



JUL 23 2001

Memorandum

To: All Associate Regional Administrators
Attention: Division of Medicare

From: Deputy Director
Purchasing Policy Group
Center for Medicare Management

SUBJECT: Workers' Compensation: Commutation of Future Benefits

Medicare's regulations (42 CFR 411.46) and manuals (MIM §§ 3407.7 & 3407.8 and MCM §§ 2370.7 & 2370.8) make a distinction between lump sum settlements that are commutations of future benefits and those that are due to a compromise between the Workers' Compensation (WC) carrier and the injured individual. This Regional Office letter clarifies the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) policy regarding a number of questions raised recently by several Regional Offices (RO) concerning how the RO should evaluate and approve WC lump sum settlements to help ensure that Medicare's interests are properly considered.

Regional Office staff may choose to consult with the Regional Office's Office of the General Counsel (OGC) on WC cases because these cases may entail many legal questions. OGC should become involved in WC cases if there are legal issues which need to be evaluated or if there is a request to compromise Medicare's recovery claim or if the Federal Claims Collection Act (FCCA) delegations require such consultation. Because most WC carriers typically dispute liability in WC compromise cases, it is very common that Medicare later finds that it has already made conditional payments. (A conditional payment means a Medicare payment for which another payer is responsible.) If Medicare's conditional payments are more than \$100,000 and the beneficiary also wishes Medicare to compromise its recovery under FCCA (31 U.S.C. 3711), the case must be referred to Central Office and then forwarded to the Department of Justice. It is important to note in all WC compromise cases that all pre-settlement and post-settlement requests to compromise **any** Medicare recovery claim amounts must be submitted to the RO for appropriate action. Regional Offices must comply with general CMS rules regarding collection of debts (please reference the Administrator's March 27, 2000 memo re: New instructions detailing your responsibilities for monies owed to the government).

Medicare is secondary payer to WC, therefore, it is in Medicare's best interests to learn the existence of WC situations as soon as possible in order to avoid making mistaken payments. The use of administrative mechanisms¹ sometimes referred to by attorneys as Medicare Set-Aside Trusts (hereafter referred to as "set-aside arrangements") in WC

¹Although 42 CFR 411.46 requires that all WC settlements must adequately consider Medicare's interests, 42 CFR 411.46 does not mandate what particular type of administrative mechanism should be used to set-aside monies for Medicare including a self-administered arrangement (State law permitting). Of course, if an arrangement is self-administered, then the injured individual/beneficiary must adhere to the same rules/requirements as any other administrator of a set-aside arrangement.

commutation cases enables Medicare to identify WC situations that would otherwise go unnoticed, which in turn prevents Medicare from making mistaken payments.

Set-aside arrangements are used in WC commutation cases, where an injured individual is disabled by the event for which WC is making payment, but the individual will not become entitled to Medicare until some time after the WC settlement is made. Medicare learns of the existence of a primary payer (WC) as soon as possible when Medicare reviews a proposed set-aside arrangement at or about the time of WC settlement. In such cases, Medicare greatly increases the likelihood that no Medicare payment is made until the set-aside arrangement's funds are depleted. These set-aside arrangements provide both Medicare and its beneficiaries security with regard to the amount that is to be used to pay for an individual's disability related expenses. It is important to note that set-aside arrangements are **only** used in WC cases that possess a commutation aspect; they are not used in WC cases that are strictly or solely compromise cases.

Lump sum compromise settlements represent an agreement between the WC carrier and the injured individual to accept less than the injured individual would have received if he or she had received full reimbursement for lost wages and life long medical treatment for the injury or illness. In a typical lump sum compromise case between a WC carrier and an injured individual, the WC carrier strongly disputes liability and usually will not have voluntarily paid for all the medical bills relating to the accident. Generally, settlement offers in these cases are relatively low and allocations for income replacement and medical costs may not be disaggregated. Such agreements, rather than being based on a purely mathematical computation, are based on other factors. These may include whether there was a preexisting condition, whether the accident was really work related, or whether the individual was acting as an employee, or performing work-related duties at the time the accident occurred.

