Section 438.6(c) Preprint

42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c) provides States with the flexibility to implement delivery system and provider payment initiatives under MCO, PIHP, or PAHP Medicaid managed care contracts (i.e., state directed payments). 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1) describes types of payment arrangements that States may use to direct expenditures under the managed care contract. Under 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii), contract arrangements that direct an MCO's, PIHP's, or PAHP's expenditures under paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(ii) and (c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D) must have written approval from CMS prior to implementation and before approval of the corresponding managed care contract(s) and rate certification(s). This preprint implements the prior approval process and must be completed, submitted, and approved by CMS before implementing any of the specific payment arrangements described in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(ii) and (c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D). Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules using State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

Submit all state directed payment preprints for prior approval to: StateDirectedPayment@cms.hhs.gov.

SECTION I: DATE AND TIMING INFORMATION

1. Identify the State's managed care contract rating period(s) for which this payment arrangement will apply (for example, July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021):
   July 1, 2026 - June 30, 2027
2. Identify the State's requested start date for this payment arrangement (for example, January 1, 2021). *Note, this should be the start of the contract rating period unless this payment arrangement will begin during the rating period.* July 1, 2026
3. Identify the managed care program(s) to which this payment arrangement will apply:
   All enrollees of the Georgia Families and Georgia Families 360 Plans who receive services from eligible providers
4. Identify the estimated **total dollar amount** (federal and non-federal dollars) of this state directed payment: $868,135,090
   a. Identify the estimated federal share of this state directed payment: $578,438,411
   b. Identify the estimated non-federal share of this state directed payment: $289,696,679

   Please note, the estimated total dollar amount and the estimated federal share should be described for the rating period in Question 1. If the State is seeking a multi-year approval (which is only an option for VBP/DSR payment arrangements (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i)-(ii))), States should provide the estimates per rating period. For amendments, states should include the change from the total and federal share estimated in the previously approved preprint.

5. Is this the initial submission the State is seeking approval under 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c) for this state directed payment arrangement? ☐ Yes ☒ No

6. If this is not the initial submission for this state directed payment, please indicate if:
   a. ☐ The State is seeking approval of an amendment to an already approved state directed payment.
   b. ☒ The State is seeking approval for a renewal of a state directed payment for a new rating period.
      i. If the State is seeking approval of a renewal, please indicate the rating periods for which previous approvals have been granted:

      July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023; July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024; July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025; July 1, 2025 - June 30, 2026
   c. Please identify the types of changes in this state directed payment that differ from what was previously approved.

      ☐ Payment Type Change
      ☐ Provider Type Change
      ☐ Quality Metric(s) / Benchmark(s) Change
      ☒ Other; please describe:
      revised eligibility data
      ☐ No changes from previously approved preprint other than rating period(s).
7. ☒ Please use the checkbox to provide an assurance that, in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(F), the payment arrangement is not renewed automatically.

SECTION II: TYPE OF STATE DIRECTED PAYMENT

8. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(A), describe in detail how the payment arrangement is based on the utilization and delivery of services for enrollees covered under the contract. The State should specifically discuss what must occur in order for the provider to receive the payment (e.g., utilization of services by managed care enrollees, meet or exceed a performance benchmark on provider quality metrics).

   Care management organizations (CMOs) will pay directed payments to eligible providers following utilization of services by managed care enrollees.

   a. ☒ Please use the checkbox to provide an assurance that CMS has approved the federal authority for the Medicaid services linked to the services associated with the SDP (i.e., Medicaid State plan, 1115(a) demonstration, 1915(c) waiver, etc.).
   b. Please also provide a link to, or submit a copy of, the authority document(s) with initial submissions and at any time the authority document(s) has been renewed/revised/updated.

9. Please select the general type of state directed payment arrangement the State is seeking prior approval to implement. (Check all that apply and address the underlying questions for each category selected.)

a. ☐ **VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS / DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM:** In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(i) and (ii), the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to implement value-based purchasing models for provider reimbursement, such as alternative payment models (APMs), pay for performance arrangements, bundled payments, or other service payment models intended to recognize value or outcomes over volume of services; or the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to participate in a multi-payer or Medicaid-specific delivery system reform or performance improvement initiative.

