being evaluated. COA may recommend a different course of treatment if the services being | CCHA is committed to assuring access to health care and services for all participating members. Over- utilization and under-utilization of services are monitored using reports (i.e. LOS, Readmissions, etc.) made available to Behavioral Health Management and Quality Management (QM)) Departments by the Performance Management Analysts/ Finance Analysts. CCHA participates in the Colorado Client Over- Utilization Program(COUP). | The Department's outlier management program for physical health has multiple components. These include utilizing a recovery audits contractor (RAC) to review certain claims for the medical appropriateness and billed services. Additionally, the FFS UM Vendor will notify the Department of any concerns regarding waste, fraud, abuse that are identified as a part of the normal review process. And finally, the Department reviews claims for use in future policy setting. | |

| Outlier Management SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| RAE 1 RAE 2&4 RAE 3&5 RAE 6&7 QUESTION MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD DEPARTMENT | | | | | |
| | on outcomes of the analysis. ⁵⁶ | | requested are not effective in treating the member's MH/SUD condition(s). | | |
| Are all services subject to outlier monitoring? IF NO, list all services by benefit classification subject to monitoring. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Are there any exceptions to these policies for reviews of services for members under the age of 21? | No | No | No | No | EPSDT requirements are followed when making determinations. |
| What actions are taken based on information from outlier reports? (policy change, payment recovery, additional analysis, etc) | Many actions have been taken as a result of reviewing outlier reports including the creation of new programs, change in processes, change in policies, payment recovery | Additional information may be requested to authorize continuing services. For example, the provider may be asked to provide a treatment plan and/or attest that | Interventions/ follow up measures could including (but not limited to): patient education on appropriate service utilization via the COA care management program, provider | The results of the reviews are used to help implement strategies to achieve utilization targets consistent with clinical and quality indicators and | In reviewing outliers, there may be a necessary change in clinical criteria, or policy, additional analysis or referrals to Program Integrity. |

⁵⁶ Areas of focus include: MONITORING OF OVERUTILIZATION: Concurrent reviews, Pre-authorizations, High ER utilization for non-emergent conditions, Hospitalization for preventable conditions, Hospital readmission within 30 days of discharge, Pharmacy overutilization (Opioids), Colorado Overutilization Project (COUP)- Medicaid, MONITORING OF UNDERUTILIZATION: Members identified with Preventative Care and Screening Gaps, Gaps in Care Reporting (providers), Member Education and Incentives, Encourage annual Wellness Visit, Provider Attribution Reports, Pharmacy Underutilization/Medication Management Program, Disease Management Program(s)

| | Outlier Management SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|----------|---|--|---|---------------------------|----------------|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| | in the event of inappropriate billing, and further specific analysis to look at cause and effects. | they are following the RAE's clinical guidelines. Outlier reports or other data mining may also initiate focused audit processes and/or investigations related to fraud, waste, and abuse. | education on medical necessity, documentation requirements, and/or billing practices, referral to the COA compliance team for auditing and/or recoupment, referral to the COA Quality team for assessment and treatment plan reviews, and/or further analysis and record reviews. | identify fraud and abuse. | | |

Outlier Management Findings: Scenario 3

The purpose of the Department's FFS utilization management outlier management policies and processes is for determining when a participant's benefits requires additional clinical review and potentially service changes. RAE 1's goal of outlier management is to ensure members have access to appropriate care and are receiving services they need while managing healthcare quality, efficiency, and cost. RAEs 2 and 4 look to identify utilization trends over time and across facilities or providers. This information can be helpful in educating providers about medical necessity and the application of clinical best practices. Additionally, outlier review is used to identify over-utilization of services that are not medically necessary and to prevent unnecessary costs. RAEs 3 and 5 use these policies to ensure the member is receiving the appropriate and effective level of care for their clinical

presentation. RAEs 6 and 7 use the results of the reviews to help implement strategies to achieve utilization targets consistent with clinical and quality indicators and identify fraud and abuse.

The outlier management policies and procedures regarding monitoring over- and under- utilization, monitored services, exceptions, and actions taken for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 4: Outlier Management

SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO OUESTION MH/SUD M/S How does the plan monitor over- and COA monitors for outliers The DHMC OI team tracks and under-utilization of services? with frequent utilization of monitors over and inpatient/outpatient underutilization (e.g., services. COA considers emergency department frequent utilization on a readmission, etc.) and reports case-by-case basis when findings quarterly to the evaluating whether Medical Management continued or additional Committee. services will (or is reasonably expected to) benefit the member in the treatment of their behavioral health condition(s). Per the definition of medical necessity, this is only one of many factors to consider when medical necessity is being evaluated. COA may recommend a different course of treatment if the services being requested are not effective in treating the member's behavioral health condition(s). Are all services subject to outlier Yes Yes monitoring? IF NO, list all services by benefit classification subject to monitoring. Are there any exceptions to these No No policies for reviews of services for members under the age of 21? What actions are taken based on If an outlier is identified, If an over/under utilizing information from outlier reports? member is identified the care any number of (policy change, payment recovery, management team is notified. interventions/follow up additional analysis, etc) The care management team measures could occur, will outreach directly to the including (but not limited member to provider education, to): patient education on resources, support and when appropriate service appropriate advocate for the utilization via the COA care member to join an intervention management program, program. provider education on medical necessity, documentation requirements, and/or billing practices, referral to the

OUTLIER MANAGEMENT SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCC

OUTLIER MANAGEMENT SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO QUESTION MH/SUD M/S COA compliance team for auditing and/or auditing and/or MI

recoupment, referral to the COA Quality team for assessment and treatment plan reviews, and/or further analysis and record reviews.

Outlier Management Findings: Scenario 4

The health plan's outlier management policies work to ensure the member is receiving the appropriate and effective level of care for their clinical presentation - that they receive the right care at the right time with the right provider. The purpose is not to limit the accessibility of services, but to identify over- or under-utilization on a case-by-case, member-specific basis to ensure the member is receiving clinically appropriate, clinically effective care for their needs.

The outlier management policies and procedures regarding monitoring over- and underutilization, monitored services, exceptions, and actions taken for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix I - Coding Limitations

Description: The claims processing, coding, and billing standards set by health plans for utilization in their benefit/service selection and payment.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing the selection and application of industry standard codes for claims processing, coding, and billing (i.e., Uniform Services Coding Manual and/or National Correct Coding Initiative).

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Coding Limitations

| CODING LIMITATIONS | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| SC | SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | | |
| What coding set do you use for determining what services are eligible for reimbursement? | Coding limitations are used for IP and OP, in accordance with the CO Medicaid provider billing manual from the Department for FFS MH/SUD and M/S services and guidance from CMS, such as Medically Unlikely Edits (MUE). | Coding limitations are used for IP and OP, in accordance with the CO Medicaid provider billing manual from the Department for FFS MH/SUD and M/S services and guidance from CMS, such as Medically Unlikely Edits (MUE). | | | | |
| | Some services and supplies that require a PAR may have coding and unit limitations that can be found on the Colorado Fee Schedule and billing manuals. | Some services and supplies that require a PAR may have coding and unit limitations that can be found on the Colorado Fee Schedule and billing manuals. | | | | |
| | The EPSDT benefit provides comprehensive and preventive health care services for members 20 years of age and younger who are enrolled with Colorado's Medicaid Program. | The EPSDT benefit provides comprehensive and preventive health care services for members 20 years of age and younger who are enrolled with Colorado's Medicaid Program. | | | | |
| | For OP services Providers still need to ensure that they are meeting all other requirements for the benefit and PAR process. | For OP services Providers still need to ensure that they are meeting all other requirements for the benefit and PAR process. | | | | |
| | Providers may submit a request for code for a service or supply that is not a covered benefit, or exceeds limitations of the benefit, of Colorado Medicaid as part of the EPSDT exception process, which will then undergo a review for compliance and medical necessity by the UM Vendor. Service and/or unit limitations found on the Fee Schedule may not be applicable under EPSDT. | Providers may submit a request for code for a service or supply that is not a covered benefit, or exceeds limitations of the benefit, of Colorado Medicaid as part of the EPSDT exception process, which will then undergo a review for compliance and medical necessity by the UM Vendor. Service and/or unit limitations found on the Fee Schedule may not be applicable under EPSDT. | | | | |
| | FFS benefits are defined according to the Colorado Medicaid State Plan. The Colorado Medicaid program uses the CMS HCPCS to identify services provided to Colorado Medicaid members. The HCPCS includes codes identified in the | FFS benefits are defined according to the Colorado Medicaid State Plan. The Colorado Medicaid program uses the CMS HCPCS to identify services provided to Colorado Medicaid members. The HCPCS includes codes identified in the | | | | |

| Coding Limitations SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | Physician's Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) and codes developed by CMS. Updates and revisions to HCPCS listings are documented in the Provider Bulletins. | Physician's Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) and codes developed by CMS. Updates and revisions to HCPCS listings are documented in the Provider Bulletins. | | |
| | Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual is also used for MH/SUD. | | | |