One of the distinctions that Medicare's regulations and manuals make between compromise and commutation cases is the absence of controversy over whether a WC carrier is liable to make payments. A significant number of WC lump-sum cases are commutations of future WC benefits where typically there is no controversy between the injured individual and the WC carrier over whether the WC carrier is actually liable to make payments. An absence of controversy over whether a WC carrier is liable to make payments is not the only distinction that Medicare's manuals and regulations make between compromise and commutation cases. Thus, lump-sum settlements should not automatically be considered as compromise cases simply because a WC carrier does not admit to being liable in the settlement agreement. Conversely, lump-sum settlements should not automatically be considered as commutation cases simply because a WC carrier does admit to being liable in a settlement agreement. Therefore, an admission of liability by the WC carrier is not the sole determining factor of whether or not a case is considered a compromise or commutation.

WC commutation cases are settlement awards intended to compensate individuals for **future** medical expenses required because of a work-related injury or disease. In contrast, WC compromise cases are settlement awards for an individual's current or past medical expenses that were incurred because of a work-related injury or disease. Therefore, settlement awards or agreements that intend to compensate an individual for any medical expenses after the date of settlement (i.e., future medical expenses) are commutation cases.

It is important to note that a single WC lump-sum settlement agreement can possess both WC compromise and commutation aspects. That is, some single lump-sum settlement agreements can designate part of a settlement for an injured individual's future medical expenses and simultaneously designate another part of the settlement for all of the injured individual's medical expenses up to the date of settlement. This means that a commutation case may possess a compromise aspect to it when a settlement agreement also stipulates to pay for all medical expenses up to the date of settlement. Conversely, a compromise case may possess a commutation aspect to it when a settlement agreement also stipulates to pay for future medical expenses. Therefore, it is possible for a single WC lump-sum settlement agreement to be both a WC compromise case and a WC commutation case.

Generally, parties to WC commutation cases agree on a lump sum amount in exchange for giving up the usual continuing payments by WC for lost wages and for lifetime medical care related to the injuries. Such lump sum amounts are usually requested because the beneficiary wishes to use the funds for some specific purpose. For example, the individual's home may need to be remodeled to accommodate a wheelchair or, more typically, he or she is so disabled that lifetime attendant care is needed. In these latter cases, the injured individual seeks a lump sum payment so that such care can be arranged with certainty in the future. The amount of the lump sum is typically established by using a life care plan² and actuarial methods to determine the individual's life expectancy. When WC has accepted full liability in a case prior to the creation of a set-aside arrangement, the likelihood of any Medicare conditional payments being made is reduced.

Set-aside arrangements are most often used in those cases in which the beneficiary is comparatively young and has an impairment that seriously restricts his or her daily living activity. These set-aside arrangements are typically not created until the individual's condition has stabilized so that it can be determined, based on past experience, what the future medical expenses may be.

Medicare regulations at 42 CFR 411.46 state that:

² If a life care plan is not used to justify the injured individual's future medical expenses, then the injured individual or his/her representative must present other alternative evidence that sufficiently justifies the amounts set-aside for Medicare.

"If a lump-sum compensation award stipulates that the amount paid is intended to compensate the individual for all future medical expenses required because of the work-related injury or disease, Medicare payments for such services are excluded until medical expenses related to the injury or disease equal the amount of the lump-sum payment."

In addition the Medicare manuals (§3407.8 of the MIM, §2370.8 of the MCM) state:

"When a beneficiary accepts a lump-sum payment that represents a commutation of all future medical expenses and disability benefits, and the lump-sum amount is reasonable considering the future medical services that can be anticipated for the condition, Medicare does not pay for any items or services directly related to the injury or illness for which the commutation lump-sum is made, until the beneficiary presents medical bills related to the injury equal to the total amount of the lump-sum settlement allocated to medical treatment."

Questions that have been raised are paraphrased below.