If checked, please answer all questions in Subsection IIA.

b. ☒ **FEE SCHEDULE REQUIREMENTS:** In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(B) through (D), the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to adopt a minimum or maximum fee schedule for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract; or the State is requiring the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP to provide a uniform dollar or percentage increase for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract. **[Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules using State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).]**

If checked, please answer all questions in Subsection IIB.

SUBSECTION IIA: VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS (VBP) / DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORM (DSR):

This section must be completed for all state directed payments that are VBP or DSR. This section does not need to be completed for state directed payments that are fee schedule requirements.

10. Please check the type of VBP/DSR State directed payment the State is seeking prior approval for. *Check all that apply; if none are checked, proceed to Section III.*

- ☐ Quality Payment/Pay for Performance (Category 2 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Bundled Payment/Episode-Based Payment (Category 3 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Population-Based Payment/Accountable Care Organization (Category 4 APM, or similar)
- ☐ Multi-Payer Delivery System Reform
- ☐ Medicaid-Specific Delivery System Reform
- ☐ Performance Improvement Initiative
- ☐ Other Value-Based Purchasing Model

11. Provide a brief summary or description of the required payment arrangement selected above and describe how the payment arrangement intends to recognize value or outcomes over volume of services. If "other" was checked above, identify the payment model. The State should specifically discuss what must occur in order for the provider to receive the payment (e.g., meet or exceed a performance benchmark on provider quality metrics).

12. In Table 1 below, identify the measure(s), baseline statistics, and targets that the State will tie to provider performance under this payment arrangement (provider performance measures). Please complete all boxes in the row. To the extent practicable, CMS encourages states to utilize existing, validated, and outcomes-based performance measures to evaluate the payment arrangement, and recommends States use the CMS Adult and Child Core Set Measures when applicable. If the state needs more space, please use Addendum Table 1.A and check this box: ☐

TABLE 1: Payment Arrangement Provider Performance Measures

Measure Name and NQF # (if applicable)	**Measure Steward/ Developer**[1]	**Baseline**[2] **Year**	**Baseline**[2] **Statistic**	**Performance Measurement Period**[3]	**Performance Target**	**Notes**[4]
Example: Percent of High-Risk Residents with Pressure Ulcers – Long Stay	*CMS*	*CY 2018*	*9.23%*	*Year 2*	*8%*	*Example notes*
a.						
b.						
c.						
d.						
e.						

1. Baseline data must be added after the first year of the payment arrangement
2. If state-developed, list State name for Steward/Developer.
3. If this is planned to be a multi-year payment arrangement, indicate which year(s) of the payment arrangement that performance on the measure will trigger payment.
4. If the State is using an established measure and will deviate from the measure steward's measure specifications, please describe here. Additionally, if a state-specific measure will be used, please define the numerator and denominator here.

13. For the measures listed in Table 1 above, please provide the following information:

a. Please describe the methodology used to set the performance targets for each measure.

b. If multiple provider performance measures are involved in the payment arrangement, discuss if the provider must meet the performance target on each measure to receive payment or can providers receive a portion of the payment if they meet the performance target on some but not all measures?

c. For state-developed measures, please briefly describe how the measure was developed?

14. Is the State seeking a multi-year approval of the state directed payment arrangement?
☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If this payment arrangement is designed to be a multi-year effort, denote the State's managed care contract rating period(s) the State is seeking approval for.

b. If this payment arrangement is designed to be a multi-year effort and the State is **NOT** requesting a multi-year approval, describe how this application's payment arrangement fits into the larger multi-year effort and identify which year of the effort is addressed in this application.

