

Obama Administration Seeks Comments on Proposed Changes to Summary of Benefits and Coverage Document and Requirements

by Helaine I. Fingold and Meghan F. Weinberg

January 2015

On December 30, 2014, the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and the Treasury (collectively, “Departments”) issued a proposed rule (“Proposed Rule”) regarding the summary of benefits and coverage (“SBC”) for use by group health plans and health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets.¹ The Proposed Rule, which would amend the SBC regulations that were issued in 2012, also includes proposed revisions to materials related to the SBC, such as the SBC templates, an instruction guide, a uniform glossary of certain insurance and medical-related terms, and other supporting materials.² The Departments are accepting comments on the Proposed Rule through **March 2, 2015**.

Background

The SBC regulations and supporting materials provide standards by which group health plan and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage communicate certain plan-specific information to the plan, to beneficiaries, or to consumers in the individual market. Final regulations governing the SBC disclosure requirements were issued in February 2012,³ and the Departments have since provided additional guidance through a series of frequently asked question (“FAQ”) publications.⁴ The SBC must generally include uniform definitions of standard insurance and medical terms; a description of the coverage of essential health benefits; any exceptions, reductions, and limitation on coverage; the cost-sharing provisions of the coverage; the renewability and continuation of coverage provisions; and examples that illustrate common benefit scenarios, among other things. These uniform standards are designed to help consumers compare coverage and understand the terms of their coverage. The

¹ 79 Fed. Reg. 78578 (Dec. 30, 2014), available at <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2014/12/30/2014-30243/summary-of-benefits-and-coverage-and-uniform-glossary>.

² Both the existing and the proposed supporting materials are available at <http://www.dol.gov/ebsa/healthreform/regulations/summaryofbenefits.html>.

³ 77 Fed. Reg. 8668 (Feb. 14, 2012).

⁴ Affordable Care Act Implementation FAQs, available at <http://www.dol.gov/ebsa/faqs/> and <http://www.cms.gov/ccio/resources/fact-sheets-and-faqs/>.

supporting materials, such as the SBC template, are designed to be customized with plan-specific information while containing the required elements.

Changes to the SBC Regulations

The Departments propose to change and clarify the SBC regulations for certain scenarios to reduce unnecessary duplication of SBC disbursement. Specifically, an entity required to supply an SBC to individuals would be able to meet that requirement through contract with another party to provide the SBC, as long as certain conditions are met. Additionally, where a group health plan uses two or more insurance products provided by separate issuers to insure benefits under a single plan offering, the plan administrator, not the issuer, would be responsible for providing the SBC, unless the parties specifically contract for the issuer to do so. Finally, for student health coverage, if the SBC is provided by the issuer, then the requirement to provide the SBC is considered satisfied for the other entity, such as the school. The Departments seek comment on whether or not this section of the SBC regulations should also include a requirement that the provision of the SBC by one of the entities be monitored.

The Departments had previously provided an enforcement safe harbor in published FAQs for group health plans using two or more insurance products provided by separate issuers in a single plan offering.⁵ Under the safe harbor, the plan administrator is permitted to issue either a single SBC containing information from the various products or multiple partial SBCs containing the full information in order to ease the burden of combining information from multiple issuers. The Departments now seek comment on codifying this safe harbor in the SBC regulations.

In addition to changes to reduce duplication, the Departments also propose clarifications regarding when the SBCs should be provided. For example, the proposed regulations clarify when an issuer is required to provide an SBC for a second time where the first time was provided prior to application for coverage.

Content of the SBC

The Proposed Rule revises the SBC template as well as its required content. The Departments propose to require that SBCs include a statement both on whether the relevant coverage provides “minimum essential coverage,” as defined in Section 5000A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code, and on whether the coverage’s share of the total allowed costs of benefits provided meets applicable minimum value requirements. Current regulations allow such statements to be conveyed through a cover letter or separate communication, but this would no longer be permitted under the proposed changes.