Question 1:

- (a) Does the Medicare program have a claim against a lump sum WC payment before an individual's Medicare entitlement?**
- (b) If not, can the Medicare program give a written opinion on the sufficiency of a set-aside arrangement even if the individual is not as yet entitled to Medicare?**
- (c) In WC cases involving injured individuals who are not yet Medicare beneficiaries, when must Medicare's interests be considered before the parties can settle the case?**

Answer:

These questions have been raised by attorneys who wish to devise set-aside arrangements, which represent amounts for medical items, and services that would ordinarily be covered by Medicare and are specified for future medical treatment for work-related illness or injuries. The attorneys are concerned that Medicare will not pay once the individual becomes entitled to Medicare, because the lump-sum included payment for future medical treatment.

The answer to Question 1(a) is no, Medicare cannot make a formal determination until the individual actually becomes entitled to Medicare. However, the attorneys are correct that once the individual becomes entitled, Medicare payment may not be made

to the extent of Medicare's interests in the lump sum payment per 42 CFR 411.46 or a set-aside arrangement that adequately considers Medicare's interests in the lump sum payment.

The answer to Question 1(b) is that the RO (with consultation from the Regional OGC, if necessary) can review a proposed settlement including a set-aside arrangement and can give a written opinion on which the potential beneficiary and the attorney can rely, regarding whether the WC settlement has adequately considered Medicare's interests per 42 CFR 411.46. These settlements should all be handled on a case-by-case basis, as each situation is different. If there are several years prior to Medicare entitlement, the RO should use its best judgment regarding what Medicare utilization might be once there is Medicare entitlement. This decision should be based on the documentation obtained as stated in the answer to Question 10. Once the RO has given written assurance that the set-aside arrangement is sufficient to satisfy the requirements at 42 CFR 411.46, when the set-aside arrangement is established and the settlement is approved, the RO, should then set up a procedure to follow the case.

The answer to question 1(c) is, it is not in Medicare's best interests to review every WC settlement nationwide in order to protect Medicare's interests per 42 CFR 411.46. Injured individuals (who are not yet Medicare beneficiaries) should only consider Medicare's interests when the injured individual has a "reasonable expectation" of Medicare enrollment within 30 months of the settlement date, **and** the anticipated **total** settlement amount for future medical expenses **and** disability/lost wages over the life or duration of the settlement agreement is expected to be greater than \$250,000.³

For example, if the injured individual is designated by WC as a Permanent Total disabled individual, has filed for Social Security disability, and the settlement apportions \$25,000 per year (combined for both future medical expenses **and** disability/lost wages) for the next 20 years, then the RO should review that WC settlement because the total settlement amount over the life of the settlement agreement is greater than \$250,000 (\$25,000 x 20 years = \$500,000) and the injured individual has a "reasonable expectation" of Medicare enrollment within 30 months of the settlement date. If the injured individual in this example fails to consider Medicare's interests, then Medicare may preclude its payments pursuant to 42 CFR 411.46 once the injured individual actually becomes entitled to Medicare.

NOTE:

Injured individuals who are already Medicare beneficiaries **must** always consider

³ Please note that the review thresholds (i.e., 30 months and \$250,000) will be subject to adjustment once CMS has experience reviewing these matters under these instructions.

Medicare's interests prior to settling their WC claim regardless of whether or not the total settlement amount exceeds \$250,000. That is, **ALL WC PAYMENTS** regardless of amount **must** be considered for current Medicare beneficiaries.

Question 2:

Should a "system of records" be established for the documentation that the RO and contractors receive/collect concerning these set-aside arrangements?

Answer:

Yes. CMS' Division of Benefit Coordination is in the process of establishing a "system of records" via the Federal Register process, which will provide legal authority to maintain records on individuals that are not enrolled in Medicare. The RO will be responsible for maintaining or "housing" the records for every arrangement on which the RO provides a written opinion. Please note that these records are not subject to Freedom of Information Act requests and may not be disseminated to the public.

Question 3:

Once the set-aside arrangement has been approved by the RO (with consultation from the Regional OGC, if necessary), what is the subsequent role of the ROs and contractors?