Coding Limitations Findings: Scenario 1

The coding sets used by the health plans establish what services are eligible for reimbursement. The sets utilized for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to those used for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Coding Limitations

CODING LIMITATIONS

SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--|--|
| What coding set do you use for determining what services are eligible for reimbursement? | RAE/Prime Contract with HCPF, Covered Services | RAE/Prime Contract with HCPF, Covered Services |
| engible for reimbursement: | HFC Fee Schedule | HFC Fee Schedule |
| | Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual | Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual |
| | CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets |

Coding Limitations Findings: Scenario 2

The coding sets used by the health plans establish what services are eligible for reimbursement. The sets utilized for MH/SUD services are the same to those used for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

| Scenario | 3: | Coding | Limitations |
|----------|----|--------|-------------|
|----------|----|--------|-------------|

| | CODING LIMITATIONS SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| What coding set do you use for determining what services are eligible for reimbursement? | RAE/Prime Contract with HCPF, Exhibit I Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | RAE Contract with HCPF Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | RAE Contract with HCPF Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | RAE Contract with HCPF Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | Coding limitations are used for IP and OP, in accordance with the Colorado Medicaid provider billing manual from the Department for FFS MH/SUD and M/S services and guidance from CMS, such as Medically Unlikely Edits (MUE). Providers may submit a request for code for a service or supply that is not a covered benefit, or exceeds limitations of the benefit, of Colorado Medicaid as part of the EPSDT exception process, which will then undergo a review for compliance and medical necessity by the UM Vendor. Service and/or unit limitations found on the Fee Schedule may not be | |

| | CODING LIMITATIONS SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|----------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | | | | | applicable under EPSDT. |
| | | | | | Fee-for-Service benefits are defined according to the Colorado Medicaid State Plan. The Colorado Medicaid program uses the CMS HCPCS to identify services provided to Colorado Medicaid members. The HCPCS includes codes identified in the CPT and codes developed by CMS. |

Coding Limitations

Findings: Scenario 3

The coding sets used by the health plans establish what services are eligible for reimbursement. The sets utilized for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to those used for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 4: Coding Limitations

| CODING LIMITATIONS SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
| What coding set do you use for determining what services are eligible for reimbursement? | Contract with HCPF and the Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual | Contract with HCPF and the Uniform Services Coding Standards Manual | | | |
| | Includes CPT, HCPC, and revenue codes outlined contract. CPT/ICD-10 Standard Code Sets | | | | |

Coding Limitations Findings: Scenario 4

The coding sets used by the health plans establish what services are eligible for reimbursement. The sets utilized for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to those used for M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix J - Network Provider Admission

Description: Network provider admission is the process of recruitment, credentialing, and accepting treatment providers into a health plan's network of care professionals.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing provider network selection criteria for network admission, credentialing, and recredentialing of MH/SUD and M/S providers, provider appeals process, utilization of national accrediting standards.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

Scenario 1: Network Provider Admission

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| What process is followed for recruiting and accepting providers into the plan's network of care professionals? | The Department is responsible for enrolling Providers, and the UM Vendor receives the enrollment feeds, and so as long as the provider is enrolled and the appropriate provider type for the benefit they may request a PAR. The Department will accept any willing provider that meets the enrollment requirements, but will specifically recruit by need. Typically will use the provider bulletin to announce specific needs. | The Department is responsible for enrolling Providers, and the UM Vendor receives the enrollment feeds, and so as long as the provider is enrolled and the appropriate provider type for the benefit they may request a PAR. The Department will accept any willing provider that meets the enrollment requirements, but will specifically recruit by need. Typically will use the provider bulletin to announce specific needs. | | | |
| What national accrediting standards are used to determine admission into the plan's network of care professionals? | Providers wishing to enroll with Medicaid must the specific requirements of provider type and services to be provided. | Providers wishing to enroll with Medicaid must the specific requirements of provider type and services to be provided. | | | |
| What process does a provider follow to become credentialed and recredentialed with the plan? | The FFS Medicaid provider enrollment process uses a validation process based on federal requirements (i.e. practitioner must be licensed to enroll, etc.) for all providers. | The FFS Medicaid provider enrollment process uses a validation process based on federal requirements (i.e. practitioner must be licensed to enroll, etc.) for all providers. | | | |
| How often do providers need to revalidate/recredential? | Providers must revalidate at least every 5 years. | Providers must revalidate at least every 5 years. | | | |
| How often do providers need to recontract? | Providers do not contract with the Department. Providers enroll with Medicaid and that enrollment does not have a timeframe. | Providers do not contract with the Department. Providers enroll with Medicaid and that enrollment does not have a timeframe. | | | |
| What process does the plan have in place for a provider to appeal a denial into the plan's network? | If a provider is denied enrolling with Medicaid, they are provided an opportunity to submit updated documentation if they believe it will change the outcome. | If a provider is denied enrolling with Medicaid, they are provided an opportunity to submit updated documentation if they believe it will change the outcome. | | | |
| Does the plan accept any willing provider into its network of care providers (assuming the provider is Medicaid enrolled, meets credentialing and quality standards, and accepts reasonable reimbursement for services)? | Yes. The FFS health plan does not limit provider participation beyond basic enrollment requirements (i.e. practitioner must be licensed to enroll, etc.) There is not a cap on the | Yes. The FFS health plan does not limit provider participation beyond basic enrollment requirements (i.e. practitioner must be licensed to enroll, etc.) There is not a cap on the | | | |

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | number of providers allowed to enroll and provide services. | number of providers allowed to enroll and provide services. | | |

Network Provider Admission Findings: Scenario 1

The network provider admission policies and procedures include recruitment, accrediting standards, credentialing/recredentialing, contracting timeframes, appealing a denial, and accepting any willing provider into the network. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Other than the different licensure, the process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S.

NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Network Provider Admission

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| What process is followed for recruiting and accepting providers into the plan's network of care professionals? | RMHP accepts any willing provider who meets our credentialing standards and is willing to accept and negotiate reasonable reimbursement for services. | RMHP accepts any willing provider who meets our credentialing standards and is willing to accept and negotiate reasonable reimbursement for services. | | | |
| What national accrediting standards are used to determine admission into the plan's network of care professionals? | NCQA | NCQA | | | |
| What process does a provider follow to become credentialed and recredentialed with the plan? | Submit complete credentialing packet to RMHP for review. The packet must include a W9, current practice demographics, proof of enrollment with HCPF, and email address. Providers must have a current CAQH application. Providers are recredentialed every 36 months. Re-credentialing focus on verifying that CAQH and | Submit complete credentialing packet to RMHP for review. The packet must include a W9, current practice demographics, proof of enrollment with HCPF, and email address. Providers must have a current CAQH application. Providers are recredentialed every 36 months. | | | |

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
| | attestation is up-to-date and verifying licensure. If up to date, process is more streamlined. | Re-credentialing focus on verifying that CAQH and attestation is up-to-date and verifying licensure. If up to date, process is more streamlined. | | | |
| How often do providers need to revalidate/recredential? | Every 36 months. | Every 36 months. | | | |
| How often do providers need to recontract? | Most Provider contracts are evergreen, so they are in effect unless either party decides to terminate. | Most Provider contracts are evergreen, so they are in effect unless either party decides to terminate. | | | |
| What process does the plan have in place for a provider to appeal a denial into the plan's network? | If a provider was denied due to credentialing reasons, they can appeal to a Medical Director. The MPRC has oversight of credentialing including the regulatorily required appeal process. | If a provider was denied due to credentialing reasons, they can appeal to a Medical Director. The MPRC has oversight of credentialing including the regulatorily required appeal process. | | | |
| Does the plan accept any willing provider into its network of care providers (assuming the provider is Medicaid enrolled, meets credentialing and quality standards, and accepts reasonable reimbursement for services)? | Yes | Yes | | | |

Network Provider Admission Findings: Scenario 2

The network provider admission policies and procedures include recruitment, accrediting standards, credentialing/recredentialing, contracting timeframes, appealing a denial, and accepting any willing provider into the network. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Other than the different licensure, the process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S.

