
CMS Manual System

Pub. 100-07 State Operations Provider Certification

Department of Health &
Human Services (DHHS)
Centers for Medicare &
Medicaid Services (CMS)

Transmittal 18

Date: MARCH 17, 2006

SUBJECT: Complete Revision to Chapter 5, “Complaint Procedures”

I. SUMMARY OF CHANGES: Chapter Five was completely revised and reformatted, includes updated policy, and incorporates cleared S& C letters through January 1, 2006. Chapter Five was reorganized into six different sections as follows:

- Information in Section 5000 to Section 5080 relates to all Medicare/Medicaid-certified providers/suppliers;
- Information in Section 5100 to Section 5170 relates to complaint procedures for deemed providers/suppliers;
- Information in Section 5200 to Section 5240 relates to all non-deemed provider/suppliers, excluding nursing homes;
- Information in Section 5300 to Section 5390 relates to nursing homes;
- Information in Section 5400 to Section 5480 relates to alleged EMTALA violations; and
- Information in Section 5500 to Section 5590 relates to CLIA-certified laboratories.

NEW/REVISED MATERIAL - EFFECTIVE DATE*: March 17, 2006

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: March 17, 2006

Disclaimer for manual changes only: The revision date and transmittal number apply to the red italicized material only.

**NOTE: NORMALLY, RED ITALIC FONT IDENTIFIES NEW MATERIAL.
HOWEVER, BECAUSE THIS CHAPTER IS A COMPLETE RE-WRITE,
NORMAL TEXT IS USED FOR THIS REVISION.**

**II. CHANGES IN MANUAL INSTRUCTIONS: (N/A if manual not updated.)
(R = REVISED, N = NEW, D = DELETED) – (Only One Per Row.)**

R/N/D	CHAPTER/SECTION/SUBSECTION/TITLE
N	5/Table of Contents
N	5/Complaint Procedures
R	5/Exhibit 22/Guidance to Distinguish Between the Priorities of Immediate Jeopardy and Non-Immediate Jeopardy-High in Nursing Home Allegations
R	5/Exhibit 23/ACTS Required Files

III. ATTACHMENTS:

	Business Requirements
X	Manual Instruction
	Confidential Requirements
	One-Time Notification
	Recurring Update Notification

***Unless otherwise specified, the effective date is the date of service.**

State Operations Manual

Chapter 5 - Complaint Procedures

Table of Contents
(Rev. 18, 03-17-06)

[Crosswalk to Old Chapter 5](#)

Sections 5000 to 5080.1 relate to all Medicare/Medicaid-certified provider/supplier types. 6

5000 - Management of Complaints and Incidents 6

 5000.1 – Purpose of the Complaint/Incident Process 6

 5000.2 - Overview 7

5010 - General Intake Process 7

 5010.1 - Information to Collect From Complainant 8

 5010.2 - Information to Provide to Complainant..... 9

 5010.3 –Notification to the RO..... 9

5050 - CMS Regional Office Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents..... 11

5060 – ASPEN Complaints/Incidents Tracking System (ACTS)..... 11

5070 - Priority Assignment for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA..... 13

5075 - Priority Definitions for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA..... 14

 5075.1 - Immediate Jeopardy (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA) 14

 5075.2 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy - High (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA) 15

 5075.3 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy - Medium (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)..... 16

5075.4 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy – Low (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA).....	16
5075.5 - Administrative Review/Offsite Investigation (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA).....	16
5075.6 - Referral – Immediate (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)	17
5075.7 - Referral – Other (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)	17
5075.8 - No Action Necessary (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)	17
5075.9- Maximum Timeframes Related to the Federal Onsite Investigation of Complaints/Incidents	19
5077- State Monitoring Visits.....	20
5080 - Investigation Findings and Reports	20
5080.1-Report to the Complainant.....	20
5080.2- Survey Exit Conference and Report to the Provider/Supplier.....	21
 Sections 5100 to 5170 relate to deemed providers/suppliers.....	 21
 5100 - Investigation of Complaints for Deemed Providers/Suppliers	 21
5100.1 - Basis for Investigation	21
5100.2- Post-Survey Procedures.....	23
5120 - Life Safety Code Guidance for Deemed Providers/Suppliers	26
5130 – Provider/ Supplier Hospital Refusal of Complaint Investigation Surveys	26
5140 - Hospital Restraints/Seclusion Death Reporting and Investigation.....	26
5140.1 - Background.....	26
5140.2 - Hospital Reporting Methods.....	27
5140.3 - Responsibilities.....	28
5140.4 - Process	29
5150 - Complaints Involving HIV-Infected Individuals.....	30
5160 - Investigating Complaints Involving ESRD Services Provided by Deemed Hospitals	30
5170 – Investigating Complaints Against ESRD Suppliers	30

Sections 5200 to 5240 relate to all non-deemed provider/supplier types, excluding nursing homes (SNFs/NFs)..... 32

5200 - Investigating Complaints for Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, Excluding Nursing Homes (SNFs/NFs)..... 32

 5200.1 - General Procedures..... 32

 5200.2 - Special Procedures for Psychiatric Hospitals 32

5210- Processing of Complaints Originating with or Investigated by the RO 33

5220- Investigation Conducted Directly by the RO 33

5230- Special RO Processing..... 33

5240 - Complaints - HHA Hotline..... 34

Sections 5300 to 5390 relate to nursing homes..... 34

5300 - Investigation of Complaints for Nursing Homes..... 34

 5300.1 - Task 1: Offsite Survey Preparation 35

 5300.2 - Task 2: Entrance Conference/Onsite Preparatory Activities..... 36

 5300.3 - Task 5: Information Gathering 36

 5300.4 - Task 6: Information Analysis 38

 5300.5 - Task 7: Exit Conference 39

5310 - Action on Complaints of Resident Neglect and Abuse, and Misappropriation of Resident Property..... 40

 5310.1 - Written Procedures 40

 5310.2 - Review of Allegation..... 40

 5310.3 - Investigating Allegations..... 40

 5310.4 - Factors Beyond the Control of the Individual 40

5320 – Reporting Findings of Abuse, Neglect, or Misappropriation of Property to the Nurse Aide Registry..... 41

 5320.1 - Notification Procedures- Preliminary Determinations 41

 5320.2 - Conduct of Hearing for Nurse Aides..... 42

 5320.3 - Reporting Findings 42

5330 - Reporting Abuse to Law Enforcement and the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit..... 43

5340 - Post-Survey Certification Actions for Nursing Homes 43

5350 – Data Entry 43

5360 - Processing of Complaints Originating with or Investigated by the CMS RO.....	44
5370 - Pre-Investigation Actions on Allegations Originating Through the RO	44
5380 - RO Processing of RO Investigated Complaints	44
5390 – RO Oversight of Complaint-Related Processes.....	45
 Sections 5400 to 5480.2 relate to alleged EMTALA violations.	 45
 5400 - Investigations Involving Alleged EMTALA Violations	 46
5410 – EMTALA and Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002	48
5410.1 Interaction of the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act and EMTALA.....	48
5410.3 Conduct of Investigations	49
5420 - Basis for Investigation.....	49
5430 - RO Direction of Investigation	49
5430.1 - Evaluation of Allegation.....	49
5430.2 - Request for Investigation of Allegations	50
5440 - Conducting an Investigation.....	50
5440.1 - Selecting the Team	50
5440.2 - Scheduling the Investigation	50
5440.3 - Guidelines for Surveyors Conducting Investigations.....	50
5440.4 - Conducting the Investigation.....	51
5440.5 - Exit Conference	53
5450 - Forwarding Report of Investigation to the RO.....	53
5460 - RO Review of Investigation	55
5460.1 - Hospital Is In Compliance - No Past Violation	55
5460.2 - Hospital Is In Compliance - Past Violation, No Termination	55
5460.3 - Hospital Is Not in Compliance - Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety.....	55
5460.4 - Hospital Is Not in Compliance - Situation Does Not Pose an Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety	56
5465 - Procedures for the 5-day QIO Review of Alleged Violations of 42 CFR 489.24.....	56
5470 -Termination Procedures for EMTALA Violations.....	57
5470.1 - Procedures for Termination when the EMTALA Violation is an Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety	57

5470.2 - Procedures for Termination When the EMTALA Violation is Not Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety	59
5480 - Procedures for QIO Review of Confirmed EMTALA Violation	59
5480.1 - Procedures for Coordinating 60 day QIO Review.....	59
5480.2- EMTALA Case Referral to OIG	61
5480.3 - Releasing QIO Assessment	62
 Sections 5500 to 5590 relate CLIA.	 62
 5500 - Complaints Involving Unaccredited Laboratories.....	 62
5500.1 - Control.....	63
5500.2 - Acknowledgment.....	63
5500.3 - Evaluation.....	63
5500.4 - Scheduling Investigations.....	64
5500.5 - Conducting Investigations	64
5500.6 - Conducting Investigations in a Laboratory with a Certificate of Waiver....	64
5500.7 - Conducting Investigations in a Laboratory with a Certificate for PPM Procedures.....	65
5500.8 - Post Investigation Actions	65
5500.9 - Resolution/Closeout.....	66
5510 - CLIA-Exempt Laboratory Complaint Investigations - General	66
5520 - Review of CLIA-Exempt Laboratory Complaints	67
5530 - Conducting Complaint Investigations and Surveys for CLIA-Exempt Laboratories.	68
5540 - Complaint Investigations and Surveys of Accredited Laboratories Under CLIA.....	69
5550 - RO Direction of Complaint Investigation of an Accredited Laboratory	70
5560 - Conducting Complaint Survey of an Accredited Laboratory	72
5570 – Forwarding Investigation Report to RO	72
5580 - Accredited Laboratory Found in Compliance Following a Complaint Survey.....	73
5590 - Accredited Laboratory Found Not in Condition-level Compliance Following a Complaint Survey	73

NOTE: Sections 5000 to 5080A relate to all Medicare/Medicaid-certified provider/supplier types.

5000 - Management of Complaints and Incidents

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5000.1 – Purpose of the Complaint/Incident Process

Mission: To protect Medicare/Medicaid beneficiaries from abuse, neglect, exploitation, inadequate care or supervision.

The goal of the Federal complaint/incident process is to establish a system that will assist in promoting and protecting the health, safety, and welfare of residents, patients, and clients receiving health care services. The complaint/incident management system has three objectives.

1. The first objective and priority for the complaint/incident management system is protective oversight. This is accomplished by analyzing the complaint allegations and reported incidents received to identify and respond to those that appear to pose the greatest potential for harming beneficiaries (has caused or is likely to cause, serious injury, harm, impairment or death). Complaints/incidents of this type that allege an immediate threat to the health, safety or welfare of individuals are investigated immediately.
2. The second objective is prevention. Complaints/incidents that do not allege a threat of serious harm are investigated to determine if a problem exists that could have a negative impact on the healthcare services provided. The investigation of these complaints/incidents is designed to identify and correct less serious complaints/incident to prevent the escalation of these problems into more serious situations that would threaten the health, safety and welfare of the individuals receiving the service. These complaints/incidents are also prioritized and investigated based on the seriousness of the allegations.

Numerous or more frequent complaints/incidents may indicate systemic problems and therefore may be assigned a higher priority for investigation.

3. The third objective is to promote efficiency and quality within the health care delivery system. Complaints/incidents that are not directly related to Federal requirements are forwarded to the appropriate agency(ies) for follow-up and investigation. Complaints/incidents in this category may include but are not limited to Medicare/Medicaid fraud, complaints against individual licensed practitioners, and billing issues.

5000.2 – Overview

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

All the procedures in this chapter are followed when complaints and reported incidents, including referrals from public entities, involve Medicare-certified providers/suppliers, Medicaid-certified providers/suppliers, or CLIA-certified laboratories. The investigation and resolution of complaints are critical certification activities. The CMS, the State Medicaid Agency (SMA), and the State survey agency (SA) are responsible for ensuring that participating providers/suppliers of health care services continually meet Federal requirements. This requires that the SA promptly reviews complaints/incidents, conducts **unannounced** onsite investigations of reports alleging noncompliance, and informs the CMS Regional Office (RO) and/or the SMA any time certification requirements are found to be out of compliance.

Since there are multiple activities associated with the management of complaints and incidents, responsibilities often cut across organizational lines. Thus, the SA must demonstrate clear-cut accountability for each step of the process and a focal coordinating/controlling responsibility to assure timely and appropriate action. The SA's responsibilities cannot be delegated.

5010 - General Intake Process

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

A complaint is an allegation of noncompliance with Federal and/or State requirements. If the SA determines that the allegation(s) falls within the authority of the SA, the SA determines the severity and urgency of the allegations, so that appropriate and timely action can be pursued. Each SA is expected to have written policies and procedures to ensure that the appropriate response is taken for each complaint. This structure needs to include response timelines and a process to document actions taken by the SA in response to complaints. If a State's time frames for the investigation of a complaint/incident are more stringent than the Federal time frames, the intake is prioritized using the State's timeframes. The SA is expected to be able to share the logic and rationale that was utilized in prioritizing the complaint for investigation. The SA response must be designed to protect the health and safety of all residents, patients, and clients.

Besides the SA, other public entities receive information and/or perform investigations. These entities include the office of the coroner or medical examiner, end-stage renal disease (ESRD) networks, quality improvement organizations (QIOs), law enforcement, the ombudsman's office, and protection and advocacy systems. At times, these public entities will forward information to the SA if there are concerns about the health and safety of residents, patients, and clients. The SAs are required to manage and investigate these referrals as complaints.

An allegation is an assertion of improper care or treatment that could result in the citation of a Federal deficiency. The point of receipt of the allegation is a critical fact-finding and decision-making point. The SA ensures that its complaint telephone number is listed in local directories. Information regarding the care, treatment and services provided to beneficiaries can come from a variety of sources, including beneficiaries themselves, beneficiaries' family members, health care providers, concerned citizens, public agencies, or media reports. Report sources may be verbal or written. In some instances, the complainant may request anonymity.

The SA and RO ensure the privacy and anonymity of every complainant. Generally, the SA follows the disclosure procedures under chapter 3, [§3308](#). The SA discloses the complainant's identity only to those individuals with a need to know who are acting in an official capacity to investigate the complaint.

In addition to these Federal requirements, the SA abides by any State procedures not in direct conflict with CMS instructions. The SA notifies the RO if State regulations conflict directly with any part of these complaint procedures.

5010.1 - Information to Collect From Complainant

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA collects information necessary to make important decisions about the allegations. In instances where written or verbal allegations are received, subsequent communication may be necessary to obtain additional information.

Comprehensive information should be collected during the intake process to allow for proper prioritization, including the following:

- Information about the complainant (e.g., name, address, telephone, etc.);
- Individuals involved and affected;
- Narrative/specifics of the complainant's concerns including the date, and time of the allegation;
- The complainant's views about the frequency and pervasiveness of the allegation;
- Name of the provider/supplier including location (e.g., unit, room, floor) of the allegation, if applicable;
- How/why the complainant believes the alleged event occurred;

- Whether the complainant initiated other courses of action, such as reporting to other agencies, discussing issues with the provider, and obtaining a response/resolution; and
- The complainant's expectation/desire for resolution/remedy, if appropriate.

5010.2 - Information to Provide to Complainant

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The complaint intake process assists the complainant in resolving his/her conflicts. As part of the intake process the SA provides the following:

- Policies and procedures for handling intakes including the scope of the SA's regulatory authority and any considerations pertaining to confidentiality;
- The course of action that the SA or RO will take and the anticipated time frames;
- Information about other appropriate agencies that could provide assistance including the name and telephone number of a contact person, if available; and
- A SA contact name and number for follow-up by the complainant.

NOTE FOR DEEMED PROVIDERS/SUPPLIERS: If a complaint does not allege condition-level noncompliance, the SA may: 1) advise the complainant to file the complaint to the accrediting organization (AO), or 2) ask for the complainant's permission to release the information to the AO.

5010.3 –Notification to the RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

1 – Notification to the RO

The SA immediately forwards allegations involving the following to the RO:

- Deemed providers/suppliers;
- Hospital and psychiatric residential treatment facility (PRTF) restraint/seclusion-related deaths;
- EMTALA complaints;
- Fires resulting in serious injury or death in a Medicare/Medicaid-certified facility;

- Federal facilities;
- Religious Non-medical Health Care Institutions (RNHCIs)(evaluation performed by Region I, Boston, only);
- CLIA-certified laboratories holding a certificate of accreditation. (See [Chapter 6](#)).
- CLIA-exempt laboratory. (See [Chapter 6](#));
- Blood transfusion-related fatalities (See [Chapter 6](#) and Appendix C);
- Over-utilization or inappropriate utilization of services within the QIO's jurisdiction;
- Civil rights violations; or
- Medicare or Medicaid fraud

2 – Special Cases

The SA considers whether notification to the RO is appropriate. If a complaint is especially significant, sensitive, or attracting broad public or media attention, the SA informs the RO immediately. Additionally, the SA needs to consider any other early notice requirements prescribed by other State or Federal policies or interagency agreements.

5050 - CMS Regional Office Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

CMS ROs are responsible for monitoring the SAs' management of complaints and incidents to assure that the SAs are complying with the provisions set forth in Federal regulations, the SOM, and CMS policy memoranda. As part of the monitoring process, the SAs will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth by the State Performance Standard Review. Many States have State laws and regulations that specify how to manage complaints and incidents. Whenever possible, State and Federal requirements should be integrated to avoid unnecessary duplication. CMS ROs should accept State requirements that meet or exceed the intent of the Federal requirements. At a minimum, it is expected that noncompliance with Federal requirements resulting from a complaint or reported incident will receive follow-up and be documented in the Aspen Complaints Tracking System (ACTS).

5060 – ASPEN Complaints/Incidents Tracking System (ACTS)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The ASPEN Complaints/Incidents Tracking System (ACTS) is designed to track, process, and report on complaints and incidents reported against health care providers and suppliers regulated by CMS. It is designed to manage all operations associated with complaint/incident processing, from initial intake and investigation through the final disposition.

The ACTS must be used for the intake of all allegations against Medicare/Medicaid-certified providers/suppliers and CLIA. The ACTS is a Federal system and data entered into ACTS is subject to Federal laws governing disclosure and the protection of an individual's right to privacy.