Answer:

When the RO approves a set-aside arrangement (with consultation from the regional OGC, if necessary), the RO will check on a monthly basis the National Medicare Enrollment database in order to determine when an injured individual actually becomes enrolled in Medicare. Once the RO verifies that the injured individual has actually been enrolled in Medicare, the RO will assign a contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case. The RO will assign the contractor based on the injured individual's State of residence.

When the injured individual has actually been enrolled in Medicare, the RO **must** provide the Coordination of Benefits Contractor (COBC) with identifying information to add a WC record to Common Working File. The RO must exercise one of the following options: 1) Fax the information to the COBC; or 2) Submit through an Electronic Correspondence Referral System (ECRS) inquiry. At a minimum, the RO must indicate that this is a WC set-aside arrangement case, and include the following information:

Beneficiary Name

Beneficiary HIC

Date of Incident

DX code(s): If you do not have dx codes readily available, you must include a description of the illness/injury. **Note:** Do not forward to COB without a dx or description.

Administrator of Trust

Claimant Attorney Information

The administrator of the set-aside arrangement must forward annual accounting summaries concerning the expenditures of the arrangement to the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case. The contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case is then responsible for insuring/verifying that the funds allocated to the set-aside arrangement were expended on medical services for Medicare covered services only. Additionally, the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case will be responsible for ensuring that Medicare makes no payments related to the illness or accident until the set-aside arrangement has been exhausted.

Question 4:

What types of measures should the RO and the contractors take to ensure that Medicare makes no payments related to the illness or accident until the set-aside arrangement has been depleted?

Answer:

Generally, set-aside arrangements that are designed as lump sums (i.e., the arrangement is funded by the WC settlement all at once) present less of a problem to monitor than structured arrangements. Medicare would not make any payments for individuals that possess lump sum arrangements until all of the funds within the arrangement have been depleted. For example, if a set-aside arrangement were established for \$90,000, Medicare would not make any payments until the entire \$90,000 (plus interest, if applicable) were exhausted on the individual's medical care (for Medicare covered services only).

Structured set-aside arrangements generally apportion settlement monies over fixed or defined periods of time. For example, a structured arrangement may be designed to disburse \$20,000 per year over the next ten years for an individual's medical care (for Medicare-covered services only). If the \$20,000 allocated on January 1 for Year One were fully exhausted on August 31, Medicare may make payments for the services performed after August 31 once the contractor responsible for monitoring the

individual's case can verify that the entire \$20,000 (plus interest, if applicable) is exhausted. However, when the structured arrangement allocates money for the start of Year Two (i.e., on January 1) Medicare would not make any payments for services performed until Year Two's allocation was completely exhausted.

In every set-aside arrangement case the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case (with assistance from the RO, if necessary) should ensure that Medicare does not make any payments until the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case can verify that the funds apportioned to the arrangement have truly been exhausted.

NOTE:

Until the individual actually becomes entitled to Medicare, the set-aside arrangement fund must **not** be used to pay the individual's expenses. That is, an individual's medical expenses must be paid from some other source besides the set-aside arrangement when the individual is not a Medicare beneficiary. Once the individual actually becomes entitled to Medicare, then the administrator of the arrangement is permitted to make payments for the individual's medical care (for Medicare-covered services only) from the arrangement.

If the contractor monitoring the individual's case discovers that payments from the set-aside arrangement have been used to pay for services that are not covered by Medicare or for administrative expenses that exceed those approved by the RO (see Question 11), then the contractor will not pay the Medicare claims. The contractor must provide the evidence of the unauthorized expenditures to the RO for investigation. If the RO determines that the expenditures were contrary to the RO's written opinion on the sufficiency of the arrangement, then the RO will notify the administrator of the arrangement that the RO's informal approval of the arrangement is withdrawn until such time as the funds used for non-Medicare expenses and/or unapproved administrative expenses are restored to the set-aside arrangement.

Question 5:

What are the criteria that Medicare uses to determine whether the amount of a lump sum or structured settlement has sufficiently taken its interests into account?