Scenario 3: Network Provider Admission

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| RAE 1 RAE 2&4 RAE 3&5 RAE 6&7 QUESTION MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD DEPARTMENT M | | | | | | |
| What process is followed for recruiting and accepting providers into the plan's network of care professionals? | RMHP accepts any willing provider who meets our credentialing standards and is willing to accept and negotiate reasonable reimbursement for services. | The RAE engages specialty provider groups and facilities based on the ⁵⁷ | The provider recruitment process is a collaborative effort between the Contracting team, Provider Network Services, and clinical program staff: verify provider meets quality standards and conditions for contracting. Provider Network Services contacts provider to schedule a meeting to discuss the contracting process and | CCHA admits providers and facilities that meet HCPF's requirements to enroll as a Medicaid provider and are able to meet CCHA's credentialing requirements. | The Department is responsible for enrolling Providers, and the UM Vendor receives the enrollment feeds, and so as long as the provider is enrolled and the appropriate provider type for the benefit they may request a PAR. The Department will accept any willing provider that meets the enrollment requirements, but will specifically recruit by need. Typically will | |

⁵⁷ Example specialty provider groups and facilities include providers who have: A unique specialty or clinical expertise; License to prescribe in all areas: APRN/APN, NP, PA, MD/DO (Board Certified Child and Adult Psychiatrists);Capability to treat in a foreign language, ASL, and/or, have specific cultural experience; Capability of billing both Medicare and Medicaid; Practice located in regional organization's service areas considered rural or frontier where there are fewer providers; Telemedicine, especially for prescriber services; Alignment with primary care and co-located in an integrated model; Capability to serve unique populations and disorders; Specialties such as Intellectual Disabilities, Autism, Members with Traumatic Brain Injuries or other groups that provide behavioral health services in addition to their non-covered specialty. Also, providers with experience in specialty care, long-term services and supports (LTSS) providers, managed service organizations and their networks of substance use disorder providers, dental and other ancillary providers; or Behavioral health providers that span inpatient, outpatient, and all other covered mental health and substance use disorder services.

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| | | | operational requirements of contracted network providers. Assistance in completing required documents is provided, if needed. For some providers, a clinical site visit may also be warranted. ⁵⁸ | | use the provider bulletin to announce specific needs. | |
| What national accrediting standards are used to determine admission into the plan's network of care professionals? | National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) | Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare (CAQH). Optionally a provider can complete a NHP/HCI application which is NCQA accredited and follows NCQA standards for credentialing. | National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) | Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare (CAQH) | Providers wishing to enroll with Medicaid must the specific requirements of provider type and services to be provided. | |
| What process does a provider follow to become credentialed and | Submit complete credentialing packet to RMHP for | Submission of completed and signed applications, | Provider completes paper application or | To become credentialed CCHA uses the CAQH | The Fee-For-Service Medicaid provider enrollment process | |

⁵⁸ Provider recruitment can be initiated as follows: Identified need through provider network adequacy assessment; Internal request from Care Management, Utilization Management, other; External request/referral from providers, members, other

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| recredentialed with the plan? | review. The packet must include a W9, current practice demographics, proof of enrollment with HCPF, and email address. Providers must have a current CAQH application. Providers are recredentialed every 36 months. Re-credentialing focus on verifying that CAQH and attestation is up- to-date and verifying licensure. If up to date, | along with all required supporting documentation using CAQH process or NHP/HCI process. The provider is notified about recredentialing up to 6 months ahead of time and if the provider's documents are current with CAQH, then the process is very streamlined. | electronic app through CAQH. To recredential, provider must update (or keep up to date in CAQH) their documentation. If up to date, we are able to recredential practitioners without ever having to notify them. | Universal Provider Data Source. Providers must complete the online credentialing application, authorize access to their information, verify and attest their data is accurate and complete, submit supporting documents. ⁵⁹ Recredentialing is less administratively burdensome than the initial credentialing process - primarily just ensuring the CAQH information is up to date. | uses a validation process based on federal requirements (i.e. practitioner must be licensed to enroll, etc.) for all providers. |

⁵⁹ CAQH Universal Provider Data Source credentialing process supporting documents: State license(s) applicable to your provider type, Board certification or highest level of medical training or education, Work history, Admitting privileges at a hospital accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO), National Integrated Accreditation for Healthcare Organizations (NIAHO), American Osteopathic Association (AOA) or a network hospital previously approved by the committee, Current DEA certificate or plan to prescribe if no DEA certificate, if applicable, Current Controlled and Dangerous Substances certificate, if applicable, Copy of the professional liability insurance face sheet is required. Organizational providers are required to maintain professional liability insurance in the amounts specified in the Network Provider Agreement consistent with State law requirements and CCHA policy. Summary of all pending or settled malpractice case(s) within the past 10 years, Curriculum vitae, Current signed attestation, Written protocol (advanced nurse practitioners only), Supervision form (physician assistants only), Hospital Coverage letter, required by CCHA from providers who do not have admitting privileges at a participating network hospital, State or federal license sanctions or limitations, Medicare, Medicaid or Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) sanctions, Disclosure of Ownership

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| RAE 1 RAE 2&4 RAE 3&5 RAE 6&7 QUESTION MH/SUD MH/SUD MH/SUD DEPARTMENT M/ | | | | | | |
| | process is more streamlined. | | | | | |
| How often do providers need to revalidate/recredential? | Providers must revalidate with Health First Colorado every 5 years. Providers must recredential every 36 months. | Providers must revalidate with Health First Colorado every 5 years. Providers must recredential every 36 months. | Providers must revalidate with Health First Colorado every 5 years. Providers must recredential every 36 months. | Providers must revalidate with Health First Colorado every 5 years. Providers must recredential every 36 months. | Providers must revalidate with Health First Colorado at least every 5 years. | |
| How often do providers need to recontract? | Most Provider contracts are evergreen, so they are in effect unless either party decides to terminate. | Contracts with providers are evergreen, automatically renewing each year. Providers are not required to recontract as long as they meet credentialing and recredentialing requirements. | Most provider contracts auto- renew annually unless they are renegotiated or terminated. | CCHA Contracts are Evergreen. CCHA does not require providers to recontract once an agreement is dually executed. | Providers do not contract with the Department. Providers enroll with Medicaid and that enrollment does not have a timeframe. | |
| What process does the plan have in place for a provider to appeal a denial into the plan's network? | If a provider was denied due to credentialing reasons, they can appeal to a Medical Director. The MPRC has oversight of credentialing including the regulatorily | A provider is able to submit appeal to National Credentialing Committee within thirty (30) days of notification. | If the COA Credentialing Committee denies a new provider from joining our network, there is no appeals process. If the Credentialing Committee recommends that a | If an initial application is rejected the Practitioner has the opportunity for an Informal Review/ Reconsideration of the decision and the right to submit additional | If a provider is denied enrolling with Medicaid, they are provided an opportunity to submit updated documentation if they believe it will change the outcome. | |

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|----------------|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | required appeal process. | | provider is terminated from our network, then the provider is offered an appeal process to include a hearing. | information to the Company to correct any errors in the factual information which led to the determination or provide other relevant information. This information must be submitted within the 30 calendar day period immediately following the date of receipt of the letter. | |
| Does the plan accept any willing provider into its network of care providers (assuming the provider is Medicaid enrolled, meets credentialing and quality standards, and accepts reasonable reimbursement for services)? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Network Provider Admission Findings: Scenario 3

The network provider admission policies and procedures include recruitment, accrediting standards, credentialing/recredentialing, contracting timeframes, appealing a denial, and accepting any willing provider into the network. These policies and procedures for

MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Other than the different licensure, the process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S.