A complaint/incident record is created in ACTS based on how the allegation is received by the SA or RO. For example, if one person calls with ten allegations about one provider/supplier, this is counted as one complaint record. If six people call with the same allegation, this is counted as six telephone calls and is counted as six complaint records. If one letter is received with one or many allegations and is signed by 20 people, this is counted as one complaint record.

1 - Data Entry

The SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS:

- All complaint information gathered as part of Federal survey and certification responsibilities, regardless if an onsite survey is conducted; *and*

- All self-reported incidents that require a Federal onsite survey.

The information recorded in ACTS reflects the allegation furnished by the complainant at the time of the intake. At a minimum, if the intake information requires an onsite survey and the allegation may involve both Federal and State licensure requirements, a Federal onsite survey is completed and entered into ACTS.

If an investigation finds one or more violations of Federal requirements, the findings must be cited under the appropriate tags and entered into the Federal system even if the information is entered into a State licensure data system. Since this information is essential to the effective management of the survey and certification program, it is important that SAs complete the required fields in ACTS in a timely manner.

[Exhibit 23](#) defines the required fields in ACTS.

Tracking of Referrals in ACTS

The SAs are required to enter into ACTS all referrals from public entities that allege noncompliance with the Federal requirements. For reporting purposes, the SAs should enter these cases as complaints (i.e., Intake Type=Complaint, Intake Subtype=Federal COPs, CFCs, RFPs, EMTALA). In order to more quickly identify which of these cases stem from a referral, the SAs are expected to check the appropriate category under the “Source” field. For example, for referrals from the coroner’s office, states would check “Coroner” under the “Source” field for the intake.

Tracking of State Monitoring Visits (See Section [5077](#)) in ACTS

When a State Monitoring Visit results in a Federal deficiency, the SA will identify the survey in ASPEN as “complaint” and create an intake and survey record in ACTS. The data should be entered into ACTS as follows:

- Intake Type = Complaint;
- Intake Subtype = Federal COPs, CFCs, RFPs, EMTALA;
- Source = State SA;
- Priority = can vary; and
- Allegation Type = State Monitoring.

2 - Reports

The ACTS produces a variety of reports that may be used for analysis and evaluation of provider/supplier performance. Complaint/incident reports are generated and displayed through menus that can be accessed in ACTS. Reports may be produced for one provider/supplier, or reports may be combined and present information for multiple

providers/suppliers. Report filtering criteria is available through the Report Customization window, which allows the user to select criteria for the report to meet the user's specifications. Refer to the *ACTS Procedures Guide* for a list and description of the reports available in ACTS.

NOTE:

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON SPECIFIC POLICIES RELATED TO:

- **DEEMED PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS, EXCLUDING CLIA, SEE [SECTION 5100](#)**
 - **NON-DEEMED PROVIDERS AND SUPPLIERS, SEE [SECTION 5200](#)**
 - **NURSING HOMES, SEE [SECTION 5300](#)**
 - **EMTALA, SEE [SECTION 5400](#)**
 - **CLIA LABORATORIES, SEE [SECTION 5500](#)**
 - **ESRD, SEE [SECTION 5160](#) AND [SECTION 5170](#)**
-

5070 - Priority Assignment for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

An assessment of each intake must be made by an individual who is professionally qualified to evaluate the nature of the problem based upon his/her knowledge and/or experience of current clinical standards of practice and Federal requirements. In situations where a determination is made that immediate jeopardy may be present and ongoing, the SA is required to investigate within two working days of receipt of the information. For all non-immediate jeopardy situations, the complaint/incident is prioritized within two working days of its receipt, unless there are extenuating circumstances that impede the collection of relevant information.

An investigation determines if a deficient practice is or was present, and assesses the degree of harm. To assist in planning the investigation, the SA may review the provider's compliance history, quality indicators, ESRD Outcome List and Data or supporting information received from other programs such as the ombudsman program or protection and advocacy program. This process may require additional contact with the

complainant. CMS expects the SA to investigate allegations of non-compliance with the Federal requirements.

For deemed providers and suppliers, the SA must obtain RO approval to conduct a complaint validation survey.

For certain provider/supplier types, there are circumstances which require self-reporting to the SA. This is defined as an incident - an official notification to the SA or RO from a self-reporting nursing home (i.e., the administrator or authorized official for the provider or supplier). The reported incident intake is prioritized after information is gathered and evaluated. The SA response is expected to protect the health and safety of all residents, patients and clients.

Generally, an alleged event occurring more than 12 months prior to the intake date may not require the SA to conduct an investigation. However, the SA is not precluded from conducting a Federal investigation to determine current compliance status based on identified concerns. For nursing homes, an onsite survey may not be required if there is sufficient evidence that the facility does not have continuing noncompliance and the alleged event occurred before the last standard survey.

5075 - Priority Definitions for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5075.1 - Immediate Jeopardy (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

General Provisions

The regulations at [42 CFR 489.3](#) define immediate jeopardy as, “A situation in which the provider’s noncompliance with one or more requirements of participation has caused, or is likely to cause, serious injury, harm, impairment, or death to a resident.” [Appendix Q](#) contains the Guidelines for Determining Immediate Jeopardy. Intakes are assigned this priority if the alleged noncompliance indicates immediate corrective action is necessary.

When the SA makes the determination that immediate jeopardy may be present and ongoing, the investigation is to be initiated in accordance with [5075.9](#).

Fires Resulting in Serious Injury or Death

Fires resulting in serious injury or death are prioritized as “immediate jeopardy”. The following actions are taken when a report of a fire resulting in serious injury or death in a Medicare/Medicaid certified facility is received from any source:

The SA

- Enters the complaint or self-reported incident into ACTS (Priority = IJ, Allegation Category = Life Safety Code);
- Informs the appropriate RO of fire resulting in serious injury or death within one working day;
- Compiles information as needed to present a comprehensive picture of the situation surrounding the fire;
- Takes appropriate action necessary to assist the Medicare/Medicaid-certified provider/supplier to protect and/or relocate residents or patients from further harm; and
- Performs the Life Safety Code investigation.

The RO

- Informs CMS Central Office (CO) of the fire and planned actions, sending a copy of the alert to the Life Safety Code specialist;
- Consults with the CO to determine whether there is an indication for CO participation in the survey for program evaluation purposes;
- Reports any findings and actions taken by the SA to the CO at the end of the on-site survey; and
- At its discretion, may accompany the SA during the on-site survey.

The CO

- Consults with the RO to determine whether or not issues are present that indicate further investigation to determine the adequacy of current standards and their application; and
- In certain cases CO staff may accompany regional and/or state personnel on the on-site survey.

5075.2 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy - High (for Nursing Homes)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if the alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions may have caused harm that negatively impacts the individual's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and are of such consequence to

the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. Usually, specific rather than general information (such as, descriptive identifiers, individual names, date/time/location of occurrence, description of harm, etc.) factors into the assignment of this level of priority.

When the SA makes the determination that a higher level of actual harm may be present, the investigation is to be initiated in accordance with [5075.9](#). The initiation of these types of investigations is generally defined as the SA beginning an onsite survey.

NOTE: [Exhibit 22](#) provides additional guidance to distinguish between the priorities of "immediate jeopardy" and "non-immediate jeopardy - high" for nursing home complaints/incidents.

5075.3 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy - Medium (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if the alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions caused or may cause harm that is of limited consequence and does not significantly impair the individual's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status or function. An onsite survey should be scheduled to review these intakes.

Non-EMTALA complaints for providers/suppliers with deemed status require an onsite survey within 45 calendar days after approval by the RO.

5075.4 - Non-Immediate Jeopardy – Low (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if the alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions may have caused physical, mental and/or psychosocial discomfort that does not constitute injury or damage. In most cases, an investigation of the allegation can wait until the next onsite survey.

5075.5 - Administrative Review/Offsite Investigation (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if an onsite investigation is not necessary. However, the SA or RO conducts an offsite administrative review (e.g., written/verbal communication or documentation) to determine if further action is necessary. The SA may review the information at the next onsite survey.

NOTE: For deemed providers/suppliers, SAs should not utilize this prioritization category for allegations of substantial noncompliance.

5075.6 - Referral – Immediate (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if the seriousness of a complaint/incident and/or State procedures requires referral or reporting to another agency, board, or ESRD network **without delay** for investigation.

When the SA refers the complaint to another agency or entity (e.g., law enforcement, Ombudsman, licensure agency, etc.) for action, the SA must request a written report on the results of the investigation. Regardless of who conducts the investigation, the SA has the responsibility to assess compliance with Federal conditions or requirements. The timeframes for investigation are not altered by the referral to another agency. (Expressed requests by law enforcement that the SA defer an onsite investigation should be discussed with the CMS RO, as appropriate.)

5075.7 - Referral – Other (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority when referred to another agency, board, or ESRD network for investigation or for informational purposes.

When the SA refers the complaint to another agency or entity (e.g., law enforcement, Ombudsman, licensure agency, etc.) for action, the SA must request a written report on the results of the investigation. Regardless of who conducts the investigation, the SA has the responsibility to assess compliance with Federal conditions or requirements. The time frames for investigation are not altered by the referral to another agency. (Expressed requests by law enforcement that the SA defer an onsite investigation should be discussed with the CMS RO, as appropriate.)

5075.8 - No Action Necessary (for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Intakes are assigned this priority if the SA or RO determines with certainty that no further investigation, analysis, or action is necessary.

For example, no action is necessary if all of the following are met:

- There is no allegation of immediate jeopardy
- A previous survey investigated the same events
- A previous survey evaluated the appropriate individuals, including those identified in the intake; and
- The situation did not worsen.

5075.9- Maximum Time Frames Related to the Federal Onsite Investigation of Complaints/Incidents

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

<i>Provider Type</i>	<i>Intake Prioritization</i>			
	<i>Immediate Jeopardy (IJ)</i>	<i>Non-IJ High</i>	<i>Non-IJ Medium</i>	<i>Non-IJ Low</i>
Nursing homes	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 2 working days of receipt.	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 10 working days of prioritization.	No timeframe specified, but an onsite survey should be scheduled.	SA should investigate during the next onsite survey.
Non-deemed providers/suppliers, other than nursing homes	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 2 working days of receipt.	N/A	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 45 calendar days of prioritization	SA should investigate during the next onsite survey.
Deemed providers/suppliers	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 2 working days of receipt of RO authorization	N/A	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 45 calendar days of receipt of RO authorization.	SA should investigate during the next onsite survey.
CLIA, non-exempt, non-accredited	SA investigates within 2 working days of receipt	N/A	N/A	N/A
CLIA, exempt	SA notifies RO within 10 calendar days	N/A	N/A	N/A
CLIA, accredited	SA submits information to RO within 2 calendar days	N/A	N/A	N/A
EMTALA	SA must complete investigation within 5 days of receipt of RO authorization.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Death related to restraint/seclusion used for behavior management-Hospitals	SA must complete an onsite investigation within 5 working days of telephone authorization from the RO.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fires resulting in serious injury or death	SA must initiate an onsite survey within 2 working days of receipt.	N/A	N/A	N/A

5077- State Monitoring Visits

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

“State monitoring visits” refers to visits by the SA to oversee a provider’s/supplier’s compliance status:

- During bankruptcy, in those cases in which CMS has authorized such visits.
- After a change of ownership, as authorized by the CMS RO.
- During or shortly after removal of immediate jeopardy when the purpose of the visit is to ensure the welfare of the residents/clients/patients by providing an oversight presence, rather than to perform a structured follow-up visit.
- In other circumstances, as authorized by the CMS RO.

See Section 5060 for data entry requirements for this type of visit.

5080 - Investigation Findings and Reports

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Each SA establishes reporting policies, procedures and formats including report language targeted to specific audiences.

5080.1-Report to the Complainant

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA/RO provides the complainant a written report of the investigation findings as a summary record of the investigation.

The following principles guide preparation of the report to the complainant:

- Acknowledge the complainant’s concern(s);
- Identify the SA’s regulatory authority to investigate the complaint/incident and any statutory or regulatory limits that may bear on the authority to conduct an investigation;
- Provide a summary of investigation methods (e.g., on-site visit, written correspondence, telephone inquiries, etc.);
- Provide date(s) of investigation;

- Provide an explanation of your SA's decision-making process including definitions of terms used (i.e., substantiated or validated, unsubstantiated or not validated, etc.);
- Provide a summary of your SA's finding. (**NOTE:** To the extent possible, the summary should not compromise the anonymity of individuals, or include specific situations that may be used to identify individuals, when anonymity has been requested or is appropriate in the judgment of the SA;
- Identify follow-up action, if any, to be taken by your agency (i.e., follow-up visit, plan of correction review, no further action, etc.); and
- Identify appropriate referral information (i.e., other agencies that may be involved).

5080.2- Survey Exit Conference and Report to the Provider/Supplier

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Generally, the SA conducts an exit conference with the provider/supplier at the completion of the complaint investigation survey. The SA informs the provider/supplier of the survey findings including deficiencies found. The SA informs the provider/supplier that survey findings will be documented on Form CMS-2567, which will be made available to the public under the disclosure of survey information provisions.

The SA/RO sends to the provider/supplier a written report of the investigation findings as a summary record of the investigation. At a minimum, this would include the Form CMS-2567 and applicable notices.

NOTE: For deemed providers/suppliers, the SA informs the provider/supplier that the RO will inform the hospital of the disposition of the survey investigation.

Sections 5100 to 5170 relate to deemed providers/suppliers.

5100 - Investigation of Complaints for Deemed Providers/Suppliers

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5100.1 - Basis for Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Sections [1864\(c\)](#) and [1865](#) of the Social Security Act (the Act) provide the basis for conducting complaint surveys of deemed providers/suppliers. The SAs should report poor quality of care or other indications of noncompliance with the Conditions of Participation (COP)/Conditions for Coverage (CfC) for deemed providers/suppliers to the RO. The SA refers to the CMS Regional Office (RO) all allegations for deemed providers/suppliers and all EMTALA allegations for Medicare-participating hospitals. The RO may authorize the SA to investigate specific areas of the hospital's operation related to EMTALA requirements for alleged noncompliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) and the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20](#). The SA has responsibility to investigate whether the conditions are met. Entities and facilities that are subject to the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA) are responsible for meeting CLIA requirements under [42 CFR Part 493](#).

A substantial allegation of noncompliance refers to a complaint from any of a variety of sources, including complaints submitted in person, by telephone, through written correspondence, or in news media articles, that, if substantiated, would have an impact on the health and safety of patients, and that raises doubts as to a provider's or supplier's compliance with one or more of the COP or CfC.

If the RO learns of a substantial allegation of noncompliance concerning a deemed provider/supplier, it will review the complaint, to determine if the complaint identifies the provider/supplier noncompliance with Medicare conditions. If the RO identifies potential noncompliance, it refers the complaint to the SA for investigation or conducts its own investigation. If the RO directly receives the allegation, it is responsible for sending the complainant a letter, which acknowledges the receipt of the complaint and advises the complainant that an investigation will be initiated. In addition, the RO is responsible for sending the complainant follow-up letters. These letters may include information regarding the results of the complaint investigation.

If the SA receives a substantial allegation of noncompliance directly from a complainant regarding a deemed provider/supplier, it acknowledges receipt of the complaint, and advises the complainant that an investigation will be initiated when warranted. In this instance, the RO is not responsible for sending the complainant a letter. The SA forwards a copy of the acknowledgment letter and the complaint to the RO through the ACTS system. The SA may not conduct a complaint survey for a deemed provider/supplier unless it is authorized by the RO. The RO is responsible for determining whether the complaint identifies an allegation of Medicare noncompliance. If the RO determines that the complaint does not warrant an investigation by the SA, it sends a copy of the complaint allegation to the appropriate accreditation organization (AO).

There may be occasions during the course of a state-only activity in a deemed provider/supplier that state surveyors observe a situation they believe may constitute IJ or noncompliance with a Medicare condition. In such circumstances, the state should contact the RO by telephone, explain the situation, and request permission to convert the survey into a Medicare complaint validation survey. CMS authorizes the investigation as

a complaint validation survey if it determines such action is necessary. The complaint is entered into ACTS at the earliest possible opportunity.

Before the SA conducts a complaint investigation survey at a deemed provider/supplier, it must receive authorization from the RO. It is the RO's responsibility to determine whether the complaint alleges Condition-level noncompliance. If the complaint identifies Condition-level noncompliance, the RO authorizes the complaint investigation by completing the applicable Form CMS-2802 ([See Exhibit 33](#)). The RO completes Item 7 of Form CMS-2802 to identify the Conditions to be investigated by the SA. The RO may, in addition, identify other related areas for SA review during the survey. If the RO does not authorize the complaint investigation, the SA may investigate the deemed provider/supplier under its State regulations and/or licensure authority. RO authorization is not required when the SA's basis for conducting the complaint investigation is related to State requirements.

The RO completes the Form CMS-2802 in ACTS even if the SA received an initial verbal authorization from the RO to initiate the complaint validation survey of a deemed provider/supplier. Since ACTS allows the RO to authorize a complaint validation survey electronically by completing the RO Signature box on the Deemed tab, it is not required to send a signed hard copy of the Form CMS-2802 to the SA via fax or U.S. Postal Service. Once the SA receives the authorization through ACTS, it may begin its complaint investigation of a deemed provider/supplier. Whether the survey is of one or all Medicare conditions, it will be treated as a complaint survey under ACTS rather than a re-certification survey, since the complaint is the basis for the survey.

5100.2- Post-Survey Procedures

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Condition-Level, IJ

If condition level deficiencies pose an IJ, the SA forwards the survey packet to the RO within 2 working days after the completion of the survey. If the RO concurs with the SA's findings, the provider/supplier is placed on the 23-day termination track. The RO notifies the provider/supplier of the proposed termination action and requests an acceptable plan of correction. The notice also contains a statement that removes the "deemed status" of the provider/supplier and places it under SA jurisdiction. When the RO receives an acceptable plan of correction, it directs the SA to conduct a full survey of all Medicare conditions before the scheduled termination date.