The Proposed Rule would also amend the SBC template to add a statement disclosing whether a qualified health plan covers or excludes coverage of abortion services and a statement regarding whether coverage is limited to services for which federal funding is

⁵ Affordable Care Act Implementation FAQs Part IX, question 10, available at http://www.cms.gov/CCIIO/Resources/Fact-Sheets-and-FAQs/aca_implementation_faqs9.html.

allowed.⁶ The instruction guide, another SBC supporting document, would be revised to indicate that these statements should be included in sections on “services your plan does not cover” or “other covered services.” The Departments seek comment on these proposed changes, including whether this information belongs in a different section of the SBC. This change is designed to increase transparency as well as assist issuers in complying with the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”) requirement that issuers providing coverage of abortion services, as described above, disclose such coverage in the SBC.

Proposed revisions to the SBC template also would eliminate certain information that is not required by statute, thus changing the length of the SBC disclosure document from four double-sided pages to two double-sided pages. The Departments believe that this more succinct communication would improve both the document’s usefulness to consumers and the ability of issuers to communicate required information within the formatting guidelines. The Departments seek comment on whether this change maintains the proper balance between conveyance of critical information and maintenance of a manageable length. Further, the Departments seek comment on any additional revisions to the SBC document and its supporting materials that could help plans stay within the statutory page limit (four double-sided pages) while conveying the required information.

Coverage Examples

The SBC template currently contains two coverage scenarios that are designed to help consumers understand the coverage they have and to enable them to compare the cost of coverage under different plans, including deductibles, copayments, coinsurance, and other out-of-pocket payments. The scenarios, “having a baby” and “managing diabetes type 2,” are two of six coverage scenarios that the Departments are authorized by statute to provide. The Departments propose to add a third scenario of a simple foot fracture with emergency room visit.

In addition to adding a third coverage scenario, the Departments propose to revise the pricing data underlying all three scenarios to improve accuracy and to continue the use of a coverage calculator provided by the Department of Health and Human Services that plans and issuers can use as a way of completing the coverage examples. The Departments seek comment on all aspects of this new, third proposed coverage scenario. When reviewing the proposed changes and submitting comments, issuers should consider whether the new coverage scenario for emergency department services is a useful example or whether a different outpatient, or perhaps out-of-network service scenario, would better serve their enrollees as an alternative coverage scenario.

⁶ Absent state law, an individual qualified health plan issuer can make the decision on whether to cover abortion services. Issuers that cover abortion services other than in the case of rape, incest, or danger to the life of the mother must ensure that federal funds (i.e., premium tax credits or cost-sharing reductions) are segregated so as not to be used to pay for such services. See Affordable Care Act, § 1303(b)(3)(A) (2010); 42 U.S.C. 18023(b).

Uniform Glossary Revisions

A plan or issuer is required to provide the Uniform Glossary of Coverage and Medical Terms upon request. The uniform glossary contains many terms that are commonly used in the SBC and is designed to provide consumers with consistent definitions for coverage comparison and extent of benefits. The Departments propose to revise the definitions of several medical and insurance-related terms in the uniform glossary, as well as add new terms that are relevant in the context of the ACA. For example, references to preexisting condition exclusions would be removed and a definition of “minimum value” would be added.

The Proposed Rule, revised templates, and other proposed changes would apply to coverage that begins on or after September 1, 2015.

The Departments are accepting comments on the Proposed Rule through **March 2, 2015**.

* * *

*This Client Alert was authored by **Helaine I. Fingold** and **Meghan F. Weinberg**. For additional information about the issues discussed in this Client Alert, please contact one of the authors or the Epstein Becker Green attorney who regularly handles your legal matters.*

About Epstein Becker Green

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., established in 1973, is a national law firm with approximately 250 lawyers practicing in 10 offices, in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, San Francisco, Stamford, and Washington, D.C. The firm’s areas of practice include health care and life sciences; employment, labor, and workforce management; and litigation and business disputes. Founded as an industry-focused firm, Epstein Becker Green has decades of experience serving clients in health care, financial services, retail, hospitality, and technology, among other industries, representing entities from startups to Fortune 100 companies. For more information, visit www.ebglaw.com.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of: (i) avoiding any tax penalty, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or need to update your contact information, please contact Lisa C. Blackburn at lblackburn@ebglaw.com or 202-861-1887.

