

DC Health Benefit Exchange Dental Working Group Report

April 13, 2013

This report is submitted to the Health Benefit Exchange Authority by the Dental Plan Advisory Working Group Chair (Leighton Ku) and Co-Vice Chairs (Katherine Stocks and Anupama Rao Tate). The purpose of this report is to outline the recommendations of the Dental Plan Advisory Working Group regarding what stand-alone dental plan issuers will be required to submit the DC Health Benefit Exchange Authority (HBX) with respect to becoming certified to sell stand-alone dental plans covering the Essential Health Benefit pediatric dental benefits, and non-pediatric dental benefits if chosen by the issuer, through the HBX.

Background

For dental coverage beginning in 2014, individuals and small groups will be able to purchase coverage through exchanges, the purpose of which is to provide a competitive marketplace and facilitate comparison of dental plans based on price, coverage and other factors. Dental plan issuers must be certified as meeting minimum standards in order to participate in the exchange and issue qualified dental plans. In March of 2012, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued a final (some parts interim final) rule on “Establishment of Exchanges and Qualified Health Plans; Exchange Standards for Employers.” (45 CFR Parts 155, 156 and 157). The preamble to the rule and the rule itself provide detailed guidance to exchange operators on the federal standards with which the exchange and the issuers must comply, such as state licensure; benefit and product standards; rating, rate filing and rating disclosures; marketing; quality, network adequacy and accreditation; and other required processes, procedures and disclosures.

Dental Issuer Certification Process

Discussion

The working group was charged with coming to consensus on the process by which dental carriers become certified to offer dental plans in the DC HBX. To assist in its discussions and deliberations, the working group used a checklist approved by the Board for use with QHP issuer certification, modified as appropriate for stand-alone dental plans. That document is attached. (Attachment A)

Additional information provided to the Working Group was the narrative regarding Departments of Insurance (DOIs) across the states, including DC's Department of Insurance Securities and Banking (DISB), use of attestations of compliance with required standards, as recited in the QHP Issuer Certification Process Working Group report:

One of the ways departments of insurance (DOIs) across the nation operate is to use attestations (also known as certifications) of issuers that they are in compliance with the law. For example, company actuaries routinely certify that their rates are reasonable in relation to the premium charged and that they are not unfairly discriminatory. State DOIs, including DC's Department of Insurance Securities and Banking (DISB), accept these actuarial certifications. Similarly, issuers file annual financial statements and certify that they are correct. Again, state DOIs, including DISB, routinely accept these certifications.

DISB retains regulatory authority by acceptance of attestations, since it has full authority to enforce correction of an issuer error and impose any sanction, such as a fine, commensurate with the gravity of the error.

A significant portion of the working group's discussion recognized the fact that the DC HBX is in start-up mode, and time is of the essence in getting processes underway in order for plans to have qualified products and the HBX to be ready for the initial open enrollment period, which starts on October 1, 2013. Due to this very real time crunch, the bulk of the working group's recommendations are to accept issuer certifications of compliance with the various standards for first plan year. However, the working group also recognizes that operation of the HBX will be an evolving experience and in fact the HBX will have more data as the HBX grows and adds more enrollees. The working group recommends that the HBX Board revisit these standards prior to QHP recertification in the second plan year, since the HBX will have additional data and experience to evaluate whether regulator verifications based on prospective evidence or means of accreditation other than issuer certifications should be required for certain standards.

It is also important to note that under the federal regulation, exchanges have an obligation to monitor compliance with federal standards for QHP and issuer certification. As HBX gains experience, becomes fully staffed and gains enrollees, actions such as spot checks of issuer websites and other monitoring activities should increase.

Consensus Recommendation

The Working Group reached a consensus recommendation to follow the general certification process adopted by the Board for QHP issuers, with certain categories modified or deleted as appropriate to dental plans.

I - Licensed and in good standing

- The regulator will verify that the issuer has a certificate of authority to conduct insurance business in DC for health (or dental) insurance
- Attestations for the following will be accepted:
 - Service area
 - General attestation that QDP issuer has appropriate structure, staffing, management, etc. to administer QDP effectively and in conformance with federal requirements now and in the future

II – Benefit Standards and Product Offerings

III – Rate Filings, Standards and Disclosure Requirement

IV – Marketing

Attestations for all the standards in II, III and IV will be accepted.

V – Network Adequacy Requirements

Attestations for all the standards in V will be accepted.

VI- Applications and Notices

VII – Transparency Requirements

VIII- Enrollment Periods

IX- Enrollment Process for Qualified Individuals

X- Termination of Coverage of Qualified Individuals.

XI – Other Substantive Requirements

Attestations for all the standards in VI, VII, VIII, IX, X and XI will be accepted.

Non-Pediatric Dental Benefits

Discussion

The working group was charged with coming to consensus on the offering of non-pediatric dental benefits in QHPs and stand-alone plans.