The termination action is rescinded if the IJ has been removed, and compliance is achieved and documented through the onsite verification. The SA will certify to the RO its findings and recommend that the termination action be rescinded. The RO will notify the provider/supplier of its compliance status and that it is no longer under the SA survey jurisdiction. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the SA and the accrediting organization (AO).

However, if the IJ has been removed but condition-level deficiencies remain, the SA gives the provider/supplier up to 67 additional calendar days or 90 calendar days total (23 plus 67) to achieve compliance. The SA certifies to the RO that the IJ has been removed and recommends rescission of the IJ termination action. The RO places the provider/supplier on a non-IJ termination track, notifies the provider/supplier of the new termination date, and requests that an acceptable POC be provided to the SA. The SA conducts the revisit by the 60th calendar day without approval from the RO.

If substantial compliance is verified during the second revisit, the SA certifies its findings to the RO and recommends the rescission of the termination action. The RO notifies the provider/supplier that it has achieved substantial compliance and is no longer under the SA jurisdiction. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the SA and the AO.

However, if the provider/supplier fails to come into substantial compliance, the SA forwards the complete survey packet to the RO within 10 working days from the exit date of the investigation. After review of the survey packet, the RO sends the provider/supplier a final termination letter and publishes a public notice. The provider/supplier is terminated from the Medicare program.

Condition-Level, Non-IJ

If condition level deficiencies do not pose an IJ, the SA forwards the survey packet to the RO within 10 working days after the completion of the survey. If the RO concurs with the SA's findings, the RO notifies the provider/supplier of the removal of its deemed status; sends a copy of the Form CMS-2567 and places the provider/supplier under SA jurisdiction. No POC is required at this time. The deemed provider/supplier must be placed first under SA jurisdiction before further enforcement action is initiated. The RO requests the SA to conduct a full survey of all Medicare conditions within 60 calendar days from the date of the deemed status removal.

If the SA confirms during the full survey that the provider/supplier is in compliance with the Medicare conditions, the SA forwards the survey packet to the RO within 30 calendar days after the completion of the survey. Since no condition-level deficiencies are cited, the provider/supplier is in substantial compliance. There may or may not be Standard level deficiencies cited. If the RO concurs that the provider/supplier is in substantial compliance; it notifies the provider/supplier and forwards a copy of the letter to the SA and the AO. A revisit is not conducted on standard level deficiencies. Deemed status of the provider/supplier is restored.

If the SA confirms during the full survey that the provider/supplier is not in compliance with one or more Medicare conditions, the SA follows the 90-day termination track. The SA notifies the provider/supplier of the termination action and timelines. If an acceptable POC is received, the SA conducts the first revisit within 45 calendar days from the date of the full survey. No revisit is necessary if the provider/supplier fails to submit

acceptable POCs. CMS will terminate a provider/supplier if it does not submit an acceptable POC. See SOM 3254F.

If substantial compliance with the Medicare conditions is achieved during the first revisit to the full survey, the SA certifies its findings to the RO and recommends the rescission of the termination action. The SA forwards the survey packet to the RO within 10 working days. The RO notifies the provider/supplier that it has achieved substantial compliance and is no longer under the SA jurisdiction. Deemed status is restored. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the SA and the AO.

If the provider/supplier remains out of compliance with the Medicare conditions during the revisit to the full survey, the SA certifies its findings to the RO, notifies the provider/supplier that the termination action continues, and requests an acceptable POC. When the SA receives an acceptable POC, the SA requests RO authorization to conduct a second revisit by the 60th calendar day. Only the second revisit is subject to RO approval.

If substantial compliance with the Medicare conditions is achieved by the provider/supplier during the second revisit, the SA certifies its findings to the RO and recommends the rescission of the termination action. The SA forwards the complete survey packet to the RO within 10 working days. The RO notifies the provider/supplier that it has achieved substantial compliance and is no longer under the SA jurisdiction. Deemed status is restored. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the SA and the AO.

However, if the provider/supplier fails to come into substantial compliance by the second revisit, the SA forwards the complete survey packet to the RO within 10 working days. After review of the survey packet, the RO sends the provider/supplier a final termination letter and publishes a public notice. The provider/supplier is terminated from the Medicare program.

Substantial Compliance

If condition level deficiencies were not cited, the provider/supplier is substantially in compliance. There may or may not be Standard level deficiencies cited. A follow-up survey is not required for any Standard level deficiencies cited. The provider/supplier is not required to submit a POC, but may choose to do so because the Form CMS-2567 will be made available to the public. The SA forwards the survey packet to the RO within 30 calendar days after the completion of the survey including POC if the provider chooses to submit for public disclosure. If the RO determines the deemed provider/supplier is substantially in compliance with the Medicare conditions, the RO notifies the provider/supplier and forwards a copy of the letter to the SA and the AO.

5120 - Life Safety Code Guidance for Deemed Providers/Suppliers

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

In most States, an engineer or other fire safety specialist surveys for compliance with the Life Safety Code (LSC) standard and others survey the remaining standards in the Physical Environment Condition. If the allegation pertains only to LSC requirements, it is not necessary to survey the remainder of the Physical Environment Medicare condition.

5130 – Provider/ Supplier Hospital Refusal of Complaint Investigation Surveys

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA informs the provider/supplier that refusal to allow a complaint investigation survey is a basis for termination from the Medicare program, in accordance with Section 1128(b)(12) of the Social Security Act. The SA notifies the RO immediately.

A hospital found out of compliance because of its refusal to allow a survey is returned to the AO's jurisdiction when:

- The provider or supplier permits the validation survey to be conducted; and
- The provider or supplier withdraws any prior refusal to authorize its accreditation organization to release a copy of its current accreditation survey.

5140 - Hospital Restraints/Seclusion Death Reporting and Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5140.1 - Background

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) hospital restraint and seclusion requirements are found in the Hospital COP, Patients' Rights; Interim Final Rule at [42 CFR 482.13, Standards \(e\) and \(f\)](#). The SA enters into ACTS information for patient deaths associated with restraint or seclusion.

The hospital's reporting requirement of death related to restraint and seclusion is located at [42 CFR 482.13\(f\) \(7\)](#) and states "The hospital must report to CMS any death that occurs while a patient is restrained or in seclusion, or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of restraint or seclusion."

Section 42 CFR [482.13\(f\)\(2\)](#) states, “Seclusion or restraint can only be used in emergency situations if needed to ensure the patient’s physical safety and less restrictive interventions have been determined to be ineffective.”

The Interpretive Guidelines for [42 CFR 482.13\(f\)\(2\)](#) state, “Emergency is defined as a situation where the patient’s behavior is violent or aggressive and where the behavior presents an immediate and serious danger to the safety of the patient, other patients, staff, or others.”

The Interpretive Guidelines for the Patients’ Rights Standards (e) and (f), address the use of restraints in two situations: respectively, standard (e) use of restraints in medical and post-surgical care; and standard (f), emergency use of restraints in behavior management. For both situations, it is important to note that **these requirements are not specific to any treatment setting, but to the situation the restraint is being used to address**. Further, the decision to use a restraint is driven not by diagnosis, but by comprehensive individual assessment that concludes that for this patient at this time, the use of less intrusive measures poses a greater risk than the risk of using a restraint or seclusion.

The intent of Standard (f) “Seclusion and Restraint for behavior management” is to address the use of restraint or seclusion to manage violent behavior. A psychiatric diagnosis, behavioral health diagnosis, or a patient being treated in a behavioral health setting does not determine if restraint or seclusion use falls under Standard (f); but rather, Standard (f) addresses restraint or seclusion used to manage a patient’s violent behavior. In situations when the patient was in seclusion or when the restraint was applied to address violent, aggressive, assaultive, etc. behavior toward self or others, the death reporting requirements of the behavior management standard apply. In these restraint or seclusion situations {behavior management} the death of **any patient, for any reason**, while in restraint or seclusion **must** be reported to the CMS Regional Office (RO). Also **any patient’s death** that occurs after seclusion or restraint {that had been applied/used for the management of violent behavior} has been discontinued **and** where the patient’s death could be **reasonably related** to that patient having been in restraint or seclusion **must be** reported to the RO.

Unlike Standard (f), Standard (e) “Restraint for acute medical and surgical care” does not require death reporting. Therefore, the hospital has no CMS death reporting requirement when the patient death occurs to a patient who was restrained for reasons other than behavior management. Behavior management includes managing behaviors that are violent, assaultive, or aggressive behavior directed towards oneself or toward others.

5140.2 - Hospital Reporting Methods

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The hospital must report all patient deaths associated with the use of seclusion or restraint under [42 CFR 482.13\(f\) \(7\)](#) by telephone to the RO prior to the close of business the next business day after the patient's death.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) requires that suspected medical device related deaths are reported by mail using the "MedWatch FDA Form 3500A." The form must be properly and fully completed and forwarded within 10 working days of the patient's death. Further details can be found at [MedWatch - Instructions for MedWatch 3500A](#).

The FDA serves as a data collection source for the MedWatch 3500A reports and forwards these reports to CMS. Instructions for completing the MedWatch FDA 3500A can be found on the FDA MedWatch Web site.

The CMS requires the deemed or non-deemed hospital to report patient restraint or seclusion deaths to the hospital's RO for the circumstances and in the methods and times stated in the previous paragraphs. The hospital is **not** to postpone reporting the patient's death until after the hospital's investigation. The hospital is reporting to CMS that a patient died while in behavior management restraint or seclusion, or that the death could reasonably be related to the patient having been in seclusion or restraint; not the cause of the patient's death.

5140.3 - Responsibilities

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Hospitals report patient deaths associated with restraint or seclusion, as previously discussed, to their RO. Any hospital patient restraint or seclusion death report received by a State Agency (SA) directly from a hospital (or other source) is forwarded immediately to its RO the day the SA receives the report.

The RO maintains restraint/seclusion death report data. Each RO designates one contact person and a backup person who serves as the point of contact, coordination, and communication regarding reporting, investigation and follow-up for the death-reporting requirement under Patients' Rights.

The CMS Central Office (CO) contact maintains the central death report roster and a copy of all death report worksheets collected. The CO contacts ROs as needed during each investigation for updates until the investigation is complete.

SAs are to notify the hospitals in their State that hospitals must report to their RO any death that occurs while a patient is restrained or in seclusion (for management of behavior, Standard (f)), or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of restraint or seclusion (used to manage violent behavior). State Agencies are to provide hospitals with their RO contact name

and telephone number, as well as the hospital reporting procedures contained in this policy.

5140.4 - Process

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Based on telephone communications between the hospital and the RO, the RO evaluates the information provided by the hospital to determine if the situation applies to seclusion or restraint use under [42 CFR 482.13\(f\)\(7\)](#), or if the situation applies to restraint use under [42 CFR 482.13\(e\)](#). If the restraint/seclusion death report applies to the behavior management standard, within 2 working days of receiving the report, the RO immediately notifies the SA to authorize a survey to investigate the hospital's compliance with the Patient's Rights COP at [42 CFR 482.13](#) (including investigating the reported death). The RO provides the SA with all the data that has been obtained for the Restraint/Seclusion Death Report Worksheet prior to the investigation. Worksheet information not provided to the RO during its telephone communication with the hospital is obtained by the SA during the survey.

In addition to notifying the SA and authorizing the survey, within 2 working days of receiving the report, the RO notifies CO, the hospital's accrediting organization (AO), if deemed, and the appropriate state Protection and Advocacy Group (P&A). The RO provides the following information to the hospital's AO and P&A: hospital's name, hospital's address, patient's name and date of death. **THIS IS THE ONLY INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED TO THESE ORGANIZATIONS.** The names and information about each State's P&A can be located at the following Web site: <http://www.protectionandadvocacy.com>.

The SA handles each restraint/seclusion death report as a complaint investigation. The SA should complete investigations within five working days of receipt of survey authorization from the RO.

In addition to its regular complaint investigation paperwork, the SA completes the Restraint/Seclusion Death Report Worksheet. The worksheet is for use by the SA and CMS to gather information and to track the investigation. The worksheet is not to be forwarded to the hospital for completion. The SA gathers the remaining information for completion of the Restraint/Seclusion Death Report Worksheet during its investigation. Within two working days of completion of the survey, the SA emails or faxes a copy of the fully completed Restraint/Seclusion Death Report Worksheet to the RO. The SA is to ensure that all information requested within the worksheet is provided.

Within 2 working days following receipt of the worksheet from the SA, RO e-mails (or Faxes) a copy of the completed Restraint/Seclusion Death Report Worksheet to the CO

contact. The CO Reviews the status of all outstanding restraint/seclusion death reports with each region regularly.

5150 - Complaints Involving HIV-Infected Individuals

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

As direct recipients of Federal funds, providers and suppliers are subject to provisions of Section 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals who are infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), or “AIDS virus,” are protected by the Rehabilitation Act as “individuals with handicaps.” Therefore, HIV-infected individuals who are provided services, are employed, or are to be employed by providers and suppliers in Federally-conducted or financed programs or activities would be treated like anyone else in the workforce, so long as these individuals do not, on a case-by-case basis, pose a substantial health and safety risk to others, or pose a performance problem, and are “otherwise qualified.”

A provider participating in the Medicare or Medicaid programs cannot discriminate against individuals who are HIV-infected so long as these individuals do not, on a case-by-case basis, pose a substantial health and safety risk to others and so long as the provider provides comparable services and care to non HIV-infected individuals.

The SA or the RO refers discrimination complaints to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), which is the authority to determine whether Medicare or Medicaid providers and suppliers comply with this non-discrimination statute.

5160 - Investigating Complaints Involving ESRD Services Provided by Deemed Hospitals

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Most of the hospitals participating in the ESRD program are deemed by JCAHO or AOA. “Deemed status” applies only to the hospital’s approval as a provider, not to its status as a supplier of ESRD transplantation or dialysis services. The SA investigates all complaints and allegations related solely to ESRD services since ESRD services fall outside the purview of accreditation.

5170 – Investigating Complaints Against ESRD Suppliers

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

1. General

Refer to the guidance for investigation of complaints against non-deemed providers and suppliers. See SOM [§5200](#).

The ESRD Networks are required to have a complaint /grievance resolution system. Networks (NW) and the SA are frequently contacted by the same complainant with the same or similar allegations. If the allegations require an onsite investigation or allege potential risk to patient health or safety, the SA is responsible for the investigation. If the allegations are primarily focused on relationship or communication issues, the NW may assume primary responsibility for the investigation. If the focus of the allegations is a medical practice issue, the SA and NW may need to collaborate on the investigation. The NWs and SA are encouraged to communicate and collaborate to reduce or prevent redundant investigations.

2. Conducting the Investigation

The SA surveyors should use the ESRD survey protocol in Appendix H to investigate complaints. The allegations of the complaint will determine the tasks needed. For example, an allegation of inadequate patient care staffing would require use of the following tasks, at a minimum:

- Pre survey activities;
- Entrance Conference: Provide an overview of the complaint allegations and the planned agenda for your survey time;
- Tour and observations;
- Patient interviews;
- Staff interviews;
- Record reviews;
- Review of quality management materials; and
- Exit conference.

Conduct each of the identified survey tasks in Appendix H, “Guidance to Surveyors: End-Stage Renal Disease Facilities.”

3. Pre-survey Task for Complaint Investigations

Review the allegations of the complaint to identify needed survey tasks. Review the State Outcomes List and the Dialysis Facility Report to determine if there are data outliers related to the allegations. For example, if the complaint alleges staff members do not wash their hands, the surveyor should review the facility’s rate of hospitalization and hospitalizations related to septicemia, and consider this information in the survey process.

To facilitate meeting the requirement of surveying each ESRD facility every 3 years, the SA evaluates all available information (outcome list rank, Dialysis Facility Report, time since last survey, complaint history, NW information, etc.) to determine whether a recertification survey should be conducted at the time of the complaint investigation.

NOTE: Sections 5200 to 5240 relate to all non-deemed provider/supplier types, excluding nursing homes (SNFs/NFs).

5200 - Investigating Complaints for Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, Excluding Nursing Homes (SNFs/NFs)

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5200.1 - General Procedures

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

For complaint surveys on non-deemed providers/suppliers, the SA uses the appropriate survey protocol and interpretive guidelines. A focus survey is conducted on the specific regulatory requirements related to the allegation. Based on an initial assessment or other observations, if significant problems are identified, the SA expands the scope of review as necessary to determine compliance or noncompliance. The SA does not refer complaints regarding non-deemed providers/suppliers to the RO.

If deficiencies are cited, the SA documents the deficiencies on Form CMS-2567 and obtains an acceptable POC. If non-compliance with the Medicare conditions is identified, the SA will follow the appropriate termination procedures and document and report as required. (See SOM Chapter 3, §§3010-3028 for termination procedures)

5200.2 - Special Procedures for Psychiatric Hospitals

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The special conditions for psychiatric hospitals cannot be deemed to meet the Medicare requirements. The remaining conditions for hospitals apply to psychiatric hospitals, and a hospital may be deemed to meet those conditions.

When the SA receives a complaint allegation against a psychiatric hospital under the general conditions of participation, it must determine whether or not the hospital is deemed. If the hospital is deemed, the SA follows the appropriate survey protocol for deemed facilities. If the hospital is not deemed, the SA investigates the complaint if appropriate under these procedures listed above in §5200.1.

If the complaint allegation concerns the special conditions for psychiatric hospitals, the SA may conduct an investigation if it has appropriate qualified personnel or refer it to the RO. If the complaint is referred to the RO, the RO will evaluate and refer it to the CO as required.

5210- Processing of Complaints Originating with or Investigated by the RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO establishes procedures and clear organizational accountability to ensure that complaints are properly evaluated, documented, acknowledged, and handled timely and appropriately. The RO uses ACTS to ensure timely and appropriate action on all allegations originating with or investigated by the RO. The extent and nature of the RO involvement with a given complaint varies depending on the nature of the allegation and the receiving organization.

Most complaints originate through the SA and are recorded and controlled by the SA. When a complaint is filed directly with the RO, the RO assumes those initial SA responsibilities.

5220- Investigation Conducted Directly by the RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

This less frequent class of complaints includes allegations retained by the RO or forwarded to the RO by the SA for investigation. The RO's responsibilities vary based on the type of complaint.

