Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit (APTC) Program Assessment Report

for

Molina Healthcare of New Mexico, Inc. (New Mexico)

January 15, 2020

Table of Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Molina Healthcare of New Mexico, Inc. (Molina of NM) is a health insurance issuer that offered qualified health plans (QHPs) in the individual market State-Based Exchange (SBE) in New Mexico during the 2014 benefit year. Molina of NM submitted its final restated 2014 benefit year data in the November 2015 Enrollment and Payment Data Workbook (EPDW). The issuer received a total of $3,060,847.50 in advance payments of the premium tax credit (APTC) from CMS and reported a total of $5,523,109.18 in premiums for its 2014 benefit year individual market plans. The issuer was assessed user fees in the state of New Mexico using a market-wide assessment based upon market share and preceding calendar year data.

This report is an assessment, conducted in coordination with the SBE, of Molina of NM's compliance with the APTC program established in sections 1401 and 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. L. 111–148) enacted on March 23, 2010 and further amended and revised by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111–152) enacted on March 30, 2010 (collectively referred to throughout as PPACA), and implementing regulations. This report also details the results of the assessment of premiums for information purposes only as CMS did not charge user fees to issuers offering QHPs through SBEs during the 2014 benefit year.

Audits to Determine Compliance with the Administration of APTC Program

Under title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) sections §§ 155.1210 and 156.480, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) may audit[1] issuers that offer a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange to assess the degree of compliance with the APTC program requirements. HHS designates the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to conduct these audits and to achieve the following objectives:

- Safeguard Federal funds;
- Instill confidence amongst regulated entities of data quality, soundness, and robustness;
- Evaluate health insurance issuer compliance with program rules and regulations; and
- Develop a successful and coordinated risk-based, multi-year audit program that maximizes resources.

[1] To provide the flexibility needed when standing up a new oversight program and to ensure that issuers are able to provide CMS with their most accurate data, audit protocols allow for dialog between auditor and issuer to identify and correct errors in data submission that differ somewhat from some independence and reporting standards laid out under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). These procedures were defined and executed consistent with the competence, integrity, and analytical discipline required for performance audits as defined by GAGAS.

This audit is part of CMS's program to validate the enrollment and payment data reported in the final 2014 EPDW submitted by the issuer, and to analyze controls and policies of selected issuers pursuant to the authority defined in the regulations.

The findings and observations are documented below. If CMS found an instance of issuer non-compliance with APTC program requirements that requires correction to the APTC reported in the final EPDW, then CMS classified it as a *finding*. If CMS found a deviation from CMS requirements that we are calling to the attention of management for purposes of improving compliance in future program years, but that does not require correction to payment, then CMS categorized it as an *observation*.

Results of Review

CMS identified one (1) finding and two (2) observations for Molina of NM. The net APTC financial impact of the one (1) audit finding is an overstatement of $32,475.00 in APTC in the final EPDW and therefore a payment to CMS of $32,475.00, consisting of APTC owed to CMS. The net premium impact of the two (2) observations is an overstatement of $37,876.24 in premiums in the final EPDW. The finding and observations include the following:

Finding:

- Differences in APTC amounts identified in the comparison of the issuer's data included in the November 2015 EPDW submitted by Molina of NM to a Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from Molina of NM's systems.

Observations:

- Differences in premium amounts identified in the comparison of the issuer's data included in the November 2015 EPDW submitted by Molina of NM to a Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from Molina of NM's systems; and
- Inclusion of premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the Payment Desk Audit File.

Please refer to section IV for details on the finding and observations listed above, including the condition, cause, effect, corrective actions, and the issuer's responses.

II. BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

A. Background

Sections 1401 and 1412 of the PPACA established the APTC program to support the provision of affordable health care coverage to individuals. Additionally, section 1311 of the PPACA allows the SBEs to charge participating issuers user fees to support SBE operations.

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

Interim Payment Process

In 2014, CMS implemented a temporary process ("interim payment process") to calculate and make monthly payments of APTC and advance cost-sharing reduction (CSR) amounts. CMS used this interim payment process to calculate payments for all SBE issuers for the 2014-2017 benefit years. CMS transitioned most SBE issuers to policy-based payments (PBP) in 2018, and intends to transition the last SBE to PBP in 2020.