15. Use the checkboxes below to make the following assurances:

a. ☐ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(A), the state directed payment arrangement makes participation in the value-based purchasing initiative, delivery system reform, or performance improvement initiative available, using the same terms of performance, to the class or classes of providers (identified below) providing services under the contract related to the reform or improvement initiative.

b. ☐ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(B), the payment arrangement makes use of a common set of performance measures across all of the payers and providers.

c. ☐ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(C), the payment arrangement does not set the amount or frequency of the expenditures.

d. ☐ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(iii)(D), the payment arrangement does not allow the State to recoup any unspent funds allocated for these arrangements from the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP.

SUBSECTION IIB: STATE DIRECTED FEE SCHEDULES:
This section must be completed for all state directed payments that are fee schedule requirements. This section does not need to be completed for state directed payments that are VBP or DSR.

16. Please check the type of state directed payment for which the State is seeking prior approval. *Check all that apply; if none are checked, proceed to Section III.*

a. ☐ Minimum Fee Schedule for providers that provide a particular service under the contract *using rates other than State plan approved rates* [1] (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(B))

b. ☐ Maximum Fee Schedule (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(D))

c. ☒ Uniform Dollar or Percentage Increase (42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(C))

[1] Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules that use State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

17. If the State is seeking prior approval of a fee schedule (options a or b in Question 16):

a. Check the basis for the fee schedule selected above.

i. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on the **State-plan approved rates** as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a). [2]

ii. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on the **Medicare or Medicare-equivalent rate**.

iii. ☐ The State is proposing to use a fee schedule based on an **alternative fee schedule established by the State**.

1. If the State is proposing an alternative fee schedule, please describe the alternative fee schedule (e.g., 80% of Medicaid State-plan approved rate)

b. Explain how the state determined this fee schedule requirement to be reasonable and appropriate.

18. If using a maximum fee schedule (option b in Question 16), please answer the following additional questions:

a. ☐ Use the checkbox to provide the following assurance: In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(C), the State has determined that the MCO, PIHP, or PAHP has retained the ability to reasonably manage risk and has discretion in accomplishing the goals of the contract.

b. Describe the process for plans and providers to request an exemption if they are under contract obligations that result in the need to pay more than the maximum fee schedule.

c. Indicate the number of exemptions to the requirement:

i. Expected in this contract rating period (estimate)

ii. Granted in past years of this payment arrangement

d. Describe how such exemptions will be considered in rate development.

[2] Please note, per the 2020 Medicaid and CHIP final rule at 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(1)(iii)(A), States no longer need to submit a preprint for prior approval to adopt minimum fee schedules that use State plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a).

19. If the State is seeking prior approval for a uniform dollar or percentage increase (option c in Question 16), please address the following questions:

a. Will the state require plans to pay a ☐ uniform dollar amount **or** a ☒ uniform percentage increase? (*Please select only one.*)

b. What is the magnitude of the increase (e.g., $4 per claim or 3% increase per claim?)

118.77% increase for inpatient hospital services and 160.04% for outpatient hospital services for teaching hospitals with five or more FTEs and 0% increase for inpatient and 38.20% for outpatient services for teaching hospitals in counties with a pc

c. Describe how will the uniform increase be paid out by plans (e.g., upon processing the initial claim, a retroactive adjustment done one month after the end of quarter for those claims incurred during that quarter).
The uniform increase is paid out by the plans as interim payments during the rating period with a reconciliation payment based on actual utilization which occurs after the end of the rating period and a claims run-out period.

d. Describe how the increase was developed, including why the increase is reasonable and appropriate for network providers that provide a particular service under the contract

The percentage increase was developed to close the gap between Medicaid and commercial reimbursement for the same services: IP and OP hospital services. The increase was developed through the determination of the average commercial reimbursement for IP and OP hospital services utilizing the top five commercial payers less the Medicaid base reimbursement and additional directed payments (public and private hospital DPPs). Providers will be paid a percentage of the commercial increase not to exceed 100% of the commercial reimbursement for each class. The increases appropriately recognize the shortfall in Medicaid reimbursement. The increases are equal to or less than the difference between commercial reimbursement and Medicaid reimbursement paid for the same services, and the State finds the increase to be reasonable and appropriate.