The RO uses the appropriate survey protocol and interpretive guidelines for the provider/supplier. These procedures apply when a direct RO investigation is conducted, such as for Federal facilities, Religious Non-Medical Health Care Institutions (RNHCIs), or special situations. When directly investigating, the RO begins by ensuring that it or the SA has met all initial data collection and acknowledgement requirements.

If the allegation involves an IJ, the RO investigates within two working days. Otherwise, the RO schedules the investigation based on the severity of the allegation. (See [§5075.9](#) for time frames related to Federal onsite investigations.)

5230- Special RO Processing

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The following types of allegations are subject to special RO handling:

1. Over-Utilization or Inappropriate Utilization of Services- The RO refers to the local QIO for investigation, and documents the provider's files as for other allegations. The RO acts, as necessary, on any findings returned by the QIO;
2. Civil Rights Violations- The RO refers to the regional OCR for investigation. The RO documents the provider's files as for other allegations. The RO acts as necessary on any findings returned by OCR; and
3. Medicare/Medicaid/CLIA fraud- The RO refers to the RO of the Inspector General/DHHS for investigation. The RO documents the provider's files as for other allegations.

In each of the above instances, the RO ensures that the complainant and SA are notified of any findings.

5240 - Complaints - HHA Hotline

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Each State has a Medicare home health hotline that can be called by patients who are dissatisfied with the home health services they are receiving or by other individuals with a complaint about a specific HHA. Under the Medicare COPs for Patient Rights at [42 CFR 484.10](#), HHAs are required to provide their patients with the hotline number for their state. Concerns about an HHA not complying with the COPs, or reports that an HHA is misinforming beneficiaries or inappropriately terminating care for patients, can be referred to the SA for investigation via the home health hotline. Concerned consumers may also call the SA directly. A violation of the COPs or the provider agreement could lead to termination of the HHA from the Medicare program.

As part of the patient rights COPs, the HHA is required to investigate complaints made by a patient or the patient's family or guardian regarding treatment or care that is, or fails to be, furnished, and to document both the existence of the complaint and resolution of the complaint.

Surveyors, as part of their investigation of the HHA's compliance of the COPs, may ask to review complaints received by the HHA and the resolution of these complaints. The HHA must permit examination of these records by or on behalf of CMS, or risk termination from the Medicare program.

NOTE: Sections 5300 to 5390 relate to nursing homes.

5300 - Investigation of Complaints for Nursing Homes

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Section 42 CFR 488.332 provides the Federal regulatory basis for the investigation of complaints about nursing homes.

The survey agency must review all complaint allegations and conduct a standard or an abbreviated standard survey to investigate complaints of violations of requirements if its review of the allegation concludes that:

- A deficiency in one or more of the requirements may have occurred; and
- Only a survey can determine whether a deficiency or deficiencies exist.

The survey agency does not conduct a survey if the complaint raises issues that are outside the purview of Federal participation requirements.

Complaint investigations follow, as appropriate, the pertinent survey tasks, and information gathered is recorded on the appropriate survey worksheets. However, if the documentation required is minimal, use Form CMS-807 to record information during the complaint investigation. Record deficiencies on Form CMS-2567 and/or, the “Statement of Isolated Deficiencies Which Cause No Harm with Only a Potential for Minimal Harm for SNFs and NFs” . The completed Form CMS-2567 must be made a part of the complaint record.

If necessary, a specialized team may be used to investigate complaints. Team members may include, but are not limited to, an attorney, auditor, and appropriate health professionals. The specialized team is not necessarily composed of qualified surveyors. However, specialized team members provide unique talents and expertise that assist at least one qualified surveyor in identifying, gathering, and preserving documented evidence. Further information regarding the composition of the survey team is provided in Chapter 7.

The timing, scope, duration and conduct of a complaint investigation are at the discretion of the SA, except when a determination is made that immediate jeopardy may be present and ongoing or a higher level of actual harm may be present. If the complaint concerns conditions on a certain day (e.g., on weekends), or on a certain shift (e.g., 11 p.m. - 7 a.m.), the SA should make an attempt to investigate it at the relevant time. In most cases, the following tasks, or portion of tasks, should be performed during a complaint investigation.

5300.1 - Task 1: Offsite Survey Preparation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Review any information about the facility that would be helpful to know in planning the investigation. Contact the ombudsman to discuss the nature of the complaint and whether there have been any similar complaints reported to and substantiated by the ombudsman.

Review the related regulatory requirements or standards that pertain to the complaint. For example, if it is a complaint about abuse, review the requirements at 42 CFR 483.13.

Plan the investigation. Before going to the nursing home, plan what information to obtain during the complaint investigation based on the information already acquired. Consider practical methods to obtain that information.

5300.2 - Task 2: Entrance Conference/Onsite Preparatory Activities

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Onsite complaint investigations should always be unannounced. Upon entrance, advise the facility's Administrator of the general purpose of the visit. The SA explains the reason for the survey and avoids any impression that a predetermination has been made as to the validity of the allegation. It is important to let the facility know why you are there, but protect the confidentiality of those involved in the complaint. Do not release information that will cause opportunities to be lost for pertinent observations, interviews, and record reviews required for a thorough investigation. For example, if the complaint is that food that is intended to be served hot is always served cold, do not tell the facility the exact complaint. Rather, tell them it is a situation related to dietary requirements.

5300.3 - Task 5: Information Gathering

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The order and manner in which information is gathered depends on the type of complaint that is being investigated. Conduct comprehensive, focused, and/or closed record reviews as appropriate for the type of complaint. Generally, it is not necessary to review records and information from more than one year ago. However, the SA is not precluded from doing so if concerns identified during the investigation indicate it is necessary in order to determine current compliance. It is very important to remember that the determination of whether the complaint happened is not enough. The surveyor needs to determine noncompliant facility practices related to the complaint situation and which, if any, requirements are not met by the facility.

Perform information gathering in order of priorities, i.e., obtain the most critical information first. Based on this critical information about the incident, determine what other information to obtain in the investigation.

Observations, record review and interviews can be done in any order necessary. As information is obtained, use what has been learned to determine what needs to be clarified or verified as the investigation continues.

Observe the physical environment, situations, procedures, patterns of care, delivery of services to residents, and interactions related to the complaint. Also, if necessary, observe other residents with the same care need. After determining what occurred, i.e.,

what happened to the resident and the outcome, investigate what facility practice(s) or procedures affected the occurrence of the incident.

EXAMPLE

It was verified through the investigation that a resident developed a pressure sore/ulcer which progressed to a Stage IV, became infected and resulted in the resident requiring hospitalization for aggressive antibiotic therapy. Observe as appropriate: dressing changes, especially to any other residents with Stage III or IV pressure sores; infection control techniques such as hand washing, linen handling, and care of residents with infections; care given to prevent development of pressure sores (e.g., turning and repositioning, use of specialized bedding when appropriate, treatments done when ordered, keeping residents dry, and provision of adequate nutritional support for wound healing).

Record Review: If a specific resident is involved, focus on the condition of the resident before and after the incident. If there are care issues, determine whether the appropriate assessments, care planning, implementation of care, and evaluations of the outcome of care have been done as specified by the regulatory requirements.

EXAMPLE

For a complaint of verbal and physical abuse, review the record to determine the resident's mood and demeanor before and after the alleged abuse. Determine if there are any other reasons for the change in the resident's demeanor and behavior. Determine whether an assessment has been done to determine the reason for the change in mood and behavior. Does the record document any unexplained bruises and/or complaints of pain, and whether they occurred in relation to the alleged incident?

Interviews: Interview the person who made the complaint. If the complainant is not at the facility at the time of the survey, he/she should be interviewed by telephone, if possible. Also, interview the person the complaint is about. Then, interview any other witnesses or staff involved. In order to maintain the confidentiality of witnesses, change the order of interviews if necessary. It may not always be desirable to interview the person who made the complaint first, as that may identify the person as the complainant to the facility. Interview residents with similar care needs at their convenience.

As interviews proceed, prepare outlines needed for other identified witnesses and revise outlines as new information is obtained.

During information gathering to investigate a complaint about the care and services provided to residents in a nursing home, findings of past noncompliance may be identified. Before considering a citation of past noncompliance with a specific regulatory tag, surveyors must determine if current compliance with the specific regulatory tag exists. Similar to verifying correction of current noncompliance on a revisit, surveyors should use a variety of methods to determine whether correction of the past

noncompliance occurred and continues. This may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Interviews with facility staff, such as the administrator, nursing staff, social services staff, medical director, quality assessment and assurance committee members, and/or other facility staff, as indicated, to determine what procedures, systems, structures, and processes have been changed.
- Reviewing through observation, interview and record review, how the facility identified and implemented interventions to address the noncompliance. Examples of interventions may include, but are not limited to:
 - The facility's review, revision, or development of policies and/or procedures to address the areas of concerns;
 - The provision and use of new equipment, as necessary;
 - The provision of staff training required to assure ongoing compliance for the implementation and use of new and/or revised policies, procedures, and/or equipment, especially with new and/or temporary staff;
 - The provision of additional staffing, changes in assignments or deployment of staff, as needed; and
 - The provision of a monitoring mechanism to assure that the changes made are being supervised, evaluated, and reinforced by responsible facility staff.
- Evaluating whether the facility has a functioning quality assessment and assurance committee whose responsibilities include the identification of quality issues; providing timely response to ascertain the cause; implementing corrective action; implementing monitoring mechanisms in place to assure continued correction and revision of approaches, as necessary, to eliminate the potential risk of occurrence to other residents and to assure continued compliance.

A citation of past noncompliance must meet all of the criteria described in Task 6 below.

5300.4 - Task 6: Information Analysis

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Review all information collected. If there are inconsistencies, do additional data collection as needed, to resolve the inconsistencies. Determine if there is any other information still needed.

Determine whether:

- The allegations are substantiated or unsubstantiated;
- The facility failed to meet any of the regulatory requirements; and
- The facility practice or procedure that contributed to the complaint has been changed to achieve and/or maintain compliance.

To cite past noncompliance with a specific survey data tag (F-tag or K-tag), all of the following three criteria must be met:

- 1) The facility was not in compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (as referenced by the specific F-tag or K-tag) at the time the situation occurred;
- 2) The noncompliance occurred after the exit date of the last standard recertification survey and before the survey (standard, complaint, or revisit) currently being conducted; and
- 3) There is sufficient evidence that the facility corrected the noncompliance and is in substantial compliance at the time of the current survey for the specific regulatory requirement(s), as referenced by the specific F-tag or K-tag.

A nursing home does not provide a plan of correction for a deficiency cited as past noncompliance as the deficiency is already corrected; however, the survey team documents the facility's corrective actions on Form CMS-2567.

5300.5 - Task 7: Exit Conference

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Advise the Administrator of the complaint investigation findings and any deficiencies identified. Do not inform him/her of confidential information unless the individual who provided the information specifically authorizes you to do so.

If a deficiency is not present now, but was present and has been corrected, notify the facility orally and in writing that the complaint was substantiated because deficiencies existed at the time that the complaint situation occurred. (See SOM [Chapter 7](#), Survey and Enforcement Process for Skilled Nursing Facilities and Nursing Facilities, for specific information about citing past noncompliance.)

If the complaint is unsubstantiated, i.e., the surveyor(s) cannot determine that it occurred and there is no indication of deficient practice, notify the facility of this decision.

5310 - Action on Complaints of Resident Neglect and Abuse, and Misappropriation of Resident Property

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5310.1 - Written Procedures

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The State must have written procedures for the timely review and investigation of allegations of resident abuse and neglect, and misappropriation of resident property.

5310.2 - Review of Allegation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The State Reviews all allegations of resident neglect and abuse and misappropriation of resident property regardless of the source of the complaint.

5310.3 - Investigating Allegations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If there is reason to believe, either through oral or written evidence, that an individual used by a facility to provide services to residents could have abused or neglected a resident or misappropriated a resident's property, the State must investigate the allegation. During the investigation, the SA should evaluate how the facility developed policies and procedures to prevent the abuse, and after the abuse occurred, how the facility took action to report and investigate the allegations while ensuring the safety of the residents.

5310.4 - Factors Beyond the Control of the Individual

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The State must not make a finding that an individual neglected a resident if the individual demonstrates that such neglect was caused by factors beyond the control of the individual.

EXAMPLE: A nurse aide could not be found negligent for not providing clean bed and bath linens to a resident if the facility had no clean bed and bath linens available. However, the facility is responsible for providing clean bed and bath linens to residents.

5320 – Reporting Findings of Abuse, Neglect, or Misappropriation of Property to the Nurse Aide Registry

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5320.1 - Notification Procedures - Preliminary Determinations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the State makes a preliminary determination, based on oral or written evidence and its investigation, that resident neglect, abuse, or misappropriation of property has occurred, the State completes the following notification procedures:

- 1. Individuals Notified - The State notifies the following individuals in writing within 10 working days of the investigation:**
 - a. Individual(s) implicated in the investigation; and
 - b. The current administrator of the facility in which the incident occurred.
- 2. Notice Information - The following information is included in the notice:**
 - a. Nature of the allegation (specific facts);
 - b. Date and time of the occurrence;
 - c. A statement that the individual implicated in the investigation has a right to a hearing and must request the hearing within 30 days from the date of the notice. Provide the individual with the specific information needed to request a hearing, such as the name and address of a contact in the State to request a hearing;
 - d. Statement that if the individual fails to request a hearing, in writing, within 30 days from the date of the notice, the presumed substantiated findings is reported to the nurse aide registry or the appropriate licensure authority;
 - e. The intent to report findings substantiated by a hearing in writing to the nurse aide registry and/or to the appropriate licensure authority;
 - f. Consequences of waiving the right to a hearing;
 - g. Consequences of a finding through the hearing process that the resident abuse or neglect, or misappropriation of property did occur; and
 - h. Right of the accused individual to be represented by an attorney at the individual's own expense.

5320.2 - Conduct of Hearing for Nurse Aides

1- Time frame to Complete the Hearing

The State must complete the hearing and the hearing record within 120 days from the day it receives the request for a hearing.

2 - Hearing Location

The State must hold the hearing in a manner consistent with State practice at a reasonable place and time convenient for the individual.

5320.3 - Reporting Findings

1 - Reporting to Entities

If the individual waives the right to a hearing or the time to request a hearing has expired, or if the hearing finding is that the individual neglected or abused a resident or misappropriated a resident's property, the substantiated findings must be reported in writing within 10 working days to:

- a. The individual;
- b. Current administrator of the facility in which the incident occurred;
- c. The administrator of the facility that currently employs the individual, if it is not the same facility in which the incident occurred;
- d. Applicable licensing authorities; and
- e. The nurse aide registry for nurse aides as specified in 42 CFR 483.156(c) and discussed in §4141. Section 4141 discusses the function of the registry, the information contained in the registry, and responsibility for the registry.

2 - Information Submitted to the Nurse Aide Registry

The following information must be included and remain in the registry permanently, unless the finding was made in error, the individual was found not guilty in a court of law, or the State is notified of the individual's death. See [§4141.B](#).

- a. Documentation of the investigation, including the nature of the allegation and the evidence that led to the conclusion that the allegation was valid;
- b. The date of the hearing, if the individual chose to have one, and its outcome; and

- c. A statement by the individual disputing the allegation if the individual chose to make one.

3 - Information Retained in the Nurse Aide Registry Permanently

The registry must remove entries for individuals who have performed no nursing or nursing-related services for 24 consecutive months, unless the individual's registry entry includes documented findings of abuse, neglect, or misappropriation of property.

5330 - Reporting Abuse to Law Enforcement and the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit

When the SA or RO substantiates a finding of abuse, the SA or RO must report the substantiated findings to local law enforcement and, if appropriate, the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit.

5340 - Post-Survey Certification Actions for Nursing Homes

Following the investigation, the SA records any findings on Form CMS-2567 and sends the provider a copy of Form CMS-2567. The SA requests a POC for any uncorrected deficiencies. See [§2728](#).

When Federal deficiencies are identified, the SA initiates certification actions as follows:

1. **Noncompliance that Constitutes Immediate Jeopardy to Resident Health and Safety** - The SA initiates procedures in accordance with §§7307 to 7309.
2. **Noncompliance that Does Not Constitute Immediate Jeopardy to Resident Health and Safety** - The SA initiates procedures in accordance with §§7311 to 7316.
3. **In Substantial Compliance** - The SA initiates procedures in accordance with §7319.

5350 – Data Entry

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA enters survey information into the ASPEN system (via ASPEN Central Office or ACTS), including Forms CMS-670 and CMS-2567.

5360 - Processing of Complaints Originating with or Investigated by the CMS RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO establishes procedures and clear organizational accountability to ensure that any complaint is properly evaluated, documented, acknowledged, and handled timely and appropriately. The RO uses ACTS to ensure timely and appropriated action on all allegations originating with or investigated by the RO.

The extent and nature of RO involvement with a given complaint varies depending on the nature of the allegation and the receiving organization. The following procedures address the major variants of RO involvement.

5370 - Pre-Investigation Actions on Allegations Originating Through the RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Most complaints originate through the SA and are recorded and controlled by the SA. When a complaint is filed directly with the RO, however, the RO assumes those initial SA responsibilities.

5380 - RO Processing of RO Investigated Complaints

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

This less frequent class of complaints includes allegations retained by the RO or forwarded to the RO by the SA for investigation or special processing. The RO responsibilities vary based on the type of complaint.

1 - Direct RO Investigation

These procedures apply when a direct RO investigation is conducted. When directly investigating, the RO begins by ensuring that it or the SA has met all intake, acknowledgment, and priority assignment requirements in §5010 to §5020.

2 - Conducting the Investigation

The RO follows the procedures for investigation in §5300.

3 – RO Certification Actions

When Federal deficiencies are identified, the RO initiates certification actions as follows:

- a. Noncompliance that Constitutes Immediate Jeopardy to Resident Health and Safety - The RO initiates procedures in accordance with §§7307 to 7309. The RO performs the SA responsibilities described in these sections.
- b. Noncompliance that Does Not Constitute Immediate Jeopardy to Resident Health and Safety - The RO initiates procedures in accordance with §§7311 to 7316.
- c. In Substantial Compliance - The RO initiates procedures in accordance with §7319.