For the 2014 benefit year, the interim payment process required SBE issuer submitters, including issuers in New Mexico, to self-report enrollment and payment data on a monthly basis, including any adjustments to previous months' requests, via manual submission of an EPDW, and to attest to the accuracy of the data. SBE issuer submitters were required to calculate the QHP enrollment and payment amounts and to submit that information in the EPDW using their internal source data.

CMS calculated and made monthly payments based on the QHP data submitted in the EPDW. While using this interim process, CMS designed and implemented a robust set of internal controls within a larger program integrity framework to ensure payment accuracy. CMS required submitters to send the following QHP plan information at the variant level via the password-protected template:

1. State
2. Tax Identification Number (TIN)
3. Health Insurance Oversight System (HIOS) ID
4. QHP ID
5. Total premium amount for all enrollments
6. Total APTC amount
7. Total advance CSR amount
8. Total effectuated enrollment groups
9. Total effectuated enrollment groups with APTC
10. Total effectuated enrollment groups with advance CSR
11. Total effectuated members
12. Total effectuated members with APTC
13. Total effectuated members with advance CSR

CMS conducted a SBE payment close-out process for the 2014 benefit year in which CMS compared the EPDW data against the policy-level reporting (PLR) data submitted by the SBE. The PLR data submitted by the SBEs contained cumulative individual market enrollment APTC data to support the reconciliation and verification of the aggregate payments made through the interim payment process during the 2014 benefit year. CMS leveraged the monthly submissions that SBEs sent to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for reporting purposes and requested that SBEs separately submit to CMS the monthly cumulative data on individual market enrollment with an additional field for the QHP ID for each policy. CMS requested SBE or SBE issuers to explain any discrepancies and to re-submit the EPDW, if necessary, or to verify that payment data was accurate despite discrepancies with PLR data.

B. Regulations Governing APTC Programs

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

- 45 CFR § 155.1210: Maintenance of Records;
- 45 CFR § 156.50: Financial Support;
- 45 CFR § 156.460: Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit; and
- 45 CFR § 156.480: Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs.

Please refer to Appendix 2 for the specific requirements established under the authorities listed above.

C. Objectives

The objectives of this audit are to:

(1) Evaluate the accuracy and integrity of issuer-generated EPDW data reported for premiums and the APTC program;
(2) Identify potential CMS APTC payment errors resulting from issuer data reporting errors;
(3) Test accuracy and integrity of issuer processes for reducing an enrollee's share of premium to account for APTCs.

D. Scope and Methodology

CMS selected Molina of NM for an audit to assess the issuer's compliance with the aforementioned regulations. CMS evaluated Molina of NM's activities related to the 2014 benefit year (January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014) individual market data reported in the final EPDW submitted in November 2015 by the issuer to CMS to support APTC payments and premium amounts.

CMS sent Molina of NM an electronic letter on May 25, 2018 to notify them of the scope of this audit. CMS's audit contractor sent a follow-up letter to Molina of NM on May 29, 2018 that identified data requirements required to conduct the audit. CMS's audit contractor reviewed the audit data file submitted by Molina of NM, as well as the final 2014 EPDW submitted by the issuer to CMS, and used CMS's audit procedures to assess compliance with APTC program rules and regulations[2].