Scenario 4: Network Provider Admission

| | NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | | | |
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | | | |
| What process is followed for recruiting and accepting providers into the plan's network of care professionals? | Actively recruit providers based on need identified through care management, utilization management, requests from providers and members. Contact the providers to discuss contracting process and requirements, assist in completing application and credentialing process. | Identify potential gaps or network concerns through network adequacy reporting, utilization team requests, care management programs, grievance and appeals, CAPHS, etc., then outreach to providers. | | | | | |
| What national accrediting standards are used to determine admission into the plan's network of care professionals? | NCQA | NCQA | | | | | |
| What process does a provider follow to become credentialed and recredentialed with the plan? | Provider completes paper application or electronic app through CAQH. To recredential, provider must update (or keep up to date in CAQH) their documentation. If up to date, we are able to recredential practitioners without ever having to notify them. | Complete Application provided on the CAQH website so that the Credentialing Department may obtain and validate information attested to by the practitioner. The CAQH Credentialing Application must be currently signed or attested with the most recent information. Providers recredential at least every 36 months. DHMC notifies applicant of recredential process in a timely manner to meet 36- month timeframe. | | | | | |
| How often do providers need to revalidate/recredential? | Revalidation with Health First CO: Every 5 years | Revalidation with Health First CO: Every 5 years | | | | | |
| | Recredentialing for COA: Every 3 years. | Recredentialing for DHMC: Every 3 years. | | | | | |
| How often do providers need to recontract? | Most provider contracts auto-renew annually unless they are renegotiated or terminated. | Re-contracting is not required unless either party expresses a need to renegotiate. | | | | | |
| What process does the plan have in place for a provider to appeal a denial into the plan's network? | If the COA Credentialing Committee denies a new provider from joining our network, there is no appeals process. If the Credentialing | Practitioners may appeal a credentialing or recredentialing decision using the practitioner appeal process | | | | | |

| NETWORK PROVIDER ADMISSION SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| | Committee recommends that a provider is terminated from our network, then the provider is offered an appeal process to include a hearing. | as defined in the DHMC Provider Manual | | | |
| Does the plan accept any willing provider into its network of care providers (assuming the provider is Medicaid enrolled, meets credentialing and quality standards, and accepts reasonable reimbursement for services)? | Yes | DHMC encourages providers to apply to join the network; however, as a closed network DHMC does not contract with all providers and focuses on areas of identified need. | | | |

Network Provider Admission Findings: Scenario 4

The network provider admission policies and procedures include recruitment, accrediting standards, credentialing/recredentialing, contracting timeframes, appealing a denial, and accepting any willing provider into the network. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. Other than the different licensure, the process is the same for MH/SUD and M/S.

Appendix K - Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates

Description: The process by which a health plan establishes charges/reimbursement rates of payment for participant services rendered by providers.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing charge establishment standards to ensure timely access to care and sufficient network adequacy; alignment of charges based on provider type and specialty.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP, EC | Yes | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP, EC | Yes | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP, EC | Yes | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP, EC | Yes | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | Yes | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

| cenario 1: Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| LJ | SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
| QUESTION MH/SUD M/S | | | | | |
| What process is used to establish charges and reimbursement rates of payments for participant services rendered by providers? Please separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | For Inpatient MH/SUD, the Department uses its standard cost- based rate methodology that factors in indirect and direct care requirements, facility expense expectations, administrative expense expectations and capital overhead expense expectations. For Outpatient MH/SUD, the Department uses its standard cost- based rate methodology that factors in indirect and direct care requirements, facility expense expectations, administrative expense expectations, and capital overhead expense expectations. For Emergency MH/SUD, the Department uses the All Payer Refined Diagnosis Related Group (APR-DRG) payment methodology for provider reimbursement. This model incentivizes using the lowest level of care necessary for a service. The model is weighted. Each hospital has a base rate calculated from their Medicare base rates. The average cost of service at a hospital is multiplied by other factors. For MH/SUD prescribed pharmaceuticals, the Department bases the payment on an average acquisition cost with a multiplier. If the average acquisition cost is unavailable, the Department uses the average wholesale cost with a multiplier. For MH/SUD physician administered pharmaceuticals, the rate is based off Medicare data. Fees are updated quarterly. If data is not available, the Department uses the Medicare Average Sales Price (ASP) minus 4.5%. | For Inpatient M/S, The Department uses the All Payer Refined Diagnosis Related Group (APR-DRG) payment methodology for provider reimbursement. This model incentivizes using the lowest level of care necessary for a service. The model is weighted. Each hospital has a base rate calculated from their Medicare base rates. The average cost of service at a hospital is multiplied by other factors. For Outpatient M/S services, the Department uses its standard cost-based rate methodology that factors in indirect and direct care requirements, facility expense expectations, administrative expense expectations, and capital overhead expense expectations. For Emergency M/S services, the Department uses the All Payer Refined Diagnosis Related Group (APR-DRG) payment methodology for provider reimbursement. This model incentivizes using the lowest level of care necessary for a service. The model is weighted. Each hospital has a base rate calculated from their Medicare base rates. The average cost of service at a hospital is multiplied by other factors. For M/S prescribed pharmaceuticals, the Department uses the payment on an average acquisition cost with a multiplier. If the average acquisition cost is unavailable, the Department uses the average wholesale cost with a multiplier. | | | |

| ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | | For M/S physician administered pharmaceuticals, the rate is based off Medicare data. Fees are updated quarterly. If data is not available, the Department uses the Medicare Average Sales Price (ASP) minus 4.5%. | | |
| Are there any differences that may exist based on provider type or specialty and separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | If it's within the scope of their practice, a provider would get the same rate regardless of provider type or specialty. | If it's within the scope of their practice, a provider would get the same rate regardless of provider type or specialty. | | |
| How often is the current provider fee scheduled reviewed ? | At least annually. Labs are updated quarterly. | At least annually. Labs are updated quarterly. | | |
| How are providers notified of changes to reimbursement rates? | Any changes are communicated to providers including direct emails, provider bulletin, the ColoradoPAR program website and direct communication with providers. | Any changes are communicated to providers including direct emails, provider bulletin, the ColoradoPAR program website and direct communication with providers. | | |
| Is there a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates? | Currently, there is not a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates. However, provider and stakeholder outreach is performed when rates are being reviewed for sufficiency in order to gather additional reimbursement information that may be lacking in the rate methodology. Single case agreements are used for very limited situations where out of state hospital services are needed for services that the state doesn't have the ability to provide. | Currently, there is not a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates. However, provider and stakeholder outreach is performed when rates are being reviewed for sufficiency in order to gather additional reimbursement information that may be lacking in the rate methodology. Single case agreements are used for very limited situations where out of state hospital services are needed for services that the state doesn't have the ability to provide. | | |

Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates Findings: Scenario 1

The policies and procedures regarding establishing charges / reimbursement rates include process used, differences based on provider type or specialty, timeframes for reviewing fees, notifying providers, and negotiating rates. The policies and procedures for establishing charges and reimbursement rates for MH/SUD services are identical in every benefit category

except inpatient services. For inpatient services, while different, the MH/SUD policies and procedures are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates

ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES

SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--|---|
| What process is used to establish charges and reimbursement rates of payments for participant services rendered by providers? Please separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | Pharmacy: RMHP uses lesser of three logic to determine the price. Members are charged the lesser of AWP/MAC price, copay, or usual and customary (U/C) price. Copays are based on the tier structure of the benefit while the price reimbursed to the pharmacy is negotiated by the PBM, OptumRx. Reimbursement rates are based on brand and generic designation from MediSpan. Brand drugs negotiated at AWP minus % for any branded drug. Generics are set at a MAC price without regard for BH or medical indications IP/OP/EC: RMHP may determine reimbursement rates on the basis of State funding levels and/or fee schedules. Scarce services may receive special consideration for higher rates. This is true for all services. | Pharmacy: RMHP uses lesser of three logic to determine the price. Members are charged the lesser of AWP/MAC price, copay, or usual and customary (U/C) price. Copays are based on the tier structure of the benefit while the price reimbursed to the pharmacy is negotiated by the PBM, OptumRx. Reimbursement rates are based on brand and generic designation from MediSpan. Brand drugs negotiated at AWP minus % for any branded drug. Generics are set at a MAC price without regard for BH or medical indications IP/OP/EC: RMHP may determine reimbursement rates on the basis of State funding levels and/or fee schedules. Scarce services may receive special consideration for higher rates. This is true for all services. |
| Are there any differences that may exist based on provider type or specialty and separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | Pharmacy: No IP/OP/EC: RMHP has different reimbursement levels based upon level of licensure. Scarce services may receive special consideration if needed to fill a network need. | Pharmacy: No IP/OP/EC: RMHP has different reimbursement levels based upon level of licensure. Scarce services may receive special consideration if needed to fill a network need. |
| How often is the current provider fee scheduled reviewed ? | Pharmacy: Ad Hoc IP/OP/EC: Annually | Pharmacy: Ad Hoc IP/OP/EC: Annually |
| How are providers notified of changes to reimbursement rates? | Contract amendment | Contract amendment |
| Is there a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates? | Pharmacy: No | Pharmacy: No |

| ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | IP/OP/EC: Providers can submit rates for RMHP review and consideration. | IP/OP/EC: Providers can submit rates for RMHP review and consideration. | | |

Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates Findings: Scenario 2

The policies and procedures regarding establishing charges / reimbursement rates include process used, differences based on provider type or specialty, timeframes for reviewing fees, notifying providers, and negotiating rates. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

| Scenario 3: Establis | cenario 3: Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| | ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES | | | | | |
| | SC | ENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 | AND DEPARTMENT | FFS | | |
| | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| QUESTION What process is used to establish charges and reimbursement rates of payments for participant services rendered by providers? Please separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | IP/OP/EC - RMHP may determine reimbursement rates on the basis of State funding levels and/or fee schedules. Scarce services may receive special consideration for higher rates. | IP/OP/EC - NHP/HCI creates and maintains a fee schedule with Medicaid appropriate rates, uses available tools to determine usual and customary rates including, but not limited to, Colorado Fee For Services Medicaid Rates and standards, CMS Reimbursement Rates, or market standards. | IP/OP/EC - COA utilizes established reimbursement methods such as: DRG for inpatient; RBRVS, EAPG, and Colorado Medicaid fee schedule for outpatient. In addition, provider contracts may also include value based arrangements that provide incentives for meeting quality of care KPI's. | IP/OP/EC - The factors that CCHA uses to determine provider reimbursement rates include: (a) provider location - urban vs. rural; (b) provider setting - office or facility; (c) competitiveness of our rates; (d) CPT/HCPCS code being billed; (e) Medicare reimbursement and tables illustrating office expenses; (f) education level of provider; (g) frequency with which a provider type specific codes; (h) for new CPT/HCPCS codes, evaluation of whether it is a replacement of a prior code, which we would crosswalk to the prior | IP/EC - The Department uses the All Payer Refined Diagnosis Related Group (APR-DRG) payment methodology for provider reimbursement. This model incentivizes using the lowest level of care necessary for a service. The model is weighted. Each hospital has a base rate calculated from their Medicare base rates. The average cost of service at a hospital is multiplied by other factors. OP - The Department uses its standard cost- based rate methodology that factors in indirect and direct care requirements, facility expense expectations, administrative expense | |

Scenario 3. Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates

| | ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| | | | | reimbursement amount, or a new code, where fees will be set based on relativity to surrounding codes; (i) Health First Colorado fee schedule; and (j) any legislative actions or requirements to our payment model. Emergency-CCHA will cover and pay for Emergency Services and Care, regardless of whether the entity furnishing the services is a participating provider. Prescription Drugs- N/A | expectations, and capital overhead expense expectations. M/S prescribed pharmaceuticals -The Department bases the payment on an average acquisition cost with a multiplier. If the average acquisition cost is unavailable, the Department uses the average wholesale cost with a multiplier. M/S physician administered pharmaceuticals - The rate is based off Medicare data. Fees are updated quarterly. If data is not available, the Department uses the Medicare Average Sales Price (ASP) minus 4.5%. | |
| Are there any differences that may exist based on provider type or specialty and separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, | RMHP has different reimbursement levels based upon level of licensure. Scarce services may receive | NHP/HCI updates reimbursement rates of payments based on provider types. Community Mental Health | The following include, but are not limited to, provider specialties/ expertise that could | Yes, fee schedules vary depending on the provider type. | If it's within the scope of their practice, a provider would get the same rate regardless of provider type or specialty. | |

| | ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------|----------------|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S | |
| outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | special consideration if needed to fill a network need. | Centers are updated annually based on their updated Based Unit Cost and States updated RVU rates. Federally Qualified Health Centers and Rural Health Centers encounter rates are updated ad hoc based on rate updates conducted by the Department. Independent Provider Network OP providers receive standard FFS fee schedule which is reviewed and updated on a periodic basis. IPN IP and residential facilities rates are determined based on usual and customary rates. Additionally, NHP/HCI may negotiate rates, where appropriate, to ensure Members | warrant additional compensation: Advanced degrees such as an MD, PhD, NP Providers that serve populations who face barriers to access to care such as, deaf/hard of hearing, foreign language spoken, refugees, BIPOC, LGBTQ Subspecialties | | | |

| | ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | | have access to covered services. | | | |
| How often is the current provider fee scheduled reviewed ? | Annually | There is no established timeframe for reviewing the IPN OP provider fee schedule, but it is done at minimum annually. It can be done more often if the review deems it appropriate. | At least annually and as indicated by factors such as inflation and market competitiveness. | CCHA continually monitors provider reimbursement using the criteria outlined above. | At least annually. Labs are updated quarterly. |
| How are providers notified of changes to reimbursement rates? | Contract amendment | Contract amendment, but may be contacted through direct written notice. | Providers are notified of reimbursement changes in formal notices, through the COA Provider Portal, and Provider Newsletters. | Unilateral amendment via email and mailing to primary location on file. | Any changes are communicated to providers including direct emails, provider bulletin, the ColoradoPAR program website and direct communication with providers. |
| Is there a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates? | Providers can submit rates for RMHP review and consideration. | Providers may request review of their reimbursements in writing for consideration. | Each contract with a provider has the potential to be negotiated and/or customized for each provider relationship. | Providers can reach out to their designated contract manager. Fee schedules are negotiated with appropriate rationale. | Single case agreements are used for very limited situations where out of state hospital services are needed for services that the state doesn't have the ability to provide. |

Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates Findings: Scenario 3

The policies and procedures regarding establishing charges / reimbursement rates include process used, differences based on provider type or specialty, timeframes for reviewing fees, notifying providers, and negotiating rates. While differences exist in how the charges / reimbursement rates are determined, the processes are industry standard and are applied in a substantially similar and no more stringent method.

Scenario 4: Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates

ESTABLISHING CHARGES/REIMBURSEMENT RATES

SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--|--|
| What process is used to establish charges and reimbursement rates of payments for participant services rendered by providers? Please separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs). | COA utilizes established reimbursement methods such as: DRG for inpatient; RBRVS, EAPG, and Colorado Medicaid fee schedule for outpatient. In addition, provider contracts may also include value based arrangements that provide incentives for meeting quality of care KPI's. | DHMC utilizes established reimbursement methods such as: DRG for inpatient; EAPG, and the Colorado Medicaid fee schedule for outpatient. |
| | The following include, but are not limited to, provider specialties/ expertise that could warrant additional compensation: | No |
| | • Advanced degrees such as an MD, PhD, NP | |
| Are there any differences that may exist based on provider type or specialty and separate by benefit classifications as appropriate (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, | • Providers that serve populations who face barriers to access to care such as, deaf/hard of hearing, foreign language spoken, refugees, BIPOC, LGBTQ | |
| prescription drugs). | Subspecialties | |
| How often is the current provider fee scheduled reviewed ? | At least annually | As updates are received |
| How are providers notified of changes to reimbursement rates? | Formal notices, COA Provider Portal, and Provider Newsletters | Provider website, provider newsletters, and direct communication if appropriate. |
| Is there a process for providers to negotiate reimbursement rates? | Each contract with a provider has the potential to be negotiated and/or customized for each provider relationship. | DHMC negotiates rate with each provider directly during the contracting process. |

Establishing Charges/Reimbursement Rates Findings: Scenario 4

The policies and procedures regarding establishing charges / reimbursement rates include process used, timeframes for reviewing fees, notifying providers, and negotiating rates. While differences exist in how the charges / reimbursement rates are determined, the processes are industry standard and are applied in a substantially similar and no more stringent method. There are differences in how provider type or specialty are handled, but the MH/SUD providers have the ability to negotiate their payment for care due to managed care and are not limited to the what fee-for-service pays, and therefore this comparison is more lenient for MH/SUD.