4 - Reporting

The RO should report survey information into the ASPEN system (via ASPEN Central Office or ACTS), including Forms CMS-670 and CMS-2567.

5390 – RO Oversight of Complaint-Related Processes

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

1. The RO considers any complaint data in targeting look-behind surveys or reviews.
2. The RO monitors data in summary form - either through a log or data system. See [§5060](#).

These records should include:

- Identification of region or State-wide patterns;
- Pinpointing of problem providers or States;
- Evaluation of SA processing times, workloads, performance, etc.; and
- Identification of overall SA workloads, including unsubstantiated and Medicaid-only complaint volumes.

3. Based on needs identified from oversight activities, the RO provides SA training and technical assistance.

NOTE: Sections 5400 to 5480.2 relate to alleged EMTALA violations.

5400 - Investigations Involving Alleged Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA) Violations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Section [1866](#) of the Act, Agreements with Providers of Services, specifies that for a hospital, or any provider of services, to qualify for participation in the Medicare program, it must enter into an agreement with the Secretary of HHS. Effective August 1, 1986, participating hospitals with emergency departments must comply with the requirements of [§1867](#) of the Act as a condition of their provider agreement.

The following Medicare provider agreement requirements, which closely parallel provisions contained in [§1866](#) of the Act, must be met by Medicare participating hospitals with emergency departments:

- [42 CFR 489.20\(l\)](#) requires a hospital to comply with the requirements of [42 CFR 489.24](#). Section [1866\(a\)\(1\)\(I\)](#) of the Act requires a hospital to have and enforce policies to ensure compliance with the requirements of [§1867](#);
- [42 CFR 489.20\(m\)](#) requires a hospital to report to CMS or the SA any time it has reason to believe it may have received an individual who has been transferred in an unstable emergency medical condition (EMC) from another hospital in violation of the requirements of [42 CFR 489.24\(e\)](#);
- [42 CFR 489.20\(q\)](#) requires a hospital to post conspicuously a sign(s) specifying the rights of individuals, under [§1867](#) of the Act, with respect to examination and treatment for emergency medical conditions and women in labor and to indicate whether or not the hospital participates in the Medicaid program. The letters within the signs must be clearly readable at a distance of at least 20 feet or the expected vantage point of the emergency department clients. The wording of the sign(s) must be clear and in simple terms and language(s) that are understandable by the population served by the hospital;
- [42 CFR 489.20\(r\)\(1\)](#) requires a hospital to maintain medical and other records related to individuals transferred, including discharges, to or from the hospital for a period of five years from the date of transfer;
- [42 CFR 489.20\(r\)\(2\)](#) requires a hospital to maintain a list of physicians who are on call to provide treatment necessary to stabilize an individual with an emergency medical condition;
- [42 CFR 489.20\(r\)\(3\)](#) requires a hospital to maintain a central log on each individual who comes seeking assistance and whether he or she refused treatment, was refused treatment, or whether the individual was transferred, admitted and treated, stabilized and transferred, or discharged.

When hospitals do not conform to the requirements of [§1867](#) of the Act, the practice is commonly called “dumping.” A hospital with a dedicated emergency department is defined in [42 CFR 489.24\(b\)](#) as a hospital that offers services for emergency medical conditions within its capacity to do so. The regulations at [42 CFR 489.24](#) parallel the provisions of [§1867](#) of the Act and contain the following requirements that a hospital with a dedicated emergency department must meet:

- [42 CFR §489.24\(a\)](#) General. Applicability of provisions of this section.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(b\)](#) Definitions. As used in this section.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(c\)](#) Use of dedicated emergency department for non-emergency services.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)](#) Necessary stabilizing treatment for emergency medical conditions.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)\(1\)](#) General. Subject to the provisions of paragraph (d)(2).
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)\(2\)](#) Exception: Application to inpatients.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)\(3\)](#) Refusal to consent to treatment.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)\(4\)](#) Delay in examination or treatment.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(d\)\(5\)](#) Refusal to consent to transfer.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(e\)](#) Restricting transfer until the individual is stabilized.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(e\)\(1\)](#) General.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(e\)\(2\)](#) Appropriate transfer to another medical facility.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(e\)\(3\)](#) Provides whistleblower protection to physicians and qualified medical personnel.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(f\)](#) Recipient hospital responsibilities.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(g\)](#) Termination of provider agreement.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(h\)](#) Consultation with Quality Improvement Organization (QIO).
- [42 CFR §489.24\(i\)](#) Release of QIO Assessment.
- [42 CFR §489.24\(j\)](#) Availability of on-call physicians.

- [42 CFR §489.24 \(j\)\(1\)](#) On-call list.
- [42 CFR §489.24 \(j\)\(2\)](#) Hospital on-call policy and procedures.

If a hospital fails to meet these requirements, CMS may terminate the provider agreement in accordance with [42 CFR 489.53](#). The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has the responsibility and authority to assess civil monetary penalties (CMPs) or to exclude physicians from the Medicare program when a hospital or physician violates these requirements. Additionally, individuals suffering personal harm and medical facilities suffering financial loss as a result of a violation of these provisions can bring civil action against the offending hospital and physicians. Filing for such civil action is limited to a period of 2 years after the date of the alleged violation. This legislation does not preempt any State or local laws, except to the extent that State or local requirements directly conflict with a requirement of this legislation.

5410 – EMTALA and Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5410.1 Interaction of the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act and EMTALA

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

With the definition of the terms “person” and “individual” codified at [1 U.S.C. §8](#), it is clear that there are circumstances where EMTALA protections are applicable to an infant who is born alive, as that term is defined in [1 U.S.C. §8\(b\)](#).

For example, assume that a hospital’s labor and delivery department meets the definition of a “dedicated emergency department.” If an infant was born alive in that dedicated emergency department, and a request was made on that infant’s behalf for screening for a medical condition, (or if a prudent layperson would conclude, based on the infant’s appearance or behavior, that the infant needed examination or treatment for an emergency medical condition and that a request would have been made for screening) the hospital and physician could be liable for violating EMTALA for failure to provide such a screening examination. The born-alive infant is a “person” and an “individual” under [1 U.S.C. § 8\(a\)](#) and the screening requirement of EMTALA applies to “any individual” who comes to the emergency department.

Another example is a case of an infant born alive elsewhere on the hospital’s campus (i.e., not in the hospital’s dedicated emergency department) and a prudent layperson observer concluded, based on the born-alive infant’s appearance or behavior, that the infant was suffering from an emergency medical condition. In such a circumstance, the hospital and its medical staff are required to perform a medical screening examination on that infant to determine whether or not an emergency medical condition existed. If the

hospital or its medical staff determined that the infant was suffering from an emergency medical condition, the hospital has an obligation to admit the infant, or to comply with either the stabilization requirement or the transfer requirement of EMTALA. The born-alive infant is a “person” and an “individual,” as described above, and the stabilization and transfer requirements of EMTALA apply to “any individual” who comes to the hospital.

Finally, a third example is when the hospital admits a born-alive infant. EMTALA does not apply to inpatients. If a born-alive infant is admitted to the hospital, EMTALA would not apply to protect the infant in most circumstances. However, the Medicare COPs would apply to the infant once he or she was admitted to the hospital as an inpatient.

5410.2 Conduct of Investigations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If a complaint indicates that a born-alive infant has been denied a screening examination, stabilizing treatment, or an appropriate transfer, the complaint is prioritized as an alleged EMTALA violation. It is not necessary to determine that the hospital acted with an improper motive in any failure to provide a screening examination, stabilizing treatment, or an appropriate transfer in order to conclude that an EMTALA violation has occurred. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that a finding of improper motive is not required to conclude that an EMTALA violation has occurred.

5420 - Basis for Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA enters alleged EMTALA violations into ACTS. The RO approves or disapproves requests for EMTALA investigations in ACTS.

5430 - RO Direction of Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5430.1 - Evaluation of Allegation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO evaluates all complaints and refers to the SA those that warrant SA investigation. The SA or the RO sends a letter to the complainant acknowledging the complaint and informing the complainant of whether an investigation is warranted. The SA’s responsibility is to verify whether a violation of [42 CFR 489.24](#) and/or the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20](#) occurred, and if there were other violations.

5430.2 - Request for Investigation of Allegations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO gives an initial verbal authorization to the SA to investigate the EMTALA allegation, and then completes Form CMS-1541A in ACTS. If the RO identifies Medicare conditions or standards it wants the SA to survey, related to the EMTALA allegation at a deemed hospital, the RO completes Form CMS-2802 in ACTS. If the RO identifies conditions or standards it wants the SA to survey related to the EMTALA allegation at a non-deemed hospital, it directs the SA to conduct a survey by completing Form CMS-1541A in ACTS.

5440 - Conducting an Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5440.1- Selecting the Team

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA selects surveyors with a background in the profession or area to be investigated. Preferably, the surveyors should have acute care training and experience. All surveyors must be adequately trained in the evaluation of [42 CFR 489.24](#) cases. Physicians should have experience in peer review.

5440.2 - Scheduling the Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Allegations of EMTALA violation against a non-deemed or deemed hospital represent a probable immediate jeopardy to the next individual who comes to the hospital requesting examination and treatment for an emergency medical condition. Therefore, complete the investigation within five working days after receipt of the telephone authorization from the RO. The onsite investigation must be conducted on consecutive working days. The survey must be completed promptly and is not to be interrupted by other activities. DO NOT ANNOUNCE ANY INVESTIGATIONS.

5440.3 - Guidelines for Surveyors Conducting Investigations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Attention to Procedures

The purpose of conducting the investigation is to ascertain whether or not the hospital violated the EMTALA requirements. The survey must be in accordance with applicable

survey procedures and policies. Review instructions in [Appendix V](#), before beginning the investigation. The guidelines provide a detailed interpretation of the regulations.

Involvement of Complainants

Complainants, if known, receive a letter of acknowledgment from the SA or RO. Do not disclose the identity of complainants. When information obtained during the investigation appears to be in conflict with the information supplied by the complainant, consult with the complainant, if this can be done without disclosing the person's identity.

5440.4 - Conducting the Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

A complete investigation consists of assessment of the following components:

- Completeness, adequacy and enforcement of policies and procedures which address the provisions of [42 CFR 489.24](#);
- Prompt reports to the SA or CMS of receipt of an improperly transferred individual by the receiving hospital;
- Presence and completeness of signs posted in emergency departments specifying the rights of individuals under [42 CFR 489.24](#), and information indicating whether the hospital participates in the Medicaid program;
- Maintenance of medical and other records related to individuals transferred to or from the hospital for a period of five years from the date of transfer, including discharged patients;
- Maintenance of a list of physicians who are on call to provide necessary stabilizing treatment;
- Maintenance of a central log on each individual who comes to the hospital seeking emergency services;
- Provision of an appropriate medical screening examination sufficient to determine the presence of an emergency medical condition;
- Provision of necessary stabilizing treatment;
- Provision of no delay in examination or treatment in order to inquire about insurance status or capability for payment;
- Provision of an appropriate transfer to another medical facility/provider;

- Provision of whistleblower protections; and
- Adequacy of responsibilities of the recipient hospital with specialized capabilities (nondiscrimination).

The survey tasks are listed below for easy reference. See [Appendix V](#) for detailed guidance.

- Task 1: Entrance Conference;
- Task 2: Case Selection Methodology;
- Task 3: Record review;
- Task 4: Interviews;
- Task 5: Exit Conference;
- Task 6: Professional Medical Review; and
- Task 7: Assessment of Compliance and Completion of the Deficiency Report.

After the investigation is concluded, complete a Form CMS-1541B ([Exhibit 137](#)). If one or more of the provisions of EMTALA are not met, complete Form CMS-2567, using “Principles of Documentation.” Describe in detail the facts of each individual case. In addition, specify whether the hospital was aware of the problem and took steps to remedy it prior to the survey. If a SA physician was a member of the investigation team, include the medical review of the case. Use the “Physician Review Outline for Emergency Care Obligations of Medicare Hospitals,” ([Exhibit 138](#)) for this purpose. In addition, complete Form CMS-562. All the forms must be signed, showing the professional titles of all participating surveyors, and dated.

A hospital may have multiple sites listed under its Medicare provider number. These sites may not be in close proximity of each other and each site may have its own dedicated emergency department (DED). In cases where the alleged EMTALA violation is against a specific site of the hospital, the surveyors should focus their survey investigation at the hospital site mentioned in the complaint intake. However, the surveyors should review all EMTALA related Policies and Procedures of all sites of the hospital. The surveyors need to survey the other sites of the hospital if the survey findings indicate that the potential EMTALA violation maybe widespread.

5440.5 - Exit Conference

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

It is usually desirable and appropriate to conduct an exit conference. The surveyor(s) may outline the basic facts uncovered during the onsite investigation. However, the surveyor(s) must inform the hospital that the RO makes the final compliance determination, and the determination is often made with information obtained after the onsite investigation. Do not reveal the complainant and do not venture an opinion on what determination the RO might make. The exit conference should include a description of the process that is followed if the RO determines that a violation has occurred.

5450 - Forwarding Report of Investigation to the RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Transmit the results of the investigation and your recommendations to the RO through ACTS within 10 working days following completion of the onsite survey, if it appears there may be an EMTALA violation. If there appears to be no violation, this time frame may be extended to 15 working days, in order to allow the SA additional processing time.

Transmit the following materials to the RO through ACTS:

- Form CMS-562, "Medicare/Medicaid/CLIA Complaint Form;"
- Form CMS-1541B, "Responsibilities of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Emergency Cases Investigation Report." Recommend one or more of the actions below on the form:
 - **None** - This means the complaint was not substantiated;
 - **In Compliance, but Previously Out of Compliance** - This means that the hospital identified the problem on its own and took effective corrective action prior to the investigation. In addition to this recommendation, document on the Form CMS-2567 when the hospital identified the violation or a similar problem, the corrective action taken, and the date of such action. Also, document that the hospital has had no violations or similar problems for at least the past 6 months;
 - **Recommend Termination (23 calendar day track)** - This means that the hospital is out of compliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) or the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20\(l\), \(m\), \(q\) or \(r\)](#) and the violation presents an immediate jeopardy to patient health and safety;

- **Recommend Termination (90 calendar day track)** - This means that the hospital is out of compliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) or the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20\(l\)](#), (m), (q) or (r), but the violation does not present an immediate jeopardy to patient health and safety;
 - **Request Physician Review.** This means that it is recommended that the RO obtain a medical review of the case;
 - **Possible Discrimination.** This means that it is believed that discrimination occurred based on financial status, race, color, nationality, handicap, or diagnosis.
- Form CMS-670, “Survey Team Composition and Workload Report;”
 - Form CMS-2567, “Statement of Deficiencies and POC;”

NOTE: If the hospital had identified the deficiency and took corrective action prior to the investigation, indicate on the Form CMS-2567 that the requirement was not met. However, indicate on the Form CMS-2567 and the narrative report that the hospital took corrective action prior to the investigation, what action was taken, and for how long the hospital has been in compliance.

- Physician Review Outline for Emergency Care Obligations of Medicare Hospital (if physician review was done by SA);
- Complaint investigation narrative;
- Copies of pertinent hospital policies and procedures that relate to the identified deficiencies;
- Summary listing of all patients comprising the sample, including an explanation of how and why the cases were selected for review;
- Summary of interviews.

Transmit the following to the RO by overnight mail:

- Copies of medical records for substantiated cases, medical records of individuals named in the complaints, and other medical records for which a QIO review is requested;
- Certification of benefits versus risks of the transfer, if this is a transfer case.

5460 - RO Review of Investigation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Upon receiving the case from the SA, the RO has 10 working days to review the investigation findings. The RO requests a 5-day advisory medical review of the case by the QIO to determine if there is an EMTALA violation. The RO has 5 working days to review the case upon return from the QIO. With this information, and any other additional information, the RO determines whether the hospital complied with the EMTALA requirements and determines whether the violation constitutes an immediate jeopardy to patient health and safety.

Prior to determining compliance or noncompliance, the RO is encouraged to confer with the State Agency, and **may** confer with the hospital's representatives. The RO shares as much data as possible in accordance with current Privacy Act requirements.

5460.1 - Hospital Is In Compliance - No Past Violation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the RO determines that the allegation is not substantiated and that the hospital is in compliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) and/or the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20](#), the RO notifies the hospital and forwards a copy of the letter to the SA. If the SA received the complaint, it notifies the complainant that the complaint was not substantiated. If the RO received the complaint, the RO notifies the complainant.

5460.2 - Hospital Is In Compliance - Past Violation, No Termination

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the RO determines that the allegation was substantiated, but the hospital had identified the violation on its own, took effective corrective action prior to the investigation, and has had no EMTALA violations for at least the past 6 months, termination action is not initiated. The RO notifies the hospital via a "Past Violation - No Termination Letter." The SA receives a copy of the letter through ACTS. The RO or SA sends a letter to the complainant regarding the outcome of the investigation. Although no termination action is taken, the RO refers past violations of [42 CFR 489.24](#) to the OIG for assessment of civil monetary penalties (CMPs) if warranted.

5460.3 - Hospital Is Not in Compliance - Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the RO determines that the hospital is not in compliance and the violation represents an immediate jeopardy to patient health and safety, the RO follows a 23 calendar-day

termination process. The termination procedures in [§3010](#) are followed. Uncorrected deficiencies that resulted in a violation of [42 CFR 489.24](#) may pose an immediate jeopardy to people seeking emergency care. The RO notifies the complainant that the complaint was substantiated. It also informs the hospital in writing of the specific violations via a preliminary determination letter, and sends the hospital a copy of Form CMS-2567. The SA receives a copy of the letter through ACTS.

5460.4 - Hospital Is Not in Compliance - Situation Does Not Pose an Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the RO determines that the hospital is not in compliance with the EMTALA requirements, but the violation does not pose an immediate jeopardy to patient's health and safety, or the hospital took corrective action after the investigation to remove the immediate jeopardy, the RO follows a 90 calendar-day termination process. The termination procedures in [§3012](#) are followed. The RO notifies the complainant that the complaint was substantiated. The RO informs the hospital, in writing, of the specific violations via a preliminary determination letter and sends the hospital a copy of Form CMS-2567. The SA receives a copy of the letter through ACTS.