The following are allowed EHB dental plans under DC law:

- a. QHP that includes pediatric dental EHB (called “embedded”)
- b. Standalone dental plan that includes pediatric dental EHB (QDP)
- c. QHP in conjunction with a QDP. In this case:
 - i. The plans are priced separately
 - ii. The plans are made available for purchase separately at the same price.

A QHP is not required to provide pediatric dental benefits if:

- i. There is at least one QDP available and

- ii. The carrier discloses there are no pediatric dental benefits in the plan and those benefits are available on the HBX.

The Secretary has expressly stated that stand-alone dental plans can offer additional benefits, including non-pediatric coverage. (Federal Register, Vol. 78, No. 37, Feb. 15, 2013, p. 12853). However, DC law does not require it.

Consensus Recommendation

The working group reached consensus recommendation that licensed District of Columbia issuers offering stand-alone pediatric dental plans may also offer non-pediatric dental benefits.

Reasonable Out-of-Pocket Maximums

Discussion

The Working Group was charged with coming to consensus on what a reasonable out-of-pocket maximum (OOP) (dollar amount) would be for a stand-alone pediatric dental plan. According to 45 CFR 156.150, the HBX must establish such a reasonable OOP. In a draft March 1 letter, the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCIIO) stated that a \$1,000 OOP would be considered reasonable (i.e. a safe harbor). However, it was not clear in the letter if that was per plan, or whether it could be applied to each child covered in the plan. Our neighbor jurisdiction, Maryland, has set the OOP at \$1,000 if there is one child in the plan, and \$2,000 if there are two or more children in the plan.

The dental issuers strongly support a \$1,000 per child OOP and maintain that if it is less, premiums, deductibles and other cost-sharing will be higher. They maintain that at \$1,000 per child, about 2% of children would reach the OOP. If the OOP were dropped to \$500, then about 4% reach the OOP. One reason for the low percentages is that only medically necessary orthodontia is covered as an EHB, and according to the experts, the handicapping criteria to reach that threshold are extremely difficult. A pediatric dentist reported that children who reach the threshold have significant deformities.

Generally speaking, consumer advocates think a \$1,000 per child OOP is too high, and even more so if there are several children in the plan. This creates a barrier to purchasing a plan because the pediatric dental benefit, although a required offer, is not a mandated purchase for childless adults and may result in less coverage. An actuarial study circulated by Milliman¹ that indicated the premium rise for a lower OOP was not significant (about \$2-\$3 to go from \$1,000 to \$270), but various parties disputed the age of the report and the assumptions used.

¹ *Out of Pocket Maximum for Pediatric Dental and Orthodontia Benefit Plan to Prevent Catastrophic Dental Cost*. Milliman, November 5, 2012.

A working group member thought that CCIIO was going to revisit the \$1,000 safe harbor, and a few working group members wanted to follow the federal safe harbor, whatever it turned out to be.

Non-Consensus Recommendation

The issue of the out-of-pocket maximum was discussed at both working group meetings, and the working group was unable to reach consensus on the OOP issue.

Subsequent to the working group meetings, on April 5, 2013, CCIIO released a revised letter that set the stand-alone dental OOP safe harbor at \$700 per child, and \$1,400 if there are two or more children covered by the plan.

Separate Pricing of Pediatric Dental Benefit Embedded in QHP

Discussion

The Working Group was charged with coming to consensus on whether an issuer offering QHP with the EHB pediatric dental benefit embedded in the plan should be required to display the cost of the pediatric dental benefit portion separately from the cost of the rest of the plan. The discussion of this issue showed that stand-alone dental plans and QHPs with an embedded have polar opposite views. Stand-alone dental plans insist they will be at a competitive disadvantage if the QHP is not required to separate out and display the pediatric EHB portion. QHP issuers are equally adamant that it is impossible to do since the pricing of the plan covers so many benefits and is spread among people who will never use the pediatric dental benefit. The Department of Insurance, Securities, and Banking also confirmed that separating the cost of dental benefits in these plans would not be feasible for comparison purposes.

Consensus Recommendation

In what can be considered a compromise, the working group reached consensus that a QHP should clearly label whether it does, or does not, include the pediatric dental EHB.

Working Group Members

The Dental Plan Advisory Working Group is comprised of representatives from dental plans, health plans and consumer advocates. Two meetings were held, on March 26 and April 2, 2013, both with in-person and conference call participation.

Leighton Ku	The George Washington University Center for Health Policy Research (DC HBX Board)
Katherine Stocks	The Goldblatt Group
Anupama Rao Tate	Children’s National Medical Center
Mark Haraway	DentaQuest
Guy Rohling	UHC Dental

Jim Mullen, Kevin Wrege	Delta Dental
Louisa Tavakoli	Care First
Colin Reusch	Children's Dental Health Project
Amy Hall	DC resident
Tiffany	Kaiser Permanente
Jim Sefcik	Consultant
Mike Hickey	MetLife
Dean Rodgers	Dominion Dental
Jonathan Zuck	United Concordia
Meg Booth	CDHP
Claire McAndrew	Families USA