Appendix L - Restrictions Based on Geographic Location/Facility Type, Provider Specialty

Description: Health plan policies on recruitment, credentialing, and enrollment of network providers to include any exclusionary criteria.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing provider network selection criteria for network admission, credentialing and recredentialing of MH/SUD and M/S providers, provider appeals process, and utilization of national accrediting standards.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | N/A | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | N/A | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | N/A | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | N/A | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | N/A | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | N/A | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | N/A | No | √Yes |

Analysis: No health plans currently place restrictions based on geographic location, facility type, or provider specialty.

Appendix M - Network Adequacy Determination

Description: The health plan's policy and protocols for determining the sufficiency of the provider network to substantiate participant needs, timely access to care, provider diversity, and compliance with applicable regulations and contract standards.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing provider adequacy policies to include timely access to care, as well as target provider counts and diversity, frequency of adequacy reviews, and reports to Department.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | Used by | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

| NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | | |
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC, PD | IP, OP, EC, PD | | | |
| How does the plan determine an adequate number of providers in the network? Are there differences by specialty? | Regional comparisons by county, year-over-year comparisons, multiple metrics as a whole, and stakeholder feedback. The process also looks to ensure adequate specialty providers. | Regional comparisons by county, year-over-year comparisons, multiple metrics as a whole, and stakeholder feedback. The process also looks to ensure adequate specialty providers. | | | |
| What process does the plan follow for maintaining network adequacy? | Consistent evaluation, engagement, and intervention when necessary | Consistent evaluation, engagement, and intervention when necessary | | | |
| How frequently does the plan report on network adequacy? | Reporting is required at least quarterly. | Reporting is required at least quarterly. | | | |
| What strategies does the plan use to address identified deficiencies in the network? | The strategies used depend on the data and conclusions. | The strategies used depend on the data and conclusions. | | | |

Scenario 1: Network Adequacy Determination

Network Adequacy Determination Findings: Scenario 1

The policies and procedures regarding network adequacy determination include determining adequacy, maintaining adequacy, reporting, and strategies to address deficiencies. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. As required in contract, all plans report on network adequacy to the Department guarterly.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Network Adequacy Determination

NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO QUESTION MH/SUD M/S Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) IP, OP, EC, PD IP, OP, EC, PD

NETWORK ADEOUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO MH/SUD M/S **OUESTION** How does the plan determine an adequate Pharmacy: In network: Pharmacy: In network: Our number of providers in the network? Are Our nationwide network nationwide network allows there differences by specialty? allows the Member to the Member to have no have no restrictions on restrictions on location for location for retail retail pharmacy. Specialty pharmacy. Specialty and and Home delivery Home delivery pharmacies pharmacies are limited to are limited to Optum Optum Specialty and Optum Home Delivery as preferred. Specialty and Optum Home Delivery as Out of network: A member preferred. Out of would have to pay out of network: A member pocket and request coverage would have to pay out of via a DMR or manual claim. pocket and request IP/OP/EC: RMHP Contracts coverage via a DMR or with all willing inpatient manual claim. facilities and regularly IP/OP/EC: RMHP measure adequacy against Contracts with all willing State benchmarks and reports inpatient facilities and those results to the State regularly measure quarterly. adequacy against State benchmarks and reports those results to the State quarterly. What process does the plan follow for Pharmacy: Creating a Pharmacy: Creating a broad maintaining network adequacy? broad and inclusive and inclusive network is network is important to important to ensure access to ensure access to our our Members. Optum Members. Optum Specialty and Optum Home Delivery add value and Specialty and Optum Home Delivery add value streamlines the process for and streamlines the our Members to access specialty drugs and delivery process for our Members to access specialty drugs services. Having more than and delivery services. one vendor for Specialty (with Having more than one the exception of limited vendor for Specialty (with distribution drugs) and Home the exception of limited Delivery can cause some distribution drugs) and

Home Delivery can cause

some confusion for both

prescribers attempting to

Contracts with all willing

against State benchmarks

providers and regularly

measures adequacy

utilize these services

the Members and

IP/OP/EC: RMHP

distribution drugs) and Hom Delivery can cause some confusion for both the Members and prescribers attempting to utilize these services

IP/OP/EC: RMHP Contracts with all willing providers and regularly measures adequacy against State benchmarks and reports those results to the State quarterly. Network adequacy is measured and

| SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| | and reports those results to the State quarterly. Network adequacy is measured and reported annually to our Network Advisory Committee. | reported annually to our Network Advisory Committee. | | |
| How frequently does the plan report on network adequacy? | Pharmacy: Quarterly | Pharmacy: Quarterly | | |
| network adequacy. | IP/OP/EC: Network reports are supplied to the State on a quarterly basis. | IP/OP/EC: Network reports are supplied to the State on a quarterly basis. | | |
| What strategies does the plan use to address identified deficiencies in the network? | Pharmacy: Attempt to contract any pharmacy in the area that is determined to be inadequate. If there are no pharmacies available, make the Members aware of mail order opportunity. IP/OP/EC: RMHP Contracts with all willing | Pharmacy: Attempt to contract any pharmacy in the area that is determined to be inadequate. If there are no pharmacies available, make the Members aware of mail order opportunity. IP/OP/EC: RMHP Contracts with all willing inpatient facilities and regularly | | |
| | inpatient facilities and regularly measure adequacy against State benchmarks. RMHP works with various community stakeholders in an effort to expand services where needed. | measure adequacy against State benchmarks. RMHP works with various community stakeholders in an effort to expand services where needed. | | |

NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION

Network Adequacy Determination Findings: Scenario 2

The policies and procedures regarding network adequacy determination include determining adequacy, maintaining adequacy, reporting, and strategies to address deficiencies. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. As required in contract, all plans report on network adequacy to the Department quarterly.

Scenario 3: Network Adequacy Determination

| | NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC |
| How does the plan determine an adequate number of providers in the network? Are there differences by specialty? | RMHP Contracts with all willing inpatient facilities and regularly measure adequacy against State benchmarks and reports those results to the State quarterly. | The plan monitors the network to ensure there is sufficient providers in the network to meet the requirements of the members for access to care to serve all behavioral health needs and allow for member freedom of choice. ⁶⁰ | Within the comprehensive Network Adequacy report is the Geoaccess report that calls out specialties that are not meeting member to provider time and distance standards and member to provider ratio standards. This is a baseline to our recruitment | CCHA conducts quarterly Network Adequacy reviews as required by HCPF to ensure we have a robust behavioral health network. If our network is deficient in any geographic area or deficient in a provider type, CCHA works to ensure members are able to receive medically | Regional comparisons by county, year-over- year comparisons, multiple metrics as a whole, and stakeholder feedback. The process also looks to ensure adequate specialty providers. |

⁶⁰ The following network adequacy factors are considered: Anticipated Medicaid enrollment; Expected utilization of services, characteristics and health needs of specific Medicaid populations in the region; Numbers, types, and specialties of network providers required to furnish the contracted Medicaid services; Number of network providers accepting new Medicaid members; Geographic location of providers in relationship to where Medicaid members live, considering distance, travel time, and means of transportation used by members; Ability of providers to communicate with limited-English-proficient members in their preferred language; Ability of network providers to ensure physical access, reasonable accommodations, culturally competent communications, and accessible equipment for members with physical or mental disabilities; Availability of triage lines or screening systems, as well as use of telemedicine, e-visits, and/or other technology solutions.

| | NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | | | activity. There are differences in specialties. SUD providers continue to be unmet according to standards and there is an ongoing effort to recruit more providers and add levels of care with current providers. | necessary services as no cost to them, whether through an out-of-network provider, telemedicine, etc. Contractual network deficiency requirement- if our network is deficient in any way we have to alert the state with a notice and a remediation plan. If gaps in the existing network are identified, the Behavioral Health Provider Recruitment Strategy (policy) would be leveraged to bridge gaps. | |
| What process does the plan follow for maintaining network adequacy? | RMHP Contracts with all willing providers and regularly measures adequacy against State benchmarks and reports those results to the State quarterly. Network adequacy | NHP/HCI creates and maintains fee schedules with Medicaid appropriate rates, uses available tools to determine usual and customary rates including, but not limited to, Colorado | Two workgroups established to address network adequacy. The provider maintenance and retention workgroup work on keeping current contracted providers up-to- | CCHA monitors and tracks changes in the network that could affect sufficiency of service delivery, availability, or provider capacity on an ongoing basis. CCHA notifies HCPF when network | Consistent evaluation, engagement, and intervention when necessary |

| | NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | is measured and reported annually to our Network Advisory Committee. | Fee For Services Medicaid Rates, CMS Reimbursement Rates, or market standards. NHP/HCI may negotiate rates, where appropriate, to ensure Members have access to covered services. NHP/HCI monitors compliance to access standards by conducting outbound calls to practices to audit appointment availability. | date. The provider recruitment workgroup works specifically on recruiting providers identified as needed through the provider network adequacy assessment, internal request from Care Management, Utilization Management, or external request/referral from providers, members, etc | changes are significant and result in a deficiency within the network. | |
| How frequently does the plan report on network adequacy? | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly | Quarterly |
| What strategies does the plan use to address identified deficiencies in the network? | RMHP Contracts with all willing inpatient facilities and regularly measure adequacy against State benchmarks. RMHP works with various community stakeholders in an | NHP/HCI reviews network adequacy to ensure the availability of behavioral health care providers | Direct outreach to providers in specialties identified as deficient. | If gaps in the existing network are identified, the Behavioral Health Provider Recruitment Strategy (policy) would be leveraged to bridge gaps. | The strategies used depend on the data and conclusions. |

| NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | effort to expand services where needed. | within its delivery system. ⁶¹ | | | |