SECTION III: PROVIDER CLASS AND ASSESSMENT OF REASONABLENESS

20. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(B), identify the class or classes of providers that will participate in this payment arrangement by answering the following questions:

a. Please indicate which general class of providers would be affected by the state directed payment (check all that apply):

- ☒ inpatient hospital service
- ☒ outpatient hospital service
- ☐ professional services at an academic medical center
- ☐ primary care services
- ☐ specialty physician services
- ☐ nursing facility services
- ☐ HCBS/personal care services
- ☐ behavioral health inpatient services
- ☐ behavioral health outpatient services
- ☐ dental services
- ☐ Other:

b. Please define the provider class(es) (if further narrowed from the general classes indicated above).

The eligible teaching hospitals are further classified as teaching hospitals with 5 or more of FTEs as reported on schedule E part A lines 10,11, and 16 in 2024 Medicare cost report and teaching hospitals in counties with a population of 50,000 or fewer and between 0.1 and 4.9 FTEs as reported on schedule E part A lines 10,11, and 16 in 2024 Medicare cost report and demographic descriptions. Hospitals participating in GA-AID are excluded.

c. Provide a justification for the provider class defined in Question 20b (e.g., the provider class is defined in the State Plan.) If the provider class is defined in the State Plan, please provide a link to or attach the applicable State Plan pages to the preprint submission. Provider classes cannot be defined to only include providers that provide intergovernmental transfers.

The provider class restriction recognizes the growing need to address the health care workforce shortage in Georgia. This program allows the participating teaching hospitals to invest in innovative programs aimed at stabilizing, developing, and growing the health care workforce with the ultimate goals of improving statewide health outcomes and increasing access to care.

21. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(B), describe how the payment arrangement directs expenditures equally, using the same terms of performance, for the class or classes of providers (identified above) providing the service under the contract.

The payment arrangement directs expenditures equally by employing a uniform percentage increase using the same terms of performance for the provider class defined above in 20b.

22. For the services where payment is affected by the state directed payment, how will the state directed payment interact with the negotiated rate(s) between the plan and the provider? Will the state directed payment:

a. ☐ Replace the negotiated rate(s) between the plan(s) and provider(s).

b. ☐ Limit but not replace the negotiated rate(s) between the plans(s) and provider(s).

c. ☒ Require a payment be made in addition to the negotiated rate(s) between the plan(s) and provider(s).

23. For payment arrangements that are intended to require plans to make a payment in addition to the negotiated rates (as noted in option c in Question 22), please provide an analysis in Table 2 showing the impact of the state directed payment on payment levels for each provider class. This provider payment analysis should be completed distinctly for each service type (e.g., inpatient hospital services, outpatient hospital services, etc.).

This should include an estimate of the base reimbursement rate the managed care plans pay to these providers as a percent of Medicare, or some other standardized measure, and the effect the increase from the state directed payment will have on total payment. *Ex: The average base payment level from plans to providers is 80% of Medicare and this SDP is expected to increase the total payment level from 80% to 100% of Medicare.*

If the state needs more space, please use Addendum 2.A and check this box: ☒

TABLE 2: Provider Payment Analysis

Provider Class(es)	Average Base Payment Level from Plans to Providers (absent the SDP)	Effect on Total Payment Level of State Directed Payment (SDP)	Effect on Total Payment Level of Other SDPs	Effect on Total Payment Level of Pass-Through Payments (PTPs)	Total Payment Level (after accounting for all SDPs and PTPs
Ex: Rural Inpatient Hospital Services	*80%*	*20%*	*N/A*	*N/A*	*100%*
a.					
b.					
c.					
d.					
e.					
f.					
g.					