Examples of noncompliance that usually do not pose an immediate jeopardy:

1. A transfer which was appropriate, but not signed or dated by the physicians;
2. An appropriate, functioning, central log that on one particular day is not fully completed; and
3. A written hospital policy that is missing, but is nonetheless being implemented.

The fact that the hospital has completed a POC should not be interpreted to mean that the hospital admits violating the EMTALA requirements. However, the hospital is included on the log of facilities with EMTALA violations, with the notation that an acceptable POC was received by CMS, and termination action was stopped.

5465 - Procedures for the 5-day QIO Review of Alleged Violations of 42 CFR 489.24

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Prior to terminating a hospital from the Medicare program because of possible violation(s) of EMTALA, the RO requests the QIO to assess whether the individual involved was provided an appropriate medical screening examination, stabilizing treatment, or an appropriate transfer as required by EMTALA.

The QIO 5-day review is mandatory if the RO determines that a case involves a possible violation of [42 CFR 489.24](#) to support possible termination action against a hospital if in fact it violated EMTALA. The RO is responsible for providing the QIO with all information relevant to the case that is within its possession and control. The RO sends the “Physician Review Outline for Emergency Care Obligations of Medicare Hospitals,” ([Exhibit 138](#)) to capture this information. The QIO completes the review within 5 working days upon the receipt of RO’s request. The QIO sends the case file back to the RO including a copy of the review report. It is not required that the physician reviewer give the hospital and/or the physician an opportunity to respond to the allegations at this time. If the affected physician and/or hospitals have questions concerning the case, they are to consult with the RO.

The QIO Review is not required in cases where a delay in effecting a sanction would jeopardize the health and safety of individuals or in situations where medical review is inappropriate (e.g., cases where the individual was denied a medical screening examination). The QIO 5-day review is required to seek medical expertise on whether the individual was adequately screened, examined and treated.

The RO shall release upon request the 5 day QIO review to the affected physician and/or hospital, after the RO has made a determination as to whether the hospital violated or is in compliance with EMTALA. In addition, the RO may release the QIO review to the complainant or his/her representative upon request. The physician reviewer’s identity is confidential, therefore, when releasing the QIO report the physician’s identity is not to be disclosed unless he or she consents to the release of their identity in accordance with the disclosure regulations at [42 CFR 480.132 and 480.133](#).

The cases in which the RO determined that the hospital was in compliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) but in violation of [42 CFR 489.20](#) of the EMTALA regulation do not need to be forwarded to the QIO for review. The RO takes action as warranted.

5470 -Termination Procedures for EMTALA Violations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

5470.1 - Procedures for Termination when the EMTALA Violation is an Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

In cases where the RO determined that an immediate jeopardy existed, after a 5-day QIO advisory review has been completed, the RO follows the termination procedures in [§3010](#). The processing timeframes are the maximum allowed. The termination procedures are not postponed or stopped unless evidence of correction of the deficiencies or proof that the violation did not exist is provided by the hospital to the RO. The RO forwards the supporting documents to the QIO (for a 60 day QIO review) in order to provide a medical opinion on the case. The RO refers the case to the OIG that has the

responsibility for assessment of CMPs against the hospital and/or physician and physician exclusion provisions for violations of [42 CFR 489.24](#). The case is also referred to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) because OCR may take action under the Hill-Burton Subpart G Community Services regulations at [42 CFR 124.603\(b\) \(1\)](#).

The termination track starts on the date that the RO makes the determination of noncompliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#). It is the date of the preliminary determination letter. The letter is forwarded to the hospital by the fastest method available (fax, e-mail or telephone). In addition, a written letter follows up by mail. The preliminary determination letter informs the hospital of:

- The RO's findings based on the investigation and the results of medical review;
- The projected termination date (the 23rd calendar day from the date of the preliminary determination letter);
- The date on which the RO issues a Notice of Termination Letter and notifies the public (at least two calendar days, but no more than four calendar days prior to the termination date); and
- That the hospital may avoid the termination action and notice to the public by either providing acceptable POCs for the deficiencies or by successfully showing that the deficiencies did not exist. In either case, the necessary information must be furnished to the CMS RO in time for the SA to verify the corrections before the projected termination date.

If, during the resurvey, the SA finds that the provider had implemented systems and processes to ensure that the likelihood of further violation is remote and there is adequate evidence that the provider is in compliance with the requirements, the termination action is rescinded and the provider is put back in compliance.

If, during the resurvey, the SA finds that the provider has not adequately implemented systems and processes to ensure compliance, the RO gives the hospital an additional 67 days or a total of 90 days (23 plus 67) to achieve compliance.

This allows the hospital time to prove that the corrective action is good for the long-term (i.e., the corrective action is adequate to ensure that no further violations will occur). The RO directs the SA to conduct a second survey by the 60th calendar day. On the resurvey, the surveyor(s) reviews patients' emergency department (ED) records and other relevant documents for the period since the last survey to assess continued compliance. If the hospital fails to achieve compliance, it is terminated from the Medicare program. The RO sends the complainant a letter reporting the final results of the investigation.

If the termination takes place and the hospital desires to become re-certified as a Medicare provider, the hospital must provide reasonable assurance that compliance will be maintained. The procedures at [§2016](#) are followed.

5470.2 - Procedures for Termination When the EMTALA Violation is Not Immediate Jeopardy to Patient Health and Safety

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

In cases where the RO determined that a violation existed but not an immediate jeopardy, after a 5-day QIO advisory review has been completed when it was warranted, the RO follows the termination procedures in [§3012](#). The processing timeframes are the maximum allowed. The termination procedures are not postponed or stopped unless evidence of correction of the deficiencies or proof that the violation did not exist is provided to the RO by the hospital. If warranted, the RO forwards supporting documents to the QIO (for a 60 day QIO review) in order to provide a medical opinion on the case. The RO refers the case to the OIG, if warranted, that has the responsibility for assessment of CMPs against the hospital and/or physician and physician exclusion provisions for violations of [42 CFR 489.24](#). The case is also referred to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) because OCR may take action under the Hill-Burton Subpart G Community Services regulations at [42 CFR 124.603\(b\)\(1\)](#).

The termination track starts on the date that the RO makes the determination of noncompliance with [42 CFR 489.24](#) and/or the related requirements at [42 CFR 489.20](#). It is the date of the preliminary determination letter.

5480 - Procedures for QIO Review of Confirmed EMTALA Violation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Before imposing sanctions under [§1867](#) of the Act for violations of [42 CFR 489.24](#), [42 CFR 489.24\(h\)](#) requires that CMS obtain consultation from the QIO. The OIG holds the authority to assess CMPs against the hospital or physicians or to exclude physicians from the Medicare program for violations of [42 CFR 489.24](#).

5480.1 - Procedures for Coordinating 60 day QIO Review

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO requests the QIO to provide a medical opinion on EMTALA violation cases within 60 calendar days. The cases referred for 60-day QIO review are outlined in [§5480B](#). The RO uses the “Model Letter Requesting QIO Review of a Confirmed Violation of [42 CFR 489.24](#) for Purposes of Assessing Civil Monetary Penalties or Excluding Physicians,” ([Exhibit 212](#)). The QIO provides the physician and the hospital reasonable notice of its review a reasonable opportunity for discussion, and an opportunity for the physician and hospital to submit additional information before issuing its report. (Instructions on notice of review and opportunity for discussion, and additional information that follow the regulatory requirements in [42 CFR 489.24\(h\)](#) are found in [§§9100-9150](#) of the [QIO Manual](#).)

The RO is responsible for providing the QIO with all information relevant to the case that is within its possession and control. The RO sends the “Physician Review Outline for Emergency Care Obligations of Medicare Hospitals,” ([Exhibit 138](#)) to capture this information. This outline is helpful for organizing the review of the medical record. The specialty of the reviewing physician should be matched to the specialty of the physician who attended the patient and/or the individual’s medical condition. If the patient was not seen by a physician, the QIO uses the diagnosis of the patient or the usual physician assignment practice of the hospital to determine the specialty of the physician reviewer.

Within 60 calendar days of receiving the case, the QIO must submit to the RO a report on its findings. The report provides an expert medical opinion regarding whether the individual involved had an emergency medical condition, whether the individual’s emergency medical condition was stabilized, whether the individual was transferred appropriately, and whether there are any medical utilization or quality of care issues involved in the case. Upon request, the RO provides copies of the QIO report to the affected physician and/or hospital after all investigative activity has been completed.

When there was no screening examination or when a delay would jeopardize the health or safety of individuals, QIO Review is not required before the OIG may impose CMPs or exclude a physician from the Medicare program. In addition, if the QIO determines, after a preliminary review, that there was an appropriate medical screening examination and the individual did not have an emergency medical condition, the QIO returns the case to the RO with its documented opinion. The RO will close the case and no referral to OIG is necessary.

When the RO determines that a hospital was non-compliant with the requirements of [42 CFR 489.24](#), one of its notice requirements is to notify the OIG that the violation was confirmed and that termination action was initiated. ([See Exhibit 208.](#)) The RO completes the notification after receipt of the QIO 60-day review report. If the QIO report does not support an EMTALA violation, the RO closes the case without referring it to the OIG.

The RO forwards the following documents to the OIG:

- Form CMS-1541B;
- Form CMS-2567;
- Medical record;
- Summary of interviews;
- Explanation of sample selection;

- Copies of pertinent hospital policies and procedures related to the identified deficiencies;
- Complaint investigation narrative;
- Certification of benefits versus risks of the transfer (if this is a transfer case);
- Copy of the 5 working-day advisory QIO Review, and
- Copy of the 60 calendar-day advisory QIO Review.

The RO sends the above information and any other pertinent documentation in its possession to the OIG at the following address:

Office of Inspector General
 Office of Counsel to the Inspector General
 Department of Health and Human Services
 Room 5527, Cohen Building
 330 Independence Avenue SW
 Washington, D.C. 20201

5480.2- EMTALA Case Referral to OIG

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

CMS refers appropriate cases to the OIG for investigation. Periodically, OIG will advise us of the criteria they would prefer CMS to use in referring cases. Examples of the types of cases that may be referred include:

1. **Financial Screening** - The hospital and/or responsible physician refused to examine or treat a person based on the person's insurance status or inability to pay a fee. The financial basis for the decision must be clearly supported by evidence in the file, e.g., documented policy, interview reports.
2. **Patient with Trauma or Acute Emergency Condition** - The hospital and/or responsible physician (including an on-call physician who failed to come to the hospital) failed to screen, stabilize, or appropriately transfer (or, in the case of a hospital with specialized capabilities or facilities, refused to accept an appropriate transfer of) a person with trauma, e.g., a severe head injury, or other acute emergency condition, e.g., heart attack or stroke, requiring immediate and substantial medical intervention.
3. **High Risk Event (such as Birth) Occurs Prior to Arrival at Another Hospital** - The hospital and/or responsible physician discharged or refused to screen/treat a

person who gave birth (or is subject to another high risk medical event) prior to arriving at another hospital (especially if transport is by private vehicle).

4. **Death or Serious Harm Results from Dump** - The evidence in the file (including the QIO Review) demonstrates that the dumping violation caused serious medical harm or death to the victim of the violation.
5. **Egregious Violation Prioritized by CMS** - CMS concludes that a CMP is appropriate because of the seriousness of the violation (the person must have had an emergency medical condition) and other relevant factors, e.g., long history of noncompliance, hospital policy resulting in violations, pattern of serious violations, knowing and willful violation. This category is for those cases that CMS determines are very serious and merit a CMP but do not fit within other categories identified by OIG.

5480.3 - Releasing QIO Assessment

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Upon request, the RO may release QIO assessment(s) to the physician and/or hospital or the affected individual, or his/her representative. The QIO physician's identity is confidential unless he/she consents to its release. The QIO Review may be released pursuant to the requirements of [42 CFR 480.132](#) and [480.133](#).

Sections 5500 to 5590 relate CLIA.

5500 - Complaints Involving Unaccredited Laboratories

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

NOTE: This section applies to complaints against laboratories that hold a CLIA certificate of compliance, certificate of waiver (COW), and certificate of PPM (See [§§5540-5590](#) for complaints regarding accredited laboratories).

A complaint is an allegation that could result in citing noncompliance with CLIA requirements. A complaint may be substantiated or unsubstantiated as a result of an investigation or survey. A substantiated complaint is one resulting in a finding of noncompliance at the time of the investigation, or a finding that noncompliance was proven to exist, but was corrected prior to the investigation. An unsubstantiated complaint is an allegation where sufficient evidence could not be found to conclude that noncompliance with CLIA requirements existed during the investigation or at the time of the alleged violation. A complaint may be received in either the SA or the RO. The receiving organization should follow the procedures outlined below.

The SA obtains the following information for every complaint:

- Complainant's name, address, and telephone number, unless the complainant requests anonymity;
- Laboratory's name and address; and
- Description of problem, (e.g., personnel, places, and dates of occurrence).

5500.1 - Control

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA establishes a file for the complaint and logs the action in a control system. The system may be manual or automated, but must facilitate tracking and control of the complaint.

5500.2 - Acknowledgment

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the complainant is known, the SA promptly issues written acknowledgment that the complaint is being investigated. The SA should not delay acknowledgment pending an investigation unless the investigation takes place within three working days. The SA must take appropriate precautions to protect the complainant's anonymity and privacy. The SA maintains a copy or record of the notification with the complaint documentation.

5500.3 - Evaluation

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA evaluates any complaint to determine whether it should be investigated by the SA, or whether it should be forwarded to the RO for investigation or referral to the appropriate authority (e.g., OCR, OSHA, RO). The SA assesses the complaint to determine if an immediate survey is necessary. While the SA will perform most complaint surveys, complaints involving State-operated facilities are the responsibility of the RO. When the SA does not have jurisdiction, it should forward the complaint to the RO within three working days. If referral is not necessary, the SA considers whether or not any special notification is appropriate.

If a complaint is especially significant, sensitive, or attracting broad public or media attention, the SA informs the RO immediately.

5500.4 - Scheduling Investigations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA investigates within two working days of receiving the complaint and focuses on the specific problem area if the complaint involves possible immediate jeopardy to patient health and safety. Otherwise, the SA follows procedures for prioritizing and investigating certification-related complaints. Laboratories with complaints pending are identified and given priority in scheduling of regular certification surveys.

5500.5 - Conducting Investigations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The SA investigates complaints by means of an onsite survey, by telephone, by electronic communication, by letter, or by a documentary review. Complaint investigations are unannounced.

For onsite complaint investigations, the SA performs a full or partial survey based on the allegations. If a complaint alleges generalized inappropriate laboratory practices, the SA evaluates compliance with applicable requirements or conducts a full survey, as needed. If the complaint is of a specific nature, the SA performs a survey focused on areas relevant to the complaint.

5500.6 - Conducting Investigations in a Laboratory with a Certificate of Waiver

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO authorizes an unannounced complaint survey of a laboratory holding a certificate of waiver only if it is based on a substantial allegation of noncompliance. The fact that a deficiency is not at the Condition-level does not preclude taking adverse action based on provisions contained in [42 CFR 493.1840](#). As with other laboratories, the SA investigates complaints made against laboratories with a certificate of waiver by means of an onsite survey, by telephone, letter, or by a review of documents.

The SA performs the onsite investigation based on the allegation and determines whether a laboratory is performing only waived tests and if the laboratory is following the manufacturer's instructions for performing the tests (See [Appendix C](#)).

5500.7 - Conducting Investigations in a Laboratory with a Certificate for PPM Procedures

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO authorizes an unannounced complaint survey of a laboratory holding a certificate for PPM procedures only if based on a substantial allegation of noncompliance. This survey should not differ from a complaint survey done in any other laboratory performing non-waived testing, as all requirements for moderate complexity apply except routine survey.

Substantial indication that a laboratory is performing tests that do not appear on the PPM procedures test list; e.g., through billing procedures, should prompt a complaint survey of a certificate for PPM procedures laboratory followed by either proper registration or appropriate sanctions.

5500.8 - Post Investigation Actions

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Following the investigation, the SA records any deficiencies on a Form CMS-2567 and provides it to the facility using regular procedures. Subsequent actions depend on the severity and nature of the deficiencies cited and the facility's willingness or ability to correct them.

When deficiencies are identified, the SA initiates actions as follows:

- 1. Condition-Level Deficiencies - Immediate Jeopardy** - Certifies noncompliance and initiates procedures to recommend imposing alternative and principal sanctions.
- 2. Condition-Level Deficiencies - No Immediate Jeopardy; Facility Provides an Acceptable POC** - Certifies noncompliance and initiates procedures to recommend imposing alternative sanctions based on the severity and nature of the deficiencies found.
- 3. Lower Level Deficiencies - Facility Provides an Acceptable POC** - Certifies compliance based upon an acceptable POC and assembles documentation for RO review.
- 4. Lower Level Deficiencies - Facility Unable or Unwilling to Provide Acceptable POC** - A facility with deficiencies may not participate without an acceptable POC. The SA recommends sanction action to the RO.

When no deficiencies are identified, no certification action is required.

5500.9 - Resolution/Closeout

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

1 - Unsubstantiated

The SA enters the unsubstantiated complaint into ACTS and documents the facility's certification file.

2 - Substantiated

The SA reports substantiated complaints using the Form CMS-2567 and any appropriate supporting documentation. The SA logs summary information in the control system and files a copy of the complaint documents in the facility's certification file. The SA enters complaints into ACTS. The laboratory will be charged a fee to cover the cost of the survey if noncompliance is documented.

The SA closes out all complaints with a follow-up notice to the complainant with the findings and disposition of the complaint. The SA should send this notice soon after the investigation and retains a copy with the complaint record.

The SA provides follow-up reports, as necessary, to any other appropriate parties such as the State Medicaid agency and/or initial referring agencies. The SA must be sure to protect the anonymity and privacy of the complainant.

The SA inputs the investigation information into ACTS within 45 days of the completion of the complaint survey.

5510 - CLIA-Exempt Laboratory Complaint Investigations - General

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

Complaints may be from any source, including verbal, written, electronic or in the media.