Network Adequacy Determination Findings: Scenario 3

The policies and procedures regarding network adequacy determination include determining adequacy, maintaining adequacy, reporting, and strategies to address deficiencies. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. As required in contract, all plans report on network adequacy to the Department quarterly.

⁶¹ NHP/HCI: Defines the types of behavioral health care practitioners and providers in its delivery system; Uses an updated and accurate list, in assessing the number of providers with expertise in key culturally based populations; Uses quantifiable and measurable standards for the number of members, by county, through the enrollment file, within the key population groups; Has quantifiable and measurable standards for the geographic distribution of providers. Analyzes performance against the standards annually; Determining any existing gap by a comparison of availability of providers as well as reviewing findings in Member and Family Affairs surveys or through contacts/surveys with advocacy organization of key populations (for examples children in foster care)

Scenario 4: Network Adequacy Determination

| NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION |
|--|
| SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO |

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|---|---|--|
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC, PD | IP, OP, EC, PD |
| How does the plan determine an adequate number of providers in the network? Are there differences by specialty? | Within the comprehensive Network Adequacy report is the Geoaccess report that calls out specialties that are not meeting member to provider time and distance standards and member to provider ratio standards. This is a baseline to our recruitment activity. There are differences in specialties. SUD providers continue to be unmet according to standards and there is an ongoing effort to recruit more providers and add levels of care with current providers. | DHMC is compliant with the HCPF the quarterly network adequacy reporting requirements. The comprehensive report includes Geoaccess to review time and distance standards to provider offices as well as provider to member ratios. The report includes a variety of different provider types. |
| What process does the plan follow for maintaining network adequacy? | Two workgroups established to address network adequacy. The provider maintenance and retention workgroup work on keeping current contracted providers up-to-date. The provider recruitment workgroup works specifically on recruiting providers identified as needed through the provider network adequacy assessment, internal request from Care Management, Utilization Management, or external request/referral from providers, members, etc | The quarterly network adequacy reports are discussed during the bi-monthly Network Management Committee (NMC) meeting. The NMC reviews all aspects of network adequacy that includes requests to the utilization management team, care management team, health plan services team, and the grievances and appeals team. DHMC utilizes CAHPS surveys to understand the perception of members regarding network adequacy. Based on the committee review, if an area is determined to be deficient, the Provider Relations team will identify and outreach to providers that provide the service of the deficiency. |
| How frequently does the plan report on network adequacy? | Quarterly | Quarterly |

NETWORK ADEQUACY DETERMINATION SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|--|--|
| What strategies does the plan use to address identified deficiencies in the network? | Direct outreach to providers in specialties identified as deficient. | The Provider Relations team will identify and outreach to providers that provide the service of the deficiency. |

Network Adequacy Determination Findings: Scenario 4

The policies and procedures regarding network adequacy determination include determining adequacy, maintaining adequacy, reporting, and strategies to address deficiencies. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice. As required in contract, all plans report on network adequacy to the Department quarterly.

Appendix N - Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

Description: Policies and protocols that health plans utilize to ensure participant timely access and medically-necessary care when unavailable through in-network providers.

Tools for Analysis: Data request, interviews with health plan staff, and policies/procedures documents referencing out-of-network provider policies and procedures to include timely access to medically-necessary services, and utilization and frequency of single case agreements.

Summary of Results: The following table illustrates the characteristics of each scenario including health plans being compared, applicable benefit categories, whether differences were found in the analysis, and compliance finding.

| | USED BY | Benefit Categories | DIFFERENCES BETWEEN M/S AND MH/SUD | Compliance Determined |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Scenario 1 | Department | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 2 | RMHP and Prime MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 3 | RAE 1 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 2 and 4 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 3 and 5 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| | RAE 6 and 7 | IP, OP, EC | No | √Yes |
| Scenario 4 | Denver PIHP and Denver Health MCO | IP, OP, EC, PD | No | √Yes |

Results by Scenario: On the following pages, each scenario is expanded into an overview of primary policies that impact this NQTL.

| Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards SCENARIO 1: DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | | |
| Can both a Member and a provider make the request for out-of-network services? | Yes | Yes | | |
| What criteria are necessary for the plan to allow out-of-network providers to bill for services? | For non-emergent IP hospital services in out-of- network hospitals to be allowed, the services must not be available in Colorado. ⁶² | For non-emergent IP hospital services in out-of-network hospitals to be allowed, the services must not be available in Colorado. ⁶³ | | |
| What process does the plan have for out- of-network providers to bill for services? | Enrollment. Providers must be enrolled for payment. The Department can walk them through enrollment if it's urgent. | Enrollment. Providers must be enrolled for payment. The Department can walk them through enrollment if it's urgent. | | |

Scenario 1: Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

Findings: Scenario 1

The policies and procedures regarding out-of-network provider access standards include requesting services, criteria for allowing out-of-network services, and process for billing services. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

It is determined that these policies and procedures are parity compliant.

Scenario 2: Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDER ACCESS STANDARDS

SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO

| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S |
|--|---|--|
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, | IP, OP, EC, PD. Benefit levels for out of network services are the same for all | IP, OP, EC, PD. Benefit levels for out of network services are the same for all services |

⁶² The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.
⁶³ Ibid.

| OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDER ACCESS STANDARDS SCENARIO 2: RAE 1 AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN HEALTH PLAN PRIME MCO | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | | |
| outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | services with the exception of urgent/emergent care which is always covered. | with the exception of urgent/emergent care which is always covered. | | |
| Can both a Member and a provider make the request for out-of-network services? | Pharmacy: No, only Members | Pharmacy: No, only Members | | |
| | IP/OP/EC: Yes | IP/OP/EC: Yes | | |
| What criteria are necessary for the plan to allow out-of-network providers to bill for services? | Pharmacy: N/A Urgent and Emergent Care is always allowed Out of Network. Additionally, if a service is not available within network, out of network services will be allowed and also in situations of continuity of care. | Pharmacy: N/A Urgent and Emergent Care is always allowed Out of Network. Additionally, if a service is not available within network, out of network services will be allowed and also in situations of continuity of care. | | |
| What process does the plan have for out- of-network providers to bill for services? | Pharmacy: N/A Urgent and Emergent Care can be billed in all cases. Out of Network care must be prior authorized. In some cases, a Single Case Agreement will be negotiated. | Pharmacy: N/A Urgent and Emergent Care can be billed in all cases. Out of Network care must be prior authorized. In some cases, a Single Case Agreement will be negotiated. | | |

Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards Findings: Scenario 2

The policies and procedures regarding out-of-network provider access standards include requesting services, criteria for allowing out-of-network services, and process for billing services. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are the same as the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 3: Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

| OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDER ACCESS STANDARDS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | |
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC | IP, OP, EC |
| Can both a Member and a provider make the request for out-of-network services? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| What criteria are necessary for the plan to allow out-of-network providers to bill for services? | Urgent and Emergent Care is always allowed Out of Network. Additionally, if a service is not available within network, out of network services will be allowed and also in situations of continuity of care. | The provider must meet criteria to serve a member as an out-of-network provide: Medicaid enrolled, meets credentialing and quality standards, and accepts reasonable reimbursement for services. The behavioral health provider must sign a Single Case Agreement with | If COA is unable to accommodate the request for services with a network provider (e.g., due to geography, provider specialty, or continuity of care), then the services are authorized for the out-of-network provider. This is consistent with industry standards. | CCHA allows out-of- network providers to bill for services if a member requires a medically necessary service that is not available from an in- network provider. | For non-emergent inpatient hospital services in out-of- network hospitals to be allowed, the services must not be available in Colorado. ⁶⁴ |