Answer:

The following criteria should be used in evaluating the amount of a proposed settlement to determine whether there has been an attempt to shift liability for the

cost of a work-related injury or illness to Medicare. Specifically, is the amount allocated for future medical expenses reasonable? If Medicare has already made conditional payments their repayment also has to be taken into account.

1. Date of entitlement to Medicare.
2. Basis for Medicare entitlement (disability, ESRD or age)-- If the beneficiary has entitlement based on disability and would also be eligible on the basis of ESRD, this should be noted since the medical expenses would be higher. This would also be true for beneficiaries who are over 65 but had been entitled prior to attaining that age.
3. Type and severity of injury or illness-- Obtain diagnosis codes so injury or illness related expenses can be identified. Is full or partial recovery expected? What is the projected time frame if partial or full recovery is anticipated? As a result of the accident is the individual an amputee, paraplegic or quadriplegic? Is the beneficiary's condition stable or is there a possibility of medical deterioration?
4. Age of beneficiary-- Acquire an evaluation of whether his/her condition would shorten the life span.
5. WC classification of beneficiary (e.g., permanent partial, permanent total disability, or a combination of both).
6. Prior medical expenses paid by WC due to the injury or illness in the 1 or 2 year period after the condition has stabilized-- If Medicare has paid any amounts, they must be recovered. Also, this would indicate that the case may not purely be a commutation case, but may also entail some compromise aspects, e.g., the WC carrier or agency may have taken the position that the services were not covered by WC.
7. Amount of lump sum or amount of structured settlement-- Obtain as much information as possible regarding the allocation between income replacement, loss of limb or function, and medical benefits.
8. Is the commutation for the beneficiary's lifetime or for a specific time period? If not for lifetime, what is the basis?-- Medicare must insist that there is a reasonable relationship between the respective allocation for services covered by Medicare and services not covered by Medicare. For example, is it reasonable for the settlement agreement's allocation for

services not covered by Medicare to be based on the beneficiary's life time while the agreement's allocation for services covered by Medicare is based on a lesser time period? What is the State law regarding how long WC is obligated to cover the items or services related to the accident or illness?

9. Is the beneficiary living at home, in a nursing home, or receiving assisted living care, etc.?-- If the beneficiary is living in a nursing home, or receiving assisted living care, it should be determined who is expected to pay for such care, e.g., WC (for life time or a specified period) from the medical benefits allocation of lump sum settlement, Medicaid, etc.

10. Are the expected expenses for Medicare covered items and services appropriate in light of the beneficiary's condition?-- Estimated medical expenses should include an amount for hospital and/or SNF care during the time period for the commutation of the WC benefit. (Just one hospital stay that is related to the accident could cost \$20,000.) For example, a quadriplegic may develop decubitus ulcers requiring possible surgery, urinary tract infections, kidney stones, pneumonia and/or thrombophlebitis. Although each case must be evaluated on its own merits, it may be helpful to ascertain for comparison purposes the average annual amounts of Part A and Part B spending for a disabled person in the appropriate State of residence. Keep in mind that these Fee-for-Service amounts are for all Medicare covered services, while our focus here only deals with services related to the WC accident or illness. Therefore, the RO should use appropriate judgment and seek input from a medical consultant when determining whether the amount of the lump sum or structured settlement has sufficiently taken Medicare's interests into account.

The attorney for the individual for whom the arrangement is set-up should be advised that Medicare applies a set of criteria to any WC settlement on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether Medicare has an obligation for services provided after the settlement that originally were the responsibility of WC.

NOTE:

Before evaluating whether an arrangement reasonably covers/considers Medicare's interests, **the RO must know** whether the arrangement is based upon WC fee schedule amounts or full actual charge amounts.

Question 6:

Some attorneys have indicated that a set-aside arrangement should only contemplate three to five years of estimated Medicare covered items or services. Would this be reasonable?

Answer:

No. To protect the Medicare Trust Fund, a set-aside arrangement should be funded based on the expected life expectancy of the individual unless the State law specifically limits the length of time that WC covers work related conditions. If an estimate of the beneficiary's estimated longevity was not submitted, one must be obtained.

Question 7:

What other issues should be considered ?