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

- Validations of the Payment Desk Audit File[2] data submitted to CMS:
    - EPDW Validations: Review and comparison of the issuer's final submitted 2014 EPDW to the Payment Desk Audit File from the issuer's systems.
    - Unreconciled Subscribers Review: Review and comparison of the subscribers reported in the Payment Desk Audit File to the subscribers included in the SBE's PLR data to determine if the subscribers existed and their coverage was effectuated in the issuer's system (i.e., the amount the subscriber is responsible to pay toward the first month's total premium amount has been paid in full by the subscriber). The state of NM did not have PLR data available for the 2014 benefit year and therefore the Unreconciled Subscribers Review entailing the use of PLR data was not applicable to Molina of NM.
    - Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File containing subscriber level data from the issuer's systems to verify that duplicate Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs (i.e., Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs that were reported in the file twice in the same month with full month or incorrectly prorated payment data) were not reported in the file.
    - Premium Less than APTC Validation: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File to verify that the subscribers' premium amounts reported in the file were not less than the APTC amounts reported in the file.
    - Coverage Days Validation: Review of the Payment Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported in the file were effectuated and had active coverage in the issuer's systems.
- Validations on samples of issuer's systems data:
    - Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review: Review and comparison of the coverage periods, premium and APTC amounts from the issuer's systems to the corresponding data included in the SBE's PLR data for a selected sample of forty-five (45) subscribers. The state of NM did not have PLR data available for the 2014 benefit year and therefore the Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review entailing the use of PLR data was not applicable to Molina of NM.
    - Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review: Analysis and review of data and

[2] The Payment Desk Audit File is CMS's standard document for issuers to provide information in support of this audit.

documentation from the issuer's systems to verify effectuation and the appropriate application of premium and APTC amounts to policies for a selected sample of fifteen (15) subscribers.

- Policy and Procedure Review: Review of issuer APTC policies and procedures for completeness and clarity.

III. RESULTS OF REVIEW

CMS assessed issuer compliance with regulations using the following procedures: EPDW Validations, Unreconciled Subscribers Review, Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check, Premium Less than APTC Validation, Coverage Days Validation, Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review, Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review, and Policy and Procedure Review.

To build collaborative relationships and identify process improvements that support program integrity goals, CMS conducted a discrepancy phase following the review of the initial audit data submission to work with the issuer to resolve or reduce audit findings, thereby improving compliance. Additional follow-up with the SBE was performed as necessary to confirm or resolve the identified audit findings. Below are the results of this review following the discrepancy phase.

EPDW Validation

One (1) finding and one (1) observation resulted from the comparison of the final 2014 EPDW submitted by the issuer to Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File. Please refer to Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 included in section IV for details on the finding and observation resulting from the EPDW validation.

Unreconciled Subscribers Review

The state of NM did not have PLR data available and therefore the Unreconciled Subscribers Review entailing the use of PLR data was not applicable to Molina of NM.

Duplicate Exchange-assigned Subscriber IDs Check

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that duplicate Exchange-assigned subscriber IDs were not reported in the file.

Premium Less than APTC Validation

No findings and one (1) observation resulted from the review of Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that subscribers were not reported in the file with premium amounts that were less than the APTC amounts. Refer to Observation No. 2 included in section IV for details on the observation.

Coverage Days Validation

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File to verify that enrollments of five (5) days or fewer reported in the file were effectuated and had active coverage in the issuer's systems.

Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review

The state of NM did not have PLR data available and therefore the Forty-five (45) Subscribers Sample Review entailing the use of PLR data was not applicable to Molina of NM.

Fifteen (15) Subscribers Sample Review

No findings or observations resulted from the review of the data and documentation from Molina of NM's systems to verify effectuation and the appropriate application of premium and APTC amounts to policies for a selected sample of fifteen (15) subscribers.

Policy and Procedure Review

No findings or observations resulted from the review of Molina of NM's APTC policies and procedures.

IV. FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

A finding is an identification of an instance of issuer non-compliance with APTC program requirements that requires correction to payment. CMS's audit procedures identified one (1) finding, which resulted in a change to the APTC amounts reported in Molina of NM's EPDW for individual market plans for the 2014 benefit year.

An observation is a deviation from CMS requirements that we are calling to the attention of management for purposes of improving compliance in future program years but that does not require correction to payment. CMS's audit procedures identified two (2) observations that resulted in a change to the premium amounts reported in Molina of NM's EPDW for individual market plans for the 2014 benefit year.

In light of the one (1) finding and two (2) observations, the adjusted 2014 benefit year EPDW APTC and premium amounts for individual market plans are shown in the following table.