⁶⁴ The term in-network and out-of-network is not used by FFS UM since the ColoradoPAR program serves the entire state of Colorado and look at in-state and out-of-state (OOS) providers. Some border facilities are considered in-state. Both OOS and in-state providers need to be enrolled with Medicaid to bill for services and the authorization policies are the same.

| Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards SCENARIO 3: RAE 1-7 AND DEPARTMENT FFS | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| QUESTION | RAE 1 MH/SUD | RAE 2&4 MH/SUD | RAE 3&5 MH/SUD | RAE 6&7 MH/SUD | DEPARTMENT M/S |
| | | agreed upon reimbursement rates and services for execution. | | | |
| What process does the plan have for out-of- network providers to bill for services? | Urgent and Emergent Care can be billed in all cases. Out-of- network care must be prior authorized. In some cases, a Single Case Agreement will be negotiated. | Out-of-network providers are required to follow standard billing process including timely filing timeframes and claims submission process for all providers. The provider is required to follow the Department's Uniform Services Coding Standards. | COA requires PAR for all services rendered with an out-of-network provider. If the COA is unable to accommodate the request for services with a network provider (e.g., due to geography, provider specialty, or continuity of care), then the services are authorized for the out-of-network provider. This is consistent with industry standards. | Out-of-network providers are issued an OON agreement if they agree to CCHA's rate schedule. If they do not agree, CCHA will issue a Single Case Agreement for the negotiated rate. | Enrollment. Providers must be enrolled for payment. The Department can walk them through enrollment if it's urgent. |

Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards **Findings: Scenario 3**

The policies and procedures regarding out-of-network provider access standards include requesting services, criteria for allowing out-of-network services, and process for billing services. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Scenario 4: Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards

| OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDER ACCESS STANDARDS SCENARIO 4: DENVER HEALTH PIHP AND DENVER HEALTH MCO | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| QUESTION | MH/SUD | M/S | |
| Which benefit classifications do you have services subject to this NQTL? (inpatient, outpatient, emergency care, prescription drugs) | IP, OP, EC, PD | IP, OP, EC, PD | |
| Can both a Member and a provider make the request for out-of-network services? | Yes | Yes | |
| What criteria are necessary for the plan to allow out-of-network providers to bill for services? | If COA is unable to accommodate the request for services with a network provider (e.g., due to geography, provider specialty, or continuity of care), then the services are authorized for the out-of- network provider. This is consistent with industry standards. | There are instances in which a member may retain their out of network provider (e.g., pregnant women with established care already in their second or third trimester). Additionally, if DHMC is unable to accommodate the request for services with a network provider (e.g., due to geography, provider specialty), then the services are authorized for the out-of- network provider. | |
| What process does the plan have for out-of-network providers to bill for services? | COA requires PAR for all services rendered with an out-of-network provider. If the COA is unable to accommodate the request for services with a network provider (e.g., due to geography, provider specialty, or continuity of care), then the services are authorized for the out-of- network provider. This is consistent with industry standards. | DHMC requires PAR for all services rendered with an out- of-network provider. | |

Out-Of-Network Provider Access Standards Findings: Scenario 4

The policies and procedures regarding out-of-network provider access standards include requesting services, criteria for allowing out-of-network services, and process for billing services. These policies and procedures for MH/SUD services are substantially similar to the policies and procedures of M/S services, and follow standard industry practice.

Appendix O - Availability of Information

All Colorado Medicaid Members receiving MH/SUD benefits, whether through FFS, RAEs, or MCOs are required to be provided with: 1) the criteria utilized to determine medical necessity; and 2) the reason for denial of payment or reimbursement for MH/SUD services. The requirements for availability of information are as follows:

- Criteria for medical necessity determinations regarding MH/SUD benefits must be made available to enrollees, potential enrollees, and contracting providers upon request.
- The reasons for any denial of reimbursement or payment for MH/SUD benefits must be made available to the beneficiary.

All plans reviewed have provided substantial evidence that they are compliant with this parity requirement.

| CATEGORY | CRITERIA FOR MEDICAL NECESSITY | REASONS FOR DENIAL |
|-----------|---|---|
| FFS | Established by contract with the FFS UM vendor. The definition for medical necessity is mandated by the State and the criteria are agreed to in contract. Specifics of InterQual's proprietary medical necessity criteria is not publicly available. But for MH/SUD, PBT criteria is accessible on the Department's website and made available to enrollees, potential enrollees, and contracting providers upon request. | The Colorado Medicaid member handbook delineates the policy and process for notifying members of the reason for denial of payment. For any decision that affects Colorado Medicaid coverage or services, providers and members receive a letter. The letter is called a Notice of Action or a Notice of Adverse Benefit Determination. It tells members what the decision is, why the decision was made, and how to appeal if members disagree. For members under age 21, any medical necessity denial states how the member did not meet any requirements under EPSDT. |
| RAE 1 | The process and criteria for medical necessity decision-making is delineated in the RMHP Provider Manual - Care Management Decision Making section. | |
| RAE 2 & 4 | The Beacon Health Options manual states: "Beacon's clinical criteria, also known as medically necessary criteria, are based on nationally recognized resources, including but not limited to, those publicly | Beacon Health Options utilizes the Colorado Medicaid member handbook which delineates the policy and process for notifying members of the reason for denial of payment or reimbursement. For any decision that affects Colorado Medicaid coverage or services, members |

| called a |
|------------|
| of Adverse |
| ls members |
| decision |
| if |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| CATEGORY | CRITERIA FOR MEDICAL NECESSITY | REASONS FOR DENIAL |
|-----------|--|---|
| | payers. In addition, Beacon | |
| | disseminates criteria sets via the | |
| | website, provider manual, provider | |
| | forums, newsletters, and individual | |
| | training sessions. Upon request, | |
| | members are provided copies of | |
| | Beacon's medical necessity criteria | |
| | free of charge. | |
| | Medically necessary criteria may | |
| | vary according to individual state | |
| | and/or contractual requirements | |
| | and member benefit coverage. Use | |
| | of other substance use criteria | |
| | other than ASAM is required in some | |
| | jurisdictions. | |
| | Access to the Beacon's medical | |
| | necessity criteria is available on the | |
| | website. Visit the ASAM website to | |
| | order a copy of the ASAM criteria." | |
| RAE 3 & 5 | COA policy CCS302 outlines the | COA policy CCS302 outlines the |
| | procedures for making medical | procedures for notifying members of |
| | necessity criteria readily available | denial of reimbursement or payment, as |
| | to beneficiaries and providers. | well as the reason for denial. |
| | A. All Utilization Review criteria are available to | All adverse benefit determination |
| | members, potential | notifications sent to members and providers include instructions on how to |
| | members, and affected | obtain a copy of the criteria used in the |
| | practitioners upon request. | review. |
| | New or revised criteria are | Teview. |
| | published and disseminated in the | |
| | applicable provider manuals and on | |
| | the company web page. | |
| RAE 6 & 7 | CCHA adopts federal and State of | CCHA adopts federal and State of |
| | Colorado laws and regulations that | Colorado laws and regulations that |
| | pertain to the rights of members | pertain to the rights of members and |
| | and ensure its staff and network | ensure that its staff and network |
| | providers take those rights into | providers take those rights into account |
| | account when furnishing services to | when furnishing services to members. |
| _ | members. | |
| Denver | COA policy CCS302 outlines the | COA policy CCS302 outlines the |
| Health | procedures for making medical | procedures for notifying members of |
| PIHP | necessity criteria readily available | denial of reimbursement or payment, as |
| | to beneficiaries and providers. | well as the reason for denial |
| | A. All Utilization Review | All adverse benefit determination |
| | criteria are available to | notifications sent to members and |

| CATEGORY | CRITERIA FOR MEDICAL NECESSITY | REASONS FOR DENIAL |
|----------|---|--|
| | members, potential members, and affected practitioners upon request. New or revised criteria are published and disseminated in the applicable provider manuals and on the company web page. | providers include instructions on how to obtain a copy of the criteria used in the review. |