Answer:

The lump sum amount should be interest bearing and indexed to account for inflation consistent with how Medicare calculates its growth in spending. Provision should also be made in the settlement agreement to provide for a mechanism so that items or services that were not covered by Medicare at the time, but later become covered, are transferred from the commutation specified for non-Medicare covered items and services to the set-aside arrangement. (For example if outpatient prescription drugs become more widely covered.) If the beneficiary belongs to a Health Maintenance Organization that may not be coordinating benefits based on WC entitlement, the settlement should still set-aside funds for Medicare covered services in case the beneficiary converts to a fee for service plan.

Question 8:

Is it permissible for Medicare to accept an up-front cash settlement instead of a set-aside arrangement?

Answer:

An up-front cash settlement is only appropriate in certain instances when Medicare agrees to a compromise in order to recover conditional payments made when WC did not pay promptly. Thus, when future benefits are included in a WC settlement agreement, Medicare cannot pay until the medical expenses related to the injury or

disease equal the amount of the settlement allocated to future medical expenses or the amount included for medical expenses in the set-aside arrangement has been exhausted.

Question 9:

How do providers and suppliers obtain payment for the services covered by the set-aside arrangement?

Answer:

There are two distinct methods for providers, physicians and other suppliers to obtain payment for WC covered services when funds are held in a set-aside arrangement. Determining which distinct payment method applies depends on two factors: 1.) How the set-aside arrangement is constructed and 2.) Whether the arrangement was constructed by contemplating full actual charges or WC fee schedule amounts (i.e., were the injured individual's medical expenses determined based on full actual charge estimates or WC fee schedule estimates).

When a set-aside arrangement's settlement agreement contains specific provisions establishing that the WC carrier will ensure that the arrangement cannot be charged more than what would normally be payable under the WC plan, and when the RO reviews and approves the sufficiency of the arrangement based on the WC plan's WC fee schedules, then, providers, physicians and other suppliers will be paid based on what would normally be payable under the WC plan (i.e., under the WC fee schedule). Therefore, providers, physicians and other suppliers would not be permitted to bill the arrangement more than the WC fee schedule rate. For example, if a provider's full charge for a particular service is \$100 and the WC carrier normally pays \$65 for that particular service, then the arrangement should only pay \$65. However, when an arrangement's settlement agreement does **not** contain specific provisions ensuring that the arrangement cannot be charged more than what would normally be payable under the WC plan, then providers, physicians and other suppliers are permitted to bill the arrangement their full charges. It is important to note that when an arrangement's settlement agreement does not contain specific provisions ensuring that providers, physicians and other suppliers cannot bill the arrangement more than the WC fee schedule amounts, then the RO must review the sufficiency of that particular arrangement based upon full actual charge estimates.

~Before evaluating whether an arrangement reasonably covers/considers Medicare's interests, **the RO must know** whether the arrangement is based upon WC fee schedule amounts or full actual charge amounts. If the arrangement is based upon WC fee schedule amounts, then, the RO cannot provide a written opinion on the

sufficiency of an arrangement until the arrangement's settlement agreement contains specific provisions that establish that the WC carrier can and will ensure that the arrangement cannot be charged more than what would normally be payable under the WC plan. The WC carrier must require all entities and individuals that accept WC payments to agree not to charge the arrangement more than what the WC plan would normally pay.

If a WC carrier is unable to enforce the requirement that the arrangement can only be charged the WC fee schedule rates, then the RO will evaluate whether an arrangement reasonably covers/considers Medicare's interest based on whether the future medical expenses billed to the arrangement are enough to cover the actual expenses for the services at issue. If State WC laws do not provide a particular WC carrier with the legal authority to enforce that requirement, then the RO can still provide a written opinion on the sufficiency of the arrangement so long as future medical expenses are evaluated by the RO using full actual charge estimates, not WC fee schedule amounts.

If the arrangement is constructed based upon full actual charge estimates, then the RO must determine whether the proposed amount to be placed in the arrangement for future medical expenses and administrative costs (see Question 11) is sufficient to cover the actual charges for the services at issue (rather than an amount equal to what would have been the Medicare approved amount for a particular service).

