

MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.

Independent Bill Review
P.O. Box 138006
Sacramento, CA 95813-8006
Fax: (916) 605-4280



INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

April 20, 2016

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

IBR Case Number:	CB16-0000515	Date of Injury:	01/31/2012
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]	Application Received:	03/28/2016
Assignment Date:	04/15/2016		
Claims Administrator:	[REDACTED]		
Date(s) of service:	04/08/2015 – 04/08/2015		
Provider Name:	[REDACTED]		
Employee Name:	[REDACTED]		
Disputed Codes:	G6056		

Dear [REDACTED]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has [REDACTED] the Independent Bill Review (“IBR”) of the above Workers’ Compensation case. This letter provides you with the IBR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

Final Determination: UPHOLD. MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that no additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is upheld and the Claim Administrator does not owe the Provider additional reimbursement. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its expert reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties. In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 20 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4603.6(f).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, M.D., M.P.H.
Medical Director

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Pertinent documents reviewed to reach the determination:

- The Independent Bill Review Application
- The original billing itemization
- Supporting documents submitted with the original billing
- Explanation of Review in response to the original bill
- Request for Second Bill Review and documentation
- Supporting documents submitted with the request for second review
- The final explanation of the second review
- OMFS

HOW THE IBR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services Chief Coding Specialist reviewed the case file and researched pertinent coding and billing standards to reach a determination. In some cases a physician reviewer was employed to review the clinical aspects of the care to help make a determination. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services.

ANALYSIS AND FINDING

Based on review of the case file the following is noted:

- **ISSUE IN DISPUTE: Provider seeking remuneration for G6056 submitted for date of service 04/08/2015.**
- EOR's indicated documentation did not substantiate billing.
- Provider letter, dated March 23, 2016, regarding IBR Dispute indicates claim was "originally" billed utilizing "8" codes for "urine drug screen." Post submission to the Claims Administrator, the '8' submitted code was "down coded" to G6056.
 - Paragraph 3 of the Provider's communication indicates claim down-coded to "G6056."
 - Paragraph 4 of the Provider's communication indicates "supporting documents supporting **medical necessity** for additional screening,"
 - Original HCFA not submitted for IBR.
 - Original denial reflecting original submission of 8 codes mentioned in the Provider Letter not submitted for IBR.
- IBR Application indicates service as authorized.
 - Authorization for Urine Drug Screening not submitted for IBR.
 - Authorization for Urine Qualitative or Quantitative Analysis not submitted for IBR.
- Opportunity to Dispute Eligibility communicated with the Claims Administrator on 03/30/2016; response received 04/11/2016. The Claims Administrator ascertains the documentation of a "negative" screen does not substantiate the need for G6056.
- **Administrative Rules § 9792.6.** Utilization Review Standards – Definition (a) "Authorization" means assurance that appropriate reimbursement will be made for an approved specific course of proposed medical treatment to cure or relieve the effects of the industrial injury pursuant to section 4600 of the Labor Code, subject to the provisions of section 5402 of the Labor Code, based on either a completed "Request for Authorization," DWC Form RFA, as contained in California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9785.5, or a request for authorization of medical treatment accepted as complete by the claims administrator under section 9792.9.1(c)(2), that has been transmitted by the treating physician to the claims administrator. Authorization shall be given pursuant to the timeframe, procedure, and notice requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 9792.9.1, and may be provided by utilizing the indicated response section of the "Request for Authorization," DWC Form RFA if that form was initially submitted by the treating physician.
- Authorization from the Claims Administrator approving the specific course of treatment relating to G6056 was not submitted for IBR.
- Authorization for G6056 service is required for reimbursement; **IBR unable to determine medical necessity.**
- **Based on the aforementioned documentation and guidelines, reimbursement for G6056 is not indicated.**

The table on page 4 describes the pertinent claim line information.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE: G6056

Date of Service 04/05/2015 Laboratory Services						
Service Code	Provider Billed	Plan Allowed	Dispute Amount	Units	Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.	Notes
G6056	\$39.72	\$0.00	\$31.78	1	\$0.00	Refer to Analysis

Copy to:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]