Complaints are investigated if they meet the following criteria:

- If substantiated, would have an impact on the health and safety of the general public or individuals served by the laboratory, and
- Would raise doubt as to the laboratory's compliance with one or more CLIA Conditions and/or requirements.

An attempt to maintain the anonymity of the complainant should always be made.

There are a number of entities that must address laboratory complaints including: CMS Central and Regional Offices, the state agencies (including those with state licensure

programs), approved states, and accreditation organizations. Each of these entities shares a strong interest in ensuring the quality of patient care and the services provided by laboratories. When the complaint involves more than one of these entities, there should be coordination and communication to ensure an effective and timely resolution of the issue.

5520 - Review of CLIA-Exempt Laboratory Complaints

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the RO receives a complaint against a CLIA-exempt laboratory, the RO determines what action is appropriate. The RO may do any of the following:

- Determine the severity of the complaint;
- Send the information to the approved State for their action;
- Conduct a survey (full or partial);
- Investigate the complaint during the course of a validation survey (full survey), if it is conducted within 45 days of the laboratory's licensure survey and the complaint does not present immediate jeopardy concerns.
- If the seriousness of the complaint or the circumstances warrant, the RO should invoke the Rapid Response Alert Protocol.

NOTE: Transfusion-related fatality investigations must be conducted by the RO. They may not be delegated to the approved State; however, the approved State may accompany the RO on the investigation. In either case, there must be coordination and communication between the RO and the State. Where State laws apply to transfusion-related incidents, the approved State program should follow its established procedures and coordinate with the RO.

The RO Reviews the approved State program's complaint activities as part of the overall annual review. The RO has the discretion to maintain its own complaint tracking system for those that have been forwarded to the approved State program. However, this information should be an integral part of the State's annual review.

If the approved State program receives a complaint against a CLIA-exempt laboratory, the approved State program determines what action is appropriate. If the approved State sanctions a CLIA-exempt laboratory in any way (e.g., licensure is withdrawn), it must notify the RO within 30 days.

If the laboratory against which the complaint is alleged is accredited, the State must also notify the accreditation organization.

5530 - Conducting Complaint Investigations and Surveys for CLIA-Exempt Laboratories

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO will complete the “Medicare/Medicaid/CLIA Complaint Form,” Form CMS-562, for every complaint investigation it performs in a CLIA-exempt laboratory. When an investigation can be conducted via telephone (e.g., personnel credentials), the RO should do so. The RO obtains the following information for every allegation:

- Complainant’s name and address, unless complainant requests anonymity. Do not disclose the identity of the complainant to the laboratory;
- Laboratory’s name and address; and
- Description of problem, involving names, places, and dates.

The RO follows the same procedures for control and acknowledgement indicated in §5500. Complaints involving potential immediate jeopardy will be investigated by the RO within 2 working days of receipt. Complaints not involving potential immediate jeopardy are investigated within 45 days. All complaint surveys are unannounced.

If a laboratory representative refuses to permit a complaint survey, the RO contacts the State and requests that it contact the laboratory to explain the protocol and, if necessary, suggest that the State take enforcement action against the CLIA-exempt laboratory. The RO conducts the complaint survey in accordance with the survey protocol and uses the appropriate survey forms specified in Exhibit 63 and the outcome-oriented protocol found in Appendix C.

Initially, the RO focuses the survey only on the Condition(s) or requirement(s) related to the complaint area(s). If the complaint is substantiated or if additional deficiencies are found during the course of the investigation, the RO expands the scope of the survey to include additional standards, conditions, and other CLIA requirements. If the complaint is not substantiated, the RO notifies the laboratory that it is in compliance with the CLIA Condition(s) (Exhibit 243). The RO also notifies the approved State program of the Condition-level compliance (Exhibit 244).

At the exit conference, the RO informs the laboratory of the deficiencies found. If the deficiencies pose immediate jeopardy to the health and safety of individuals served by a laboratory or that of the general public, the RO notifies the approved State program and the laboratory within two working days by overnight mail and includes a copy of the Form CMS-2567. The RO directs the State program to take the appropriate enforcement action. (See Exhibits 231 and 228). The RO follows-up with the State program within 15 working days of its notification to the laboratory to verify that the enforcement action has either been taken against the laboratory or that the laboratory has achieved compliance with CLIA requirements.

If the State program fails to take appropriate enforcement action for an immediate jeopardy case within 23 days of the RO's notification, and the laboratory has not achieved Condition-level compliance, the RO may request CO to either contact the State or attempt other resolution to eliminate the jeopardy.

If the deficiencies do not pose immediate jeopardy to the health and safety of individuals served by a laboratory or that of the general public, the RO prepares a Form CMS-2567 and forwards a letter along with the Form CMS-2567 to the laboratory and to the State program within 10 working days of completing the survey. The State program is responsible for taking any enforcement action, if necessary, monitoring the correction of the deficiencies, and providing a report to the RO. (See Exhibit 231.)

The RO completes a Survey Team Composition and Workload Report, Form CMS-670, for all complaint surveys and related activity.

If the approved State program fails to take appropriate enforcement action in non-immediate jeopardy situations, the RO documents its files accordingly and notifies CO. Failure to take and document the necessary enforcement action may subsequently jeopardize current or future approval of the State's laboratory licensure program.

5540 - Complaint Investigations and Surveys of Accredited Laboratories Under CLIA

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

There are a number of entities that must address laboratory complaints including: CMS Central and Regional Offices, the state agencies (including those with state licensure programs), approved states, and accreditation organizations. Each of these entities shares a strong interest in ensuring the quality of patient care and the services provided by laboratories. When the complaint involves more than one of these entities, there should be coordination and communication to ensure an effective and timely resolution of the issue.

The statutory basis for conducting surveys of accredited laboratories based on allegations of noncompliance is found in §353(e)(2)(D) of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA). Since accreditation organization (AO) requirements are equivalent to CLIA requirements, a complaint may affect the laboratory's accreditation status as well.

Complaints are investigated if they meet the following criteria:

- If substantiated, would have an impact on the health and safety of the general public or individuals served by the laboratory, and
- Would raise doubt as to the laboratory's compliance with one or more CLIA Conditions and/or requirements.

The RO should evaluate the complaint and take appropriate investigatory action. If the seriousness of the complaint or the circumstances warrant, the RO should invoke the Rapid Response Alert Protocol. Every effort should be made to secure a written form of the complaint, while maintaining anonymity, if requested.

All complaint surveys are unannounced and conducted according to outcome-oriented survey principles (See [Appendix C](#)). If an investigation can be conducted by letter or telephone, in lieu of an onsite survey, those means should be utilized.

Upon receipt, all complaints are logged and tracked and the same information as for CMS certified laboratories is collected, monitored and maintained (see Section 5500).

5550 - RO Direction of Complaint Investigation of an Accredited Laboratory

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

The RO has primary responsibility for the coordination of all activities involving complaints relating to an accredited laboratory.

This includes:

- Ensuring that all pertinent information concerning the complaint is obtained;
- Assessing the level of severity of the complaint;
- Determining actions required for investigation;
- Determining whether multiple AOs may be involved; and
- When warranted (e.g., in cases potentially involving media coverage, Federal/State Congressional or political interest, legal intervention, etc.), informing and coordination with all affected parties, including AO's, State Agencies and Central Office.

Although the RO has the lead role in directing the investigation of complaints involving accredited laboratories, all affected entities (i.e., State Agencies, AO's, Central Office) share responsibility in ensuring timely and effective action is taken.

Complaints received by the SA:

If the SA receives a substantial allegation of noncompliance directly from a complainant about an accredited laboratory, it promptly acknowledges receipt of the complaint and

advises the complainant that it is being forwarded to the RO for action. The SA forwards a copy of the acknowledgment letter and the complaint to the RO. This includes SAs with a State laboratory licensure program.

Complaints received by the RO:

If the complaint is received directly by the RO, the RO will promptly send a letter to the complainant acknowledging the complaint and advising the complainant of the intended course of action, and subsequently the results of any investigation, if appropriate, and of the corrective action taken.

In either case (complaint received by SA or RO), the RO evaluates the complaint and has the lead in determining the course of action. The RO determines whether the RO, the SA, or the AO, including multiple AOs if circumstances so warrant, will investigate the complaint. The RO will also determine whether one or multiple AOs may be impacted by the complaint and, if so, alert them of the pending action. In certain instances the RO may enlist CO support to help determine the most effective course of action.

If the RO determines that the SA should investigate the complaint, the RO prepares a “Request for Complaint Investigation or Validation Survey of Accredited Laboratory, Form CMS-2802A,” (See **Exhibit 107**) and a “Medicare/Medicaid/CLIA Complaint,” Form CMS-562, and forwards them to the SA along with a copy of the complaint and notifies the AO. If the RO authorizes the SA to perform a full survey (all specialties and subspecialties covered by the certificate), and the survey can be performed within 90 days of the AO’s inspection, the survey can be counted in the SA’s validation workload.

If the RO determines that the complaint involves a potential immediate jeopardy to the individuals served by the laboratory, or to the general public, the SA investigates the complaint within two working days of receiving it from the RO. . Otherwise, the RO will direct the SA to investigate non-Immediate Jeopardy complaints within 45 days and report their findings to the RO and AO at the conclusion of the survey.

Complaints investigated by AOs:

If the RO determines that the accreditation organization should carry out its own investigation, it promptly forwards the complaint to the accreditation organization for immediate attention. The RO will request to be notified of the results of any investigative action taken. The RO will then notify the SA and, if warranted, CO.

NOTE: Transfusion-related fatality investigations must be conducted by the RO or SA. Transfusion-related fatality investigations must not be referred to an accreditation organization for action. However, the AO or multiple AOs, as appropriate, should be notified when such an investigation is taking place.

Complaints received by AOs:

Complaints received directly by AOs will be investigated under each AOs own standards and procedures. If multiple AOs are potentially impacted, the AO receiving the complaint will promptly inform the other AOs and a determination should be reached regarding the need for coordinated action. In cases potentially involving media coverage, Federal/State Congressional or political interest, legal intervention, etc., the SA, RO and CO should be promptly alerted by the AO receiving the complaint and consulted concerning appropriate action.

5560 - Conducting Complaint Survey of an Accredited Laboratory

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If an onsite survey is warranted, the SA will conduct an unannounced survey of an accredited laboratory based on the substantial allegation of noncompliance. The SA conducts the complaint survey in accordance with outcome-oriented principles (see [Appendix C](#)). The SA conducts a focused complaint survey, as instructed by the RO on Form CMS-2802A. If the SA finds additional deficiencies during the course of the complaint investigation, it may expand the scope of the survey with RO approval.

At the exit conference, the SA informs the laboratory director of the deficiencies found and the procedures to respond to them. If the deficiencies do not pose an immediate jeopardy to the health and safety of individuals served by a laboratory, or to the general public, the SA prepares a Form CMS-2567 and requests that the laboratory submit a POC for all Condition-level deficiencies. Condition level deficiencies **must** be corrected; those at the standard level are optional. The SA informs the laboratory that the Form CMS-2567 will be made available to the public under the disclosure of survey information provisions. The SA indicates to the laboratory that the “Statement of Deficiencies” (Form CMS-2567) will be forwarded to the laboratory within 10 working days and that the POC must be returned to the SA within 10 calendar days. Upon receipt of the survey information and POC, the RO makes a determination of whether or not sanctions will be imposed against the laboratory and notifies the AO.

5570 – Forwarding Investigation Report to RO

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If non-immediate jeopardy is found, the SA will submit the appropriate information as specified in the List of Documents in the Certification Packet ([see Exhibit 63](#)) to the RO, or through an update to ACTS within 45 days of completing the survey and notifies the RO of the entry. If the laboratory chooses not to submit a POC when deficiencies are found, the SA reports any known information about the laboratory’s efforts to correct deficiencies to the RO and AO.

5580 - Accredited Laboratory Found in Compliance Following a Complaint Survey

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If after review of the documentation the RO determines that the accredited laboratory is in compliance with all CLIA Condition-level requirements, it officially notifies the laboratory and forwards a copy of this letter to the SA and the AO. This letter advises that the accreditation organization may contact the laboratory about correcting any deficiencies below Condition-level.

5590 - Accredited Laboratory Found Not in Condition-level Compliance Following a Complaint Survey

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Effective/Implementation Dates: 03-17-06)

If the deficiencies found pose an immediate jeopardy to the health and safety of individuals, the SA prepares the Form CMS-2567, (which is included as part of the List of Documents in the Certification Package, [See Exhibit 63](#)) and notifies the RO and sends Form CMS-2576 to the laboratory within 2 working days. RO will notify the AO. Based on the information forwarded, and the laboratory's POC, the RO determines if sanctions are to be imposed against the laboratory. The RO will then notify the AO.

Should the immediate jeopardy situation be corrected before the adverse action is taken or completed, the SA will advise the laboratory that it will revisit it to inspect all remaining Conditions not in compliance. The RO will notify the AO.

If non-immediate jeopardy is found, the SA will submit the appropriate information as specified in the List of Documents in the Certification Packet (See [Exhibit 63](#)) to the RO, or through an update to ACTS within 45 days of completing the survey and notifies the RO of the entry. The POC should also be forwarded to the RO. If the laboratory chooses not to submit a POC when deficiencies are found, the SA reports any known information about the laboratory's efforts to correct deficiencies to the RO and the RO will notify the AO and the laboratory that the laboratory is out of compliance and has been placed under SA monitoring jurisdiction ([see Exhibit 241](#)). The laboratory is monitored by the SA, RO, and/or AO until it reaches Condition-level compliance or its certificate of accreditation is revoked. A copy of all correspondence is provided to the accreditation organization by the RO.

For standard only deficiencies, responsibility rests with the AO to follow-up and pursue corrective action. The laboratory continues to be accredited by its accreditation organization and retains its CLIA certificate of accreditation during this monitoring period; however, it becomes subject to the same CLIA requirements, survey and enforcement procedures as applied to non-accredited laboratories found out of compliance.

CROSSWALK TO THE OLD CHAPTER 5

A crosswalk from sections of the State Operations Manual Chapter Five published 5-21-2004 to the revised chapter five is as follows:

Name of Old Section	Old Section Number	New Section Number	Name of New Section
Management of Complaints and Incidents	5000	5000	Management of Complaints and Incidents
Intake Process	5010	5010	Intake Process
Triage and Priority Assignment	5020	5070	Priority Assessment for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA
Priority Definitions	5030	5075	Priority Definitions for Nursing Homes, Deemed and Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, and EMTALA
Investigation Findings and Reports	5040	5080	Investigation Findings and Reports
CMS Regional Office Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents	5050	5050	CMS Regional Office Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents
Aspen Complaints/Incidents Tracking System (ACTS)	5060	5060	ASPEN Complaints/Incidents Tracking System (ACTS)
Investigation of Complaints Against Accredited/Deemed Providers and Suppliers	5100	5100	Investigation of Complaints for Deemed Providers/Suppliers
Basis for Investigation of Complaints Against Accredited/Deemed Providers and Suppliers	5110	5100.1	Basis for Investigation
RO Direction of Accredited Hospital Complaint Investigation	5120	5210	Processing of Complaints Originating with or Investigated by RO
Conducting an Accredited Hospital Complaint Validation Survey	5130	5050	CMS RO Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents
Forwarding Investigation Report to RO	5140	5050	CMS RO Responsibility for Monitoring SA Management of Complaints and Incidents
Accredited Hospital Found in Compliance Following Complaint Validation Survey	5150	5100	Investigation of Complaints for Deemed Providers/Suppliers
Accredited Hospital Found Not in Compliance Following Complaint Validation Survey	5160	5100	Investigation of Complaints for Deemed Providers/Suppliers
Reinstatement to Accreditation Organization Jurisdiction	5170	5100.2	Post-Survey Procedures
Termination of Accredited Hospital	5180	5100.2	Post-Survey Procedures

Investigating Complaints Involving ESRD Services Provided by Accredited Hospitals	5190	5160	Investigating Complaints Involving ESRD Services Provided by Deemed Hospitals
Investigation of Complaints Against Other Than Accredited/Deemed Providers and Suppliers	5200	5200	Investigating Complaints for Non-Deemed Providers/Suppliers, Excluding Nursing Homes
SA Processing of General, Certification-Related Complaints	5210	5010	General Intake Process
Hospital Restraints/Seclusion Death Reporting and Investigation	5240	5140	Hospital Restraints/Seclusion Death Reporting and Investigation
Complaints Involving HIV-Infected Individuals	5250	5150	Complaints Involving HIV-Infected Individuals
Investigations Involving Alleged EMTALA Violations	5300-5400	5400-5500	Investigations Involving Alleged EMTALA Violations
Complaints Involving Unaccredited Laboratories	5500-5590	5500-5590	Complaints Involving Unaccredited Laboratories

Chapter Five State Operations Manual

Acronyms

(Rev. 18, 03-17-06)

ACTS	ASPEN Complaint Tracking System
AIDS	Auto-immune deficiency syndrome
AO	Accreditation Organization
the ACT	Social Security Act
CFC	Conditions for Coverage
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CLIA	Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments
CMP	Civil Monetary Penalties
CMS	Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services
CO	Central Office
CoP	Conditions of Participation
COW	Certificate of Waiver
DED	Dedicated Emergency Department
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
EMS	Emergency Medical System
EMTALA	Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act
ESRD	End-Stage Renal Disease
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
HHA	Home Health Agency

HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IJ	Immediate Jeopardy
JCAHO	Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations
LSC	Life Safety Code
NF	Nursing Facility
NW	Networks
OCR	Office of Civil Rights
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
P & A	Protection and Advocacy Group
PHSA	Public Health Service Act
POC	Plan of Correction
PPM	Provider Perform Microscopy (PPM) Procedures
PRTF	Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility
QIO	Quality Improvement Organization
RFP	Requirements for Participation
RNHCI	Religious Non-Medical Health Care Institutions
RO	Regional Office
SA	State Agency
SMA	State Medicaid Agency
SNF	Skilled Nursing Facility
SOM	State Operations Manual
USC	United States Code

Exhibit 22 - Guidance to Distinguish Between the Priorities of Immediate Jeopardy and Non-Immediate Jeopardy-High in Nursing Home Allegations

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Implementation/Effective Dates: 03-17-06)

GUIDANCE TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE PRIORITIES OF IMMEDIATE JEOPARDY AND NON-IMMEDIATE JEOPARDY-HIGH IN NURSING HOME ALLEGATIONS

(The following scenarios are intended only to assist in the triage of certain allegations of noncompliance in a nursing home. Each situation is unique, and the following examples should be considered as guidance only. An additional resource is [Appendix Q](#) (Guidelines for Determining Immediate Jeopardy) of the State Operations Manual.)

