

Calendar Year: 2015

Utilization Review Performance Rating of Investigation of a Claims Administrator

Investigation No: URA-S07-15-R1

Claims Administrator: Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Group

Location: Los Angeles

Utilization Review Management: Bunch CareSolutions, CorVel

Number of Requests for Authorization:

Prospective	<u>48</u>
Concurrent	<u>0</u>
Retrospective	<u>5</u>

Decisions by Type:

Approval	<u>18</u>
Modification	<u>16</u>
Delay	<u>5</u>
Denial	<u>12</u>

1. FACTOR FOR UNTIMELY RESPONSE TO REQUEST

# late prospective responses	0	divide by # of prospective requests	48	
# late concurrent responses	0	divide by # of concurrent requests	0	
# late retrospective responses	<u>0</u>	divide by # of retrospective requests	<u>5</u>	
Totals	0	divide by	Totals	<u>53</u>
				=
				0.00000

2. FACTOR FOR FAULTY NOTICE CONTENT

# faulty prospective responses	2	divide by # of prospective requests	48	
# faulty concurrent responses	0	divide by # of concurrent requests	0	
# faulty retrospective responses	<u>0</u>	divide by # of retrospective requests	<u>5</u>	
Totals	2	divide by	Totals	<u>53</u>
				=
				0.03774

3. FACTOR FOR IMPROPER DISTRIBUTION OF NOTICE

# prospective w/ improper distribution	0	divide by # of prospective requests	48	
# concurrent w/ improper distribution	0	divide by # of concurrent requests	0	
# retrospective w/ improper distribution	<u>0</u>	divide by # of retrospective requests	<u>5</u>	
Totals	0		Totals	<u>53</u>
				=
				0.00000

UTILIZATION REVIEW PERFORMANCE RATING

A Utilization Review Performance Rating of 0.85000 or greater is a passing score.

98.7%

Analysis of Penalties and/or Violations Cited for Utilization Review Investigation

Investigation No.: URA-S07-15-R1
Claims Administrator: Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Group
Location: Los Angeles
Utilization Review Management: Bunch CareSolutions, CorVel

Number of Utilization Review Requests for Authorization (requests) for Quarter: 128
Requests reviewed: 53 **Complaints Reviewed:** 0

Type of Violation	Violation of Title 8, CCR §9792.12	# of Violations	Total \$ Violations Identified	*\$ Not Subject to Assessment	Total \$ Subject to Assessment
Failure to establish a utilization review plan.	§9792.12 (a)(1)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to maintain a UR plan conforming to all of the requirements of 8CCR§9792.7(a).	§9792.12 (a)(2)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to file a UR plan or letter in lieu of UR plan with the Administrative Director.	§9792.12 (a)(3)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely file any material modification of a UR plan with the Administrative Director.	§9792.12 (a)(4)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to employ or designate a physician as medical director of the UR process.	§9792.12 (a)(5)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Issuance of a decision to modify or delay a request which is not within the reviewer's scope of practice.	§9792.12 (a)(6)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Modification, delay or denial of a request by a non-physician.	§9792.12 (a)(7)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Approval of amended request by non-physician without written evidence for submission of amended request.	§9792.12 (a)(8)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely respond to an expedited request.	§9792.12 (a)(9)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Denial of request solely because it is not addressed by MTUS/ACOEM.	§9792.12 (a)(10)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to document discussion for care plan for denial of concurrent request.	§9792.12 (a)(11)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to non-expedited concurrent request.	§9792.12 (a)(12)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to non-expedited prospective request.	§9792.12 (a)(13)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to a retrospective request.	§9792.12 (a)(14)	2	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Failure to disclose UR guidelines to the public.	§9792.12 (a)(15)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure of URO or claims administrator to provide documentation of compliance pursuant to 8CCR§9792.11(v)(5).	§9792.12 (a)(16)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely comply with any compliance requirement for the Final Report of UR Investigation.	§9792.12 (a)(17)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Analysis of Penalties and/or Violations Cited for Utilization Review Investigation

Investigation No.: URA-S07-15-R1
Claims Administrator: Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Group
Location: Los Angeles
Utilization Review Management: Bunch CareSolutions, CorVel

Type of Violation	Violation of Title 8, CCR §9792.12	# of Violations	Total \$ Violations Identified	*\$ Not Subject to Assessment	Total \$ Subject to Assessment
Failure to provide timely notice to all parties of need to extend decision date for request.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(A)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to document efforts to obtain information from requesting party prior to denying request.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(B)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to make and communicate a decision to approve, modify or deny a prospective/concurrent request within 5 days of receiving needed information.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(C)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to issue timely retrospective decision within 30 days of receipt of requested information.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(D)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Incomplete notice of modification, delay or denial.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(E)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide UR criteria/guidelines when requested by patient.	§9792.12 (b)(4)(F)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to make a timely request for additional information needed for decision for prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(A)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely initial communication of approval for a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(B)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely notice to all parties of decision to modify, delay, or deny a prospective/ concurrent request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(C)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely notice to all parties decision for a retrospective request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(D)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to immediately notify the requesting party that decision cannot be made within timeframes.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(E)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to document need/basis to delay decision.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(F)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide in written notice the reason for delay in making a decision.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(G)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to make a timely decision for a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(1)	2	\$200	\$200	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to provide a timely written notice of decision for a prospective/ concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(3)	0	N/A	N/A	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to provide initial notice for modification, delay or denial of a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(4)	0	N/A	N/A	\$0
TOTAL:		4	\$1,200	\$200	\$1,000

*Penalties for violations in 8 CCR § 9792.12(a) are mandatory and cannot be waived but may be mitigated depending on factors in § 9792.13. Penalties under § 9792.12(b)(4) and (b)(5) may be waived per § 9792.12(b)(2) and mitigated per § 9792.13.