24. Please indicate if the data provided in Table 2 above is in terms of a percentage of:

- **a.** ☐ Medicare payment/cost
- **b.** ☐ State-plan approved rates as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a) *(Please note, this rate cannot include supplemental payments.)*
- **c.** ☒ Other; Please define: Average commercial rate

25. Does the State also require plans to pay any other state directed payments for providers eligible for the provider class described in Question 20b? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide information requested under the column "Other State Directed Payments" in Table 2.

26. Does the State also require plans to pay pass-through payments as defined in 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(a) to any of the providers eligible for any of the provider class(es) described in Question 20b? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide information requested under the column "Pass-Through Payments" in Table 2.

27. Please describe the data sources and methodology used for the analysis provided in response to Question 23.

The data sources include Medicaid claims data and commercial claims data. Each class is calculated as follows: The Average Base Payment Level from Plans to Providers (absent the SDP) (%ACR) is equal to the Medicaid Payment divided by the commercial equivalent reimbursement. The Effect on Total Payment Level of State Directed Payment (SDP) is the SDP payment level divided by the commercial equivalent payment reimbursement. The Effect on Total Payment Level of Other SDPs is the total payment level of other SDPs (public and private hospital directed payment programs, Rural Hospital OB directed payment program, and HIP directed payment program) divided by the commercial equivalent reimbursement. The Total Payment Level (after accounting for all SDPs and PTPs) is the sum of the Average Base Payment Level from Plans to Providers (absent SDP), Effect of Total Payment Level of State Directed Payment (SDP), and Effect on Total Payment Level of Other SDPs. The Total Payment Level (after accounting for all SDPs and PTPs) is reported as a percentage of commercial equivalent reimbursement and does not exceed 100% of commercial equivalent reimbursement. Each class is split by managed care program: Georgia Families (GF) and Georgia Families 360 (GF360). The ACR data is not trended, but Medicaid CMO payments were projected for the applicable rating period.

28. Please describe the State's process for determining how the proposed state directed payment was appropriate and reasonable.

The State's process for determining that the proposed directed payment is appropriate and reasonable is an analysis to ensure that payment across the state does not exceed the commercial equivalent reimbursement.

SECTION IV: INCORPORATION INTO MANAGED CARE CONTRACTS

29. States must adequately describe the contractual obligation for the state directed payment in the state's contract with the managed care plan(s) in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c). Has the state already submitted all contract action(s) to implement this state directed payment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

a. If yes:

i. What is/are the state-assigned identifier(s) of the contract actions provided to CMS?

ii. Please indicate where (page or section) the state directed payment is captured in the contract action(s).

b. If no, please estimate when the state will be submitting the contract actions for review.

Contract amendments will be submitted once all rounds of CMS questions for all of the SFY2027 SDPs are resolved.

SECTION V: INCORPORATION INTO THE ACTUARIAL RATE CERTIFICATION

Note: Provide responses to the questions below for the first rating period if seeking approval for multi-year approval.

30. Has/Have the actuarial rate certification(s) for the rating period for which this state directed payment applies been submitted to CMS? ☒ Yes ☐ No

a. If no, please estimate when the state will be submitting the actuarial rate certification(s) for review.

b. If yes, provide the following information in the table below for each of the actuarial rate certification review(s) that will include this state directed payment.

Table 3: Actuarial Rate Certification(s)

Control Name Provided by CMS (List each actuarial rate certification separately)	Date Submitted to CMS	Does the certification incorporate the SDP?	If so, indicate where the state directed payment is captured in the certification (page or section)
i.			
ii.			
iii.			
iv.			
v.			

Please note, states and actuaries should consult the most recent Medicaid Managed Care Rate Development Guide for how to document state directed payments in actuarial rate certification(s). The actuary's certification must contain all of the information outlined; if all required documentation is not included, review of the certification will likely be delayed.)

c. If not currently captured in the State's actuarial certification submitted to CMS, note that the regulations at 42 C.F.R. § 438.7(b)(6) requires that all state directed payments are documented in the State's actuarial rate certification(s). CMS will not be able to approve the related contract action(s) until the rate certification(s) has/have been amended to account for all state directed payments. Please provide an estimate of when the State plans to submit an amendment to capture this information.