1. Allegations of Abuse

- **Unexplained, unexpected death, with circumstances indicating that there was abuse or neglect** - A report of abuse/neglect resulting in an unexplained or unexpected death would not be triaged as immediate jeopardy if it is clear that the abuse/neglect is not present and ongoing. Whether or not an alleged perpetrator is still present in the facility and has unsupervised interaction with residents would be a consideration in assessing the urgency for an onsite visit. Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine the conditions are not present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.
- **Resident is physically abused - spitting/slapping/sticking with sharp object, pushing, pinching** - A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm that negatively impacts the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. The extent of the injuries, whether or not the alleged perpetrator is still present in the facility and has unsupervised interaction with the residents, the frequency and duration of the behavior as well as the facility history, recent complaint reports, deficiencies cited, and other available information should also be reviewed in making a decision regarding the triage of complaints alleging physical abuse. Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine the conditions are not present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.
- **Sexual assault, sexual harassment and sexual coercion** - A report of sexual assault, sexual harassment or sexual coercion would not be triaged as immediate jeopardy if it is clear that the threat of sexual abuse is not present and ongoing. A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm that negatively impacts the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and

is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. Whether or not an alleged perpetrator is still present and has unsupervised interaction with the residents in the facility would be a consideration in assessing the urgency for an onsite visit. Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine the conditions are not present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.

- **Verbal Abuse - Resident is intimidated/threatened** - A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm that negatively impacts the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. Possible indicators of a higher level of actual harm could include: the resident crying, fleeing, not want to leave their room, fearful, not participating in activities, communicating, etc.). The frequency and duration of the behavior, as well as the facility history, recent complaint reports, deficiencies cited, and other available information should also be reviewed in making a decision regarding the triage of intakes alleging verbal abuse. Whether or not an alleged perpetrator is still present in the facility and has unsupervised interaction with the residents would be a consideration in assessing the urgency for an onsite visit. Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine whether or not the conditions are present and ongoing, the complaint should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.

2. Falls Resulting in Fracture or Serious Injury

A report of falls resulting in fracture would not be triaged as immediate jeopardy if it is clear that the conditions causing and/or contributing to the falls are not present and ongoing. If the intake information is not sufficient to determine whether or not the conditions are present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within 2 working days. A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm that negatively impacts on the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. Factors to consider would be whether or not falls are preventable (the cause of the fall was the result of something the facility did or failed to do) or non-preventable (the cause of the fall was not the result of something the facility did or failed to do). Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine whether or not the conditions are present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.

3. Inappropriate Use of Physical or Chemical Restraints Resulting in Serious Injury

A report of inappropriate use of restraints resulting in injury would not be triaged as immediate jeopardy if it is clear that the inappropriate use of restraints is not present and ongoing. If the intake information is not sufficient to determine whether or not the

conditions are present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days. A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm that negatively impacts the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. Unless the intake information is sufficient to determine whether or not the conditions are present and ongoing, the intake should be triaged as immediate jeopardy and an onsite visit should be conducted within two working days.

4. Inadequate Staffing that Negatively Impacts Resident Health and Safety

A higher level of actual harm would exist if the situation has caused harm negatively impacting on the resident's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. The intake would need to provide information about the nature and frequency of the problems created for residents by the inadequate staffing. Other information that could be used to triage the allegation of inadequate staff would be facility history, recent complaint reports, deficiencies cited, MDS data (falls, weight loss, etc). Allegations of inadequate staff should also be analyzed to assess whether or not the lack of staff poses a life safety code violation that places residents at risk. The source or sources of the allegations may impact on the classification of the complaint. Numerous complaints from multiple sources could elevate the priority for an investigation.

Exhibit 23- ACTS Required Fields

(Rev. 18, Issued: 03-17-06; Implementation/Effective Dates: 03-17-06)

ACTS REQUIRED FIELDS

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
Intake	Intake Type	<p>1) <i>Complaint</i> - A <u>complaint</u> is a report made to the SA or RO by anyone other than the administrator or authorized official for a provider or supplier that alleges noncompliance with Federal and/or State laws and regulations.</p> <p>2) <i>Incident</i> - An <u>incident</u> is an official notification to the SA or RO from a self-reporting provider or supplier (i.e., the administrator or authorized official for the provider or supplier).</p>
	Intake Subtype (for Complaints)	<p>A) <i>Federal COPs, CFCs, RFPs, EMTALA</i>: The allegation relates to noncompliance with the Federal condition(s) of participation (COPs), condition(s) for coverage (CFCs), requirement(s) for participation (RFPs), or EMTALA requirement(s). This would include allegations of noncompliance with Federal requirements only or both Federal and State requirements. (SAs and ROs are required to enter these cases into ACTS.)</p> <p>B) <i>State-only, licensure</i>: The allegation is related to noncompliance with State licensure requirements only. (SAs have the option to enter these cases into ACTS.)</p> <p>C) <i>No State or Federal provider compliance issue involved</i>: The allegation does not relate to noncompliance with Federal or State survey and certification requirements. (SAs have the option to enter these cases into ACTS.)</p>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Intake Subtype (for Incidents)	<p>A) <i>Federally required, entity-reported:</i> A provider or supplier is required by Federal law, regulation, or policy to report this type of incident, which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 42 C.F.R. §482.13(f)- <i>Standard: Seclusion and restraint for behavior management.</i> The hospital must report to CMS any death that occurs while a patient is restrained or in seclusion, or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of restraint or seclusion. (SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS all incidents that lead to an onsite survey of Federal requirements or conditions.) b. 42 C.F.R. §483.13- For skilled nursing facilities (SNFs) and nursing facilities (NFs), the facility must ensure that all alleged violations involving mistreatment, neglect, or abuse, including injuries of unknown source, and misappropriation of resident property are reported ...to other officials in accordance with State law through established procedures (including to the State survey and certification agency). (SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS all incidents that lead to an onsite survey of Federal requirements or conditions.) <p>B) <i>State-required, may result in Federal noncompliance, entity-reported:</i> A provider or supplier is required by State law, regulation, or policy to report this type of incident to the SA. This type of incident may result in noncompliance with a Federal condition(s) of participation, condition(s) for coverage, requirement(s) for participation, or EMTALA requirement(s). For incidents of this type, the SA must follow CMS policies and procedures to investigate Medicare/Medicaid complaints, no matter the source of information. (SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS all incidents that lead to an onsite survey of Federal requirements or conditions.)</p> <p>C) <i>State-required, all other, entity-reported:</i> A provider or supplier is required by State law, regulation, or policy to report this type of incident to the SA. This type of incident does not imply noncompliance with Federal conditions or requirements. (SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS all incidents that lead to an onsite survey of Federal requirements or conditions.)</p> <p>D) <i>Reported by other agencies:</i> As defined by the State.</p> <p>E) <i>None of the above:</i> A provider or supplier is not required by Federal or State laws, regulations, or policies to report this type of incident. (SAs and ROs are required to enter into ACTS all incidents that lead to an onsite survey of Federal requirements or conditions.)</p>
	Complainant's Name	For an incident the name of the official reporting the information is entered.
	Source	A selection is made from a predefined list. The user cannot select more than 3.

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Received Dates: Start/End	<p><i>Start Date:</i> The date of the telephone call or electronic correspondence; or, the date stamped by the SA or RO receiving office of the written correspondence.</p> <p><i>End Date:</i> The date the SA or RO has sufficient information to prioritize the complaint or incident. This is the date in which the SA or RO determines 1) whether an onsite survey to assess Federal compliance or further action is necessary and 2) the appropriate time frame for investigation.</p>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Priority	<p><i>At least one priority must be selected for each intake. Some combinations are not permitted.</i></p> <p>A) <i>Immediate Jeopardy:</i> Intakes assigned this priority indicate immediate corrective action is necessary because a provider's or supplier's noncompliance with one or more conditions or requirements may have caused, or is likely to cause, serious injury, harm, impairment or death to a resident, patient or client.</p> <p>B) <i>Non-Immediate Jeopardy - High:</i> Intakes are assigned this priority if a provider's or supplier's alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions may have caused harm negatively impacting on the individual's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status and is of such consequence to the person's well being that a rapid response by the SA is indicated. This level of complaint is represented by specific rather than general information, such as, descriptive identifiers, individual names, date/time/location of occurrence, description of harm, etc.</p> <p>C) <i>Non-Immediate Jeopardy - Medium:</i> Intakes are assigned this priority if a provider's or supplier's alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions has caused or may cause harm that is of limited consequence and does not significantly impair the individual's mental, physical and/or psychosocial status to function.</p> <p>D) <i>Non-Immediate Jeopardy - Low:</i> Intakes are assigned this priority if a provider's or supplier's alleged noncompliance with one or more requirements or conditions may have caused physical, mental and/or psychosocial discomfort that does not constitute injury or damage. An onsite investigation may not be scheduled but the allegation would be reviewed at the next scheduled onsite survey, at the latest.</p> <p>E) <i>Administrative Review/Offsite Investigation:</i> This priority is used for complaints/incidents that are triaged as not needing an onsite investigation. However, further investigative action (written/verbal communication or documentation) initiated by the SA or RO to the provider may be needed to ensure compliance with the Federal requirements. The additional information is adequate in scope and depth to determine that an onsite investigation is not necessary; however, a SA has the discretion to review the information at the next onsite survey.</p> <p>F) <i>Referral – Immediate:</i> Complaints/incidents are assigned this priority if the seriousness of a complaint/incident and/or State procedures requires referral or reporting to another agency, board or network immediately for investigation.</p> <p>G) <i>Referral - Other:</i> Complaints/incidents assigned this priority indicate referral to another agency, board, or network for investigation or for informational purposes.</p> <p>H) <i>No action necessary:</i> Adequate information has been received about the complaint/incident such that the SA can determine with certainty that no further investigation, analysis, or action is necessary. For all cases except EMTALA, that do not allege immediate jeopardy, and at the SAs discretion an intake may not require a new onsite investigation if, at a previously completed survey, the same events were investigated; the previously completed survey evaluated the appropriate individuals, including those identified in the intake; and the situation did not worsen. These types of intakes should be linked to the appropriate survey that has already reviewed the issue.</p>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Investigate Within X Days	Completion is required if the Priority is Immediate Jeopardy or Non-immediate Jeopardy (Priorities A – D). A numerical time frame in calendar days or working days is entered to support the Priority selected. The calendar date of the intake is counted as day zero.
	Investigation Due By	Completion is required if the Priority is Immediate Jeopardy or Non-immediate Jeopardy (Priorities A – D). A corresponding calendar date is entered.
Allegations	Allegation Category	At least one allegation category from a predefined list per intake is required unless Priority H - No Action Necessary is selected.
	Findings (Substantiated)	<p>A <u>substantiated</u> allegation is an allegation that is verified by evidence. An allegation is considered substantiated based on the finding about the individual or specific situation named by the complainant in his or her allegation; or, other residents or patients reviewed or similar situations, even if the noncompliance was corrected for the specific individual(s) named by the complainant in the allegation.</p> <p>A. <i>Federal deficiencies related to the allegation are cited</i> For nursing homes only, this would include cases of current noncompliance and past noncompliance.</p> <p>B. <i>State deficiencies related to the allegation are cited</i></p> <p>C. <i>No deficiencies related to the allegation are cited</i> The SA verified the allegation by evidence. However, at the time of the investigation, the provider had taken action necessary to prevent the deficient practice, and/or the allegation was not serious enough to warrant citing deficiencies. (This is not applicable for EMTALA, for EMTALA see the State Operations Manual at §3410.)</p> <p>D. <i>Referral to appropriate agency</i> After investigation, the complaint/incident was forwarded to the appropriate agency.</p>
	Findings (Unsubstantiated)	<p>An <u>unsubstantiated</u> allegation is an allegation that cannot be verified by evidence.</p> <p><i>Allegation did not occur</i> Evidence indicates that the alleged concern did not occur. Lack of sufficient evidence <i>There is insufficient evidence to verify the allegation. The evidence is inconclusive.</i></p> <p><i>Referral to appropriate agency</i> After investigation, the complaint/incident was referred to the appropriate agency.</p>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Link Deficiencies	<i>Users indicate which Federal deficiencies are related to any of the allegations. Only allegations categorized as "Substantiated" and "Federal deficiencies related to the allegation are cited" may be linked to Federal deficiencies. At least one Federal deficiency must be linked to an allegation if it is categorized as "Substantiated" and "Federal deficiencies related to the allegation are cited".</i>
	Priority	<i>This field is shared with the Intake page and Deemed page (when applicable).</i>
	Investigate Within X Days	<i>This field is shared with the Intake page and Deemed page (when applicable).</i>
	Investigation Due By	<i>This field is shared with the Intake page and Deemed page (when applicable).</i>
	Death Associated with Restraint/ Seclusion [Grid]	<p><i>For Hospitals: When allegation type = Death Associated with Restraint/Seclusion (05), the following must be completed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patient Death type Reported Date of death AO Notify To P&A
EMTALA (Fields required only if 'Create EMTALA Allegation' box is checked)	EMTALA Request for RO Approval Checkbox	
	EMTALA Request for RO Approval Date	
	EMTALA RO Response Checkbox	<i>Required when EMTALA Request for RO Approval is checked.</i>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	EMTALA RO Response Date	<i>Required when EMTALA Request for RO Approval is checked.</i>
	Type of Emergency	
	RO EMTALA Determination	<i>Not required if RO disapproves investigation.</i>
	Resolution	<i>Not required if RO disapproves investigation.</i>
	RO Confirmed Violation Date or RO Confirmed No Violation Date	<i>One of these fields should always be completed, unless RO disapproves investigation.</i>
	EMTALA Allegation Type	<i>Entry of EMTALA allegation here ties to an allegation record on the Allegation Page. Once an RO Response is entered, SA users cannot modify the EMTALA page. Also, once an EMTALA RO Response has been entered, EMTALA allegations may no longer be added or deleted by SA users; however, Allegation Findings categories and text may be entered by any user. Once the Determination has been entered, SA users may not add, delete, or modify EMTALA allegations.</i>
Deemed and Accredited (Fields enabled if 'Deemed for Medicare Participation' or 'Accredited' box is checked. Fields are required if	Priority	<i>This field is shared with Intake and Allegation pages.</i>
	Request for RO Approval	
	Date of Request for RO Approval	
	Condition(s) of Participation	
	RO Response	<i>There are no edits on these fields at this time.</i>
	Regional Representative	

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
‘Request for RO Approval’ box is checked.)	Region	
	Date	
Investigation	Investigated By	<i>Required when Complaint Priority is Immediate Jeopardy or Non-immediate Jeopardy (Priorities A – D)</i>
	Investigation Completed	<i>Required when Complaint Priority is Immediate Jeopardy or Non-immediate Jeopardy (Priorities A – D) The date that the result of the investigation is communicated to the provider or supplier.</i>
Actions/Close	Forwarded to RO/MSA	<p>If the intake originates from the CMS RO, the SA should check the “Forwarded to CMS/MSA” box in all complaint/incident scenarios.</p> <p>If the intake originates from the SA, SAs <u>should not</u> check the box or enter a date for all <u>nursing home</u> intakes.</p> <p>For non-long-term care intakes, the SA should check the “Forwarded to RO/MSA” box on the complaint/incident record in the three following scenarios:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. If the complaint/incident survey is on an accredited/deemed provider/supplier. ii. If the complaint results in an EMTALA investigation. iii. If the complaint/incident survey is on an “other than accredited/deemed provider or supplier” and the SA is recommending termination.
	Proposed Action	<i>At least one proposed action per complaint/incident record if a survey is present.</i>
	Proposed Action Date	<p><i>Date of the notice sent to the provider/supplier informing the provider/supplier of actions that may be taken as a result of the investigation findings. If the provider/supplier is in compliance, the proposed action date is the date the provider/supplier is notified that it is in compliance.</i></p> <p><i>At least one proposed action date per complaint/incident record if a survey is present.</i></p>

TAB	FIELD(s)	DEFINITION
	Overall Findings	<i>Supplied by ACTS (For complaints, uses same rule as Findings: Required when Complaint Priority = Immediate Jeopardy or Non-immediate Jeopardy (Priorities A – D); for incidents, defaults on-screen to Not Applicable).</i>
	Reason Closed	<p><i>Field is completed by selecting one or more of the following:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Paperwork complete</i> – All information and documentation related to this complaint or incident has been completed in the SA or RO file. If applicable, this would include the notification of the results of the investigation to the complainant and provider, and the successful upload of the investigation record to the Certification and Survey Provider Enhanced Reports (CASPER) system. For nursing homes, if applicable, the intake may be closed prior to the revisit and imposition of an enforcement action.</p> <p>B. <i>Withdrawn</i> – The complainant contacted the entity receiving the allegation and asked that the allegation be removed.</p> <p>C. <i>Referred</i> – At the intake, during administrative review, or after the onsite complaint survey, it is determined that the issues involved must be directed to another agency or organization for resolution.</p> <p>D. <i>No jurisdiction</i> – The issues identified at intake, during an administrative review or after a survey do not involve Medicare/Medicaid participation requirements.</p> <p>E. <i>Provider/Supplier Termination</i> – The provider or supplier has been terminated from participation in the Medicare and/or Medicaid programs.</p>
	Date Closed	<i>Date associated with the latest reason closed action selected.</i>
<p>NOTIFICATION: Notices Button (every tab) and the Acknowledgement and Parties Notified section on the Investigation Properties tab</p>		<p><i>At least one notification is required, except when Priority is No Action Necessary.</i></p> <p>For each notice, enter the Type, Party, Method, and Notification Date.</p>