Recalculated EPDW for the 2014 Benefit Year

	APTC	Premium (Observations)
EPDW as Filed in November 2015	$3,060,847.50	$5,523,109.18
Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 - EPDW Validations Adjustment	$(32,475.00)	$(42,103.61)
Observation No. 2 – Premium Less Than APTC Validation Adjustment	$0.00	$4,227.37
EPDW As Recalculated	$3,028,372.50	$5,485,232.94
Total Impact	**$(32,475.00)**	**$(37,876.24)***

Note: Positive APTC values indicate funds owed to the issuer.

The net financial impact of the one (1) audit finding is a payment to CMS of $32,475.00, consisting of APTC owed to CMS.

*Note: The premium impact of the two (2) observations is an overstatement of $37,876.24 in premiums. The premium impact is noted for purposes of improving compliance in future program years, as observations, as CMS did not charge user fees to issuers offering QHPs through SBEs during the 2014 benefit year.

For the one (1) audit finding and two (2) observations, CMS documented the criteria, cause, effect, corrective actions, and Molina of NM's responses as seen in the charts below.

Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations	
Condition:	**APTC Differences (Finding) –** For one or more months of 2014 benefit year enrollment in eight (8) QHPs, the net "Total APTC Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in Molina of NM's EPDW was greater than the total APTC amount included in Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File, resulting in an overpayment of $32,475.00 in APTC. For the one or more months of 2014 benefit year enrollment in eight (8) QHPs, the EPDW was overstated by one hundred and thirty (130) APTC enrollment groups and one hundred and eighty-three (183) APTC members. **Premium Differences (Observation)–** For one or more months of 2014 benefit year enrollment in nine (9) QHPs, the net "Total Premium Amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" included in Molina of NM's EPDW was greater than the total premium amount included in Molina of NM's Payment Desk Audit File, resulting in an overstatement of $42,103.61 in premiums. For the one or more months of 2014 benefit year enrollment in nine (9) QHPs, the EPDW was overstated by one hundred and twelve (112) enrollment groups and one hundred and twenty-six (126) members.
Criteria:	Per CMS guidance and EPDW submission requirements: The "Total APTC amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" submitted on the EPDW is the "total APTC toward the total premium amount for effectuated enrollments within a 16-digit QHP ID." The "Total premium amount by QHP ID for effectuated enrollments" submitted on the EPDW is the "total premium amount for the health coverage for all effectuated enrollments within that plan".
Cause:	The issuer indicated that "Last EPDW worksheets for year 2014, were submitted on Nov 2015, so it contained data at that point in time from our enrollment system. Since then retro activity has taken place on some of the members resulting in updated member level submission on Aug 2018. This is resulting into a difference between EPDW worksheets and member level submission done for the audit."
Effect:	The APTC and premium differences resulted in a change to Molina of NM's final, restated 2014 benefit year EPDW data.
Corrective Action Required:	The net financial impact of this finding is a payment to CMS of $32,475.00, consisting of APTC owed to CMS. Molina of NM should confirm the financial impact and coordinate on resolution with CMS.

Finding No. 1 and Observation No. 1 – EPDW Validations	
	The premium impact of this observation is an overstatement of $42,103.61 in premiums. CMS notes this observation for purposes of improving compliance in future program years.
Management Response:	Management agrees with the findings.

Observation No. 2 - Premium Less than APTC Validation	
Condition:	Molina of NM reported 2014 benefit year premium amounts that was less than the APTC amounts for one (1) subscriber in the Payment Desk Audit File. As a result, Molina of NM understated the 2014 benefit year premium amounts for one (1) subscriber in the Payment Desk Audit File.
Criteria:	Issuers cannot report a premium amount that is less than an APTC amount. Per CMS guidance, the premium amount reported in the EPDW and Payment Desk Audit File is the total monthly premium amount for the effectuated enrollment within a qualified health plan.
Cause:	CMS concluded that the correct APTC amounts were reported but the incorrect premium amounts were reported in the Payment Desk Audit File as the issuer indicated “Internal system issue. Premium amount should be 603.91 for these segments”.
Effect:	The inclusion of the incorrect premium amounts for the one (1) subscriber resulted in a change to Molina of NM’s final, restated 2014 benefit year EPDW data.
Corrective Action Required:	The premium impact of this observation is an understatement of $4,227.37 in premiums. CMS notes this observation for purposes of improving compliance in future program years.
Management Response:	Management agrees with the findings.

V. MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

Please provide management's response to the one (1) finding and two (2) observations identified in the draft audit report and complete the attached Appendix 1 - Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment (Appendix 1), within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. Management's response should indicate agreement or disagreement.

Agreement

If management agrees with the one (1) finding and the two (2) observations, complete the "Management Response" field of the finding and observations in the draft audit report, and initial "Agree" and sign the attached Appendix 1. Return the draft audit report including Appendix 1 within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. Upon receipt of the signed Appendix 1, CMS will finalize and publish the report on the CCIIO webpage. CMS will process the final payment adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

Disagreement

If management disagrees with the one (1) finding and corrective action or either of the two (2) observations, complete the "Management Response" field of the finding and observations in the draft audit report, and initial "Disagree" and sign the attached Appendix 1. Return the draft audit report including Appendix 1 and any supporting documentation that substantiates management's response within thirty (30) calendar days from the draft audit report date. This will be the final opportunity to provide information or supporting documentation to correct any inaccuracies in the report before it is finalized.

CMS will review the written explanations in the "Management Response" field of the findings and observations and any supporting documentation to determine if the report can be amended in a mutually acceptable manner. If you and CMS are unable to come to a mutually acceptable result, your response to this report will be included in the final published audit report.

Please return the updated Appendix 1 within fifteen (15) calendar days. Upon receipt of the signed Appendix 1, CMS will finalize and publish the report on the CCIIO webpage. CMS will process the final payment adjustment amount in the next available monthly payment cycle.

Appendix 1 – Issuer Management Response to Net Financial Adjustment

Issuer HIOS ID: 19722

Issuer Name: Molina of New Mexico, Inc. (Molina of NM)

The undersigned Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or other individual who can legally and financially bind this issuer has reviewed the information included in the audit report of the issuer's 2014 benefit year APTC program participation, resulting in a payment of $32,475.00 to CMS and:

(INITIAL)____ Agrees with the audit net adjustment amount above, confirming the audit finding(s) and observations(s), if applicable, and as such this report will be considered final and published.

OR

(INITIAL) _____ Disagrees and requests a review of additional information that may impact the audit net adjustment amount resulting from the 2014 benefit year audit. If review is requested, CMS will consider this draft only a preliminary audit report. If the review option is selected, you must provide a written explanation with any additional documentation when you return this response within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of this draft audit report. CMS will review the written explanation and any supporting documentation to determine if the report can be amended in a mutually-acceptable manner. If you and CMS are unable to come to a mutually-acceptable result, your response to this report will be included in the final published audit report.

Signed: _____
(Signature of authorized person acting on behalf of the issuer)

Printed Name: Alok Sancheti
(Print name of signature)

Title: AVP – Data Analytics
(Title of authorized person acting on behalf of the Issuer)

Telephone Number: 562-901-1054
(Direct Telephone Number)

Date: 01/15/2020

Appendix 2 – Applicable Regulations

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

Regulation	Guidance
45 CFR §155.1210 – Maintenance of Records	**(a) General.** The State Exchange must maintain and must ensure its contractors, subcontractors, and agents maintain for 10 years, documents and records (whether paper, electronic, or other media) and other evidence of accounting procedures and practices, which are sufficient to do the following: (1) Accommodate periodic auditing of the State Exchange's financial records; and (2) Enable HHS or its designee(s) to inspect facilities, or otherwise evaluate the State- Exchange's compliance with Federal standards. **(b) Records.** The State Exchange and its contractors, subcontractors, and agents must ensure that the records specified in paragraph (a) of this section include, at a minimum, the following: (1) Information concerning management and operation of the State Exchange's financial and other record keeping systems; (2) Financial statements, including cash flow statements, and accounts receivable and matters pertaining to the costs of operations; (3) Any financial reports filed with other Federal programs or State authorities; (4) Data and records relating to the State Exchange's eligibility verifications and determinations, enrollment transactions, appeals, and plan variation certifications; and (5) Qualified health plan contracting (including benefit review) data and consumer outreach and Navigator grant oversight information. **(c) Availability.** A State Exchange must make all records and must ensure its contractors, subcontractors, and agents must make all records in paragraph (a) of this section available to HHS, the OIG, the Comptroller General, or their designees, upon request.