Once the arrangement has been depleted because of payments for otherwise Medicare covered services, a complete accounting must be provided to the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case and if the payments have been properly made Medicare can then be billed.

Question 10:

Are there documentation requirements that must be satisfied before the RO can provide a written opinion on the sufficiency of a set-aside arrangement?

Answer:

Yes. At a minimum, the following documentation must be obtained by the RO prior to the approval of any arrangement:

A copy of the settlement agreement, or proposed settlement agreement, a copy of the life care plan (if there is one), and, if the life care plan does not contain an estimate of the injured individual's estimated life span, then a "rated age" may be obtainable from life insurance companies for injuries/illnesses sustained by other

similarly situated individuals. Also, documentation which gives the basis for the amounts of projected expenses for Medicare covered services and services not covered by Medicare (this could be a copy of letters from doctors/providers documenting the necessity of continued care).

The RO may require additional documentation, if necessary and approved by CO.

Question 11:

How does the RO determine whether or not the administrative fees and expenses charged to the arrangement are reasonable?

Answer:

Before a proposed arrangement can be approved, the RO must determine whether the administrative fees and expenses to be charged to the arrangement are reasonable. The RO must be notified (in writing) of all proposed administrative fees prior to the RO providing its written assurance that the set-aside arrangement is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of 42 CFR 411.46. If the administrative fees are determined to be unreasonable, the RO must withhold its approval of the set-aside arrangement. The amount of the approved arrangement must include both the estimated medical expenses plus the amount of administrative fees found to be reasonable.

Question 12:

What impact will arrangements have on Medicare payment systems and procedures?

Answer:

Because an arrangement's purpose is to pay for all services related to the individual's work-related injury or disease, Medicare will not make any payments (as a primary, secondary or tertiary payer) for any services related to the work-related injury or disease until nothing remains in the set-aside arrangement. Arrangements are established in order to pay for **all** medical expenses resulting from work-related injuries or diseases; arrangements are not designed to simply pay portions of medical expenses for work-related injuries or diseases.

When arrangements are designed as lump sum commutations (i.e., the arrangement is designed in a manner that the WC settlement is paid into the arrangement all at once, see Question #4 above), Medicare would not make any payments for that individual's


medical expenses (for work-related injuries or diseases) until all the funds (including interest) within the arrangement have been completely exhausted. These same basic principles also apply to structured commutations (see Question #4 above).

When providers, physicians and other suppliers submit claims to Medicare related to the individual's work-related injury or disease, claims processing contractors should deny those claims and instruct the entity or individual to seek payment from the administrator of the arrangement. Since the injured individual will be a Medicare beneficiary at the time when the provider, physician, or other supplier submits the claim to Medicare, the contractor responsible for monitoring the individual's case will have already updated the Common Working File to indicate that the injured individual's claims should be denied. However, when a provider, physician or other supplier submits any claims that are for injuries or diseases that **are not** work-related, then contractors should process those claims like they would any other claim for Medicare payment.

When the administrator of an arrangement refuses to make payment on a provider's, physician's or other supplier's claim because the administrator of the arrangement asserts the services are for injuries or diseases that are not work-related (or when the administrator of the arrangement denies the claim for any other reason), and the provider, physician or other supplier, subsequent to the administrator's denial, submits the claim to Medicare, then the contractor should consult the RO in order to determine whether Medicare should pay the claim. If a determination to deny the claim is made, then Medicare's regular administrative appeals process for claim denials would apply to the claim.

Please note that Central Office is planning to have a contractor assist ROs in monitoring and processing (however, not evaluating) these set-aside arrangement cases as early as possible in Fiscal Year 2002. Further instructions will be issued at that time.

Regional Office staff's questions on these issues should be directed to Fred Grabau at (410) 786-0206. We will issue additional guidance as necessary.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Parashar B. Patel', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Parashar B. Patel

cc: Regional Administrators
Gerry Nicholson, Benefits Operations Group
Liz Richter, Financial Services Group