N/A

31. Describe how the State will/has incorporated this state directed payment arrangement in the applicable actuarial rate certification(s) (please select one of the options below):

- **a.** ☐ An adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans.
- **b.** ☒ Separate payment term(s) which are captured in the applicable rate certification(s) but paid separately to the plans from the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans.
- **c.** ☐ Other, please describe:

32. States should incorporate state directed payment arrangements into actuarial rate certification(s) as an adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to plans as this approach is consistent with the rate development requirements described in 42 C.F.R. § 438.5 and consistent with the nature of risk-based managed care. For state directed payments that are incorporated in another manner, particularly through separate payment terms, provide additional justification as to why this is necessary and what precludes the state from incorporating as an adjustment applied in the development of the monthly base capitation rates paid to managed care plans.

The separate payment term is necessary to calculate payments off actual utilization and ensure corresponding payments occur to each facility included under this directed payment. It also offers administrative simplicity to the state agency administering the directed payments and ease of tracking and verification of accurate payment to providers from the CMOs.

33. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(i), the State assures that all expenditures for this payment arrangement under this section are developed in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.4, the standards specified in 42 C.F.R. § 438.5, and generally accepted actuarial principles and practices.

SECTION VI: FUNDING FOR THE NON-FEDERAL SHARE

34. Describe the source of the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. Check all that apply:

- **a.** ☐ State general revenue
- **b.** ☒ Intergovernmental transfers (IGTs) from a State or local government entity
- **c.** ☒ Health Care-Related Provider tax(es) / assessment(s)
- **d.** ☐ Provider donation(s)
- **e.** ☐ Other, specify:

35. For any payment funded by **IGTs (option b in Question 34)**,

- **a.** Provide the following (respond to each column for all entities transferring funds). If the state needs more space, please use Addendum Table 4.A and check this box: ☒

Table 4: IGT Transferring Entities

Name of Entities transferring funds (enter each on a separate line)	Operational nature of the Transferring Entity (State, County, City, Other)	Total Amounts Transferred by This Entity	Does the Transferring Entity have General Taxing Authority? (Yes or No)	Did the Transferring Entity receive appropriations? If not, put N/A. If yes, identify the level of appropriations	Is the Transferring Entity eligible for payment under this state directed payment? (Yes or No)
i.					
ii.					
iii.					
iv.					
v.					
vi.					
vii.					
viii.					
ix.					
x.					

b. ☒ Use the checkbox to provide an assurance that no state directed payments made under this payment arrangement funded by IGTs are dependent on any agreement or arrangement for providers or related entities to donate money or services to a governmental entity.

c. Provide information or documentation regarding any written agreements that exist between the State and healthcare providers or amongst healthcare providers and/or related entities relating to the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. This should include any written agreements that may exist with healthcare providers to support and finance the non-federal share of the payment arrangement. Submit a copy of any written agreements described above.

N/A- no written agreements

36. For any state directed payments funded by **provider taxes/assessments (option c in Question 34)**,

a. Provide the following (respond to each column for all entries). If there are more entries than space in the table, please provide an attachment with the information requested in the table.

Table 5: Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment(s)

Name of the Health Care-Related Provider Tax / Assessment (enter each on a separate line)	Identify the permissible class for this tax / assessment	Is the tax / assessment broad-based?	Is the tax / assessment uniform?	Is the tax / assessment under the 6% indirect hold harmless limit?	If not under the 6% indirect hold harmless limit, does it pass the "75/75" test?	Does it contain a hold harmless arrangement that guarantees to return all or any portion of the tax payment to the tax payer?
i. Georgia IP Tax	Inpatient hospital services	No	No	Yes		No
ii.						
iii.						
iv.						
v.						

b. If the state has any waiver(s) of the broad-based and/or uniform requirements for any of the health care-related provider taxes/assessments, list the waiver(s) and its current status:

Table 6: Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment Waivers

Name of the Health Care-Related Provider Tax/Assessment Waiver (enter each on a separate line)	Submission Date	Current Status (Under Review, Approved)	Approval Date
i. Georgia IP Tax Waiver	6/30/2025	Approved	2/27/2026
ii.			
iii.			
iv.			
v.			