Regulation	Guidance
45 CFR §156.50 – Financial Support	**(a) *Definitions.*** The following definitions apply for the purposes of this section: *Participating issuer* means any issuer offering a plan that participates in the specific function that is funded by user fees. This term may include: health insurance issuers, QHP issuers, issuers of multi-State plans (as defined in § 155.1000(a) of this subchapter), issuers of stand-alone dental plans (as described in § 155.1065 of this subtitle), or other issuers identified by an Exchange. **(b) *Requirement for State-based Exchange user fees.*** A participating issuer must remit user fee payments, or any other payments, charges, or fees, if assessed by a State-based Exchange under § 155.160 of this subchapter. **(c) *Requirement for Federally-facilitated Exchange user fee.*** To support the functions of Federally-facilitated Exchanges, a participating issuer offering a plan through a Federally-facilitated Exchange must remit a user fee to HHS each month, in the timeframe and manner established by HHS, equal to the product of the monthly user fee rate specified in the annual HHS notice of benefit and payment parameters for the applicable benefit year and the monthly premium charged by the issuer for each policy under the plan where enrollment is through a Federally-facilitated Exchange.
45 CFR §156.460 - Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit	**(a) Reduction of enrollee's share of premium to account for advance payments of the premium tax credit.** A QHP issuer that receives notice from the Exchange that an individual enrolled in the issuer's QHP is eligible for an advance payment of the premium tax credit must— (1) Reduce the portion of the premium charged to or for the individual for the applicable month(s) by the amount of the advance payment of the premium tax credit; (2) Notify the Exchange of the reduction in the portion of the premium charged to the individual in accordance with§ 156.265(g); and (3) Include with each billing statement, as applicable, to or for the individual the amount of the advance payment of the premium tax credit for the applicable month(s), and the remaining premium owed.

Regulation	Guidance
45 CFR § 156.480 - Oversight of the administration of the cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs.	**(a) Maintenance of records.** An issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through a State Exchange must adhere to, and ensure that any relevant delegated entities and downstream entities adhere to, the standards set forth in § 156.705 concerning maintenance of documents and records, whether paper, electronic, or in other media, by issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange, in connection with cost-sharing reductions and advance payments of the premium tax credit. **(b) Annual reporting requirements.** For each benefit year, an issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange must report to HHS, in the manner and timeframe required by HHS, summary statistics specified by HHS with respect to administration of cost-sharing reduction and advance payments of the premium tax credit programs, including any failure to adhere to the standards set forth under § 156.410(a) through (d), § 156.425(a) through (b), and § 156.460(a) through (c) of this Part. **(c) Audits.** HHS or its designee may audit an issuer that offers a QHP in the individual market through an Exchange to assess compliance with the requirements of this subpart.
45 CFR §156.705 – Maintenance of records for Federally-facilitated Exchanges	**(a)** ***General standard.*** Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must maintain all documents and records (whether paper, electronic, or other media) and other evidence of accounting procedures and practices, necessary for HHS to do the following: **(1)** Periodically audit financial records related to QHP issuers' participation in a Federally-facilitated Exchange, and evaluate the ability of QHP issuers to bear the risk of potential financial losses; and **(2)** Conduct compliance reviews or otherwise monitor QHP issuers' compliance with all Exchange standards applicable to issuers offering QHPs in a federally-facilitated Exchange as listed in this part. **(b)** ***Records.*** The records described in paragraph (a) of this section include the sources listed in § 155.1210(b)(2), (3), and (5) of this subchapter. **(c)** ***Record retention timeframe.*** Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must maintain all records referenced in paragraph (a) of this section for 10 years. **(d)** ***Record availability.*** Issuers offering QHPs in a Federally-facilitated Exchange must make all records in paragraph (a) of this section available to HHS, the OIG, the Comptroller General, or their designees, upon request.

Appendix 3 – Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

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