BALTIMORE

Helaine I. Fingold
 Joshua J. Freemire
 Thomas E. Hutchinson*
 John S. Linehan

BOSTON

Emily E. Bajcsi
 Barry A. Guryan

CHICAGO

Ryan R. Benz
 Amy K. Dow
 Griffin W. Mulcahey
 Kevin J. Ryan

HOUSTON

Mark S. Armstrong
 Daniel E. Gospin

LOS ANGELES

Adam C. Abrahms
 Ted A. Gehring
 Paul A. Gomez
 J. Susan Graham
 Kim Tyrrell-Knott

NEW YORK

Jeffrey H. Becker
 Lindsay M. Borgeson
 Michelle Capezza
 Aime Dempsey
 Kenneth W. DiGia
 Jerrold I. Ehrlich
 Gregory H. Epstein
 Hanna Fox
 James S. Frank
 Arthur J. Fried
 John F. Gleason
 Robert D. Goldstein
 Robert S. Groban, Jr.
 Gretchen Harders
 Bethany J. Hills
 Jennifer M. Horowitz
 Kenneth J. Kelly
 Joseph J. Kempf, Jr.
 Stephanie G. Lerman
 Leonard Lipsky
 Purvi Badiani Maniar
 Wendy G. Marcari
 Eileen D. Millett
 Shilpa Prem*
 Jackie Selby
 Catherine F. Silie
 Victoria M. Sloan

Steven M. Swirsky
 Natasha F. Thoren
 Benjamin M. Zegarelli

NEWARK

Joan A. Disler
 James P. Flynn
 Daniel R. Levy
 Maxine Neuhauser
 Mollie K. O'Brien
 Sheila A. Woolson

STAMFORD

Ted Kennedy, Jr.
 David S. Poppick

WASHINGTON, DC

Alan J. Arville
 Kirsten M. Backstrom
 Clifford E. Barnes
 James A. Boiani
 Selena M. Brady
 George B. Breen
 Merlin J. Brittenham*
 Lee Calligaro
 Jesse M. Caplan
 Jason E. Christ
 Tanya V. Cramer

Anjali N.C. Downs
 Steven B. Epstein
 John W. Eriksen
 Wandaly E. Fernández
 Daniel C. Fundakowski
 Brandon C. Ge
 Stuart M. Gerson
 Daniel G. Gottlieb
 M. Brian Hall, IV
 Philo D. Hall
 Douglas A. Hastings
 Marshall E. Jackson Jr.
 S. Lawrence Kocot
 William G. Kopit
 Ali Lakhani
 Amy F. Lerman
 Christopher M. Locke
 Katherine R. Lofft
 Mark E. Lutes
 Teresa A. Mason
 David E. Matyas
 Colin G. McCulloch
 Frank C. Morris, Jr.
 Evan J. Nagler
 Leslie V. Norwalk
 René Y. Quashie
 Jonah D. Retzinger
 Serra J. Schlanger

Bonnie I. Scott
 Deepa B. Selvam
 Lynn Shapiro Snyder
 Adam C. Solander
 David B. Tatge
 Daly D.E. Temchine
 Bradley Merrill Thompson
 Linda V. Tiano
 Carrie Valiant
 Patricia M. Wagner
 Robert E. Wanerman
 Meghan F. Weinberg
 Constance A. Wilkinson
 Kathleen M. Williams
 Lesley R. Yeung

**Not Admitted to the Practice of Law*

This document has been provided for informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed to constitute legal advice. Please consult your attorneys in connection with any fact-specific situation under federal law and the applicable state or local laws that may impose additional obligations on you and your company.