37. For any state directed payments funded by **provider donations (option d in Question 34)**, please answer the following questions:

a. Is the donation bona-fide? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Does it contain a hold harmless arrangement to return all or any part of the donation to the donating entity, a related entity, or other provider furnishing the same health care items or services as the donating entity within the class?
☐ Yes ☐ No

38. ☒ **For all state directed payment arrangements**, use the checkbox to provide an assurance that in accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(E), the payment arrangement does not condition network provider participation on the network provider entering into or adhering to intergovernmental transfer agreements.

SECTION VII: QUALITY CRITERIA AND FRAMEWORK FOR ALL PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS

39. ☒ Use the checkbox below to make the following assurance, "In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(C), the State expects this payment arrangement to advance at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy required per 42 C.F.R. § 438.340."

40. Consistent with 42 C.F.R. § 438.340(d), States must post the final quality strategy online beginning July 1, 2018. Please provide:

- **a.** A hyperlink to State's most recent quality strategy: https://dch.georgia.gov/document/document/ga2024dchquality-strategyd4
- **b.** The effective date of quality strategy. July 1, 2024

41. If the State is currently updating the quality strategy, please submit a draft version, and provide:

- **a.** A target date for submission of the revised quality strategy (month and year):
- **b.** Note any potential changes that might be made to the goals and objectives.

Note: The State should submit the final version to CMS as soon as it is finalized. To be in compliance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.340(c)(2) the quality strategy must be updated no less than once every 3-years.

42. To obtain written approval of this payment arrangement, a State must demonstrate that each state directed payment arrangement expects to advance at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy. In the Table 7 below, identify the goal(s) and objective(s), as they appear in the Quality Strategy (include page numbers), this payment arrangement is expected to advance. If additional rows are required, please attach.

Table 7: Payment Arrangement Quality Strategy Goals and Objectives

Goal(s)	Objective(s)	Quality strategy page
Example: Improve care coordination for enrollees with behavioral health conditions	*Example: Increase the number of managed care patients receiving follow-up behavior health counseling by 15%*	*5*
a. Goal 1.1 Improve Access to Care	Objective 1.1: Increase the number of children receiving well-child and preventive visits. Objective 1.2: Increase the number of adults receiving well and preventive visits.	8
b. Goal 4: Improve Maternal and Newborn Care	Objective 4.4: Increase the number of pregnant persons receiving prenatal services within 30 days of enrollment	9
c. Goal 6: Improve Utilization of Care and Services	Objective 6.1 Decrease hospital readmission rate for LTSS population	9
d.		

43. Describe how this payment arrangement is expected to advance the goal(s) and objective(s) identified in Table 7. If this is part of a multi-year effort, describe this both in terms of this year's payment arrangement and in terms of that of the multi-year payment arrangement.

This payment arrangement recognizes the growing need to address the healthcare workforce shortage in Georgia to improve health outcomes and quality statewide. These directed payments support the stabilization, development, and growth of the healthcare workforce by ensuring that teaching hospitals in Georgia receive adequate payment to deliver effective, efficient, and affordable care and support the teaching mission across the continuum of care. The additional funding provided through this program will allow participants to grow the healthcare workforce. An expanded workforce will increase access to care both locally and statewide and advances the State ' s critical quality goals of greater access to care, an increase in wellness and preventive care, improved outcomes for chronic diseases, and an increase in the appropriate utilization of levels of care.

With the understanding that workforce development takes time, GA-STRONG is envisioned as a multi-year effort with the expectation that year-over-year growth and improvement will be achieved. The State will promote and assess the program through an annual healthcare workforce development report, which will include key demographic statistics related to the participant workforce who provide direct patient care and oversee clinical education. Programmatic narratives and staffing data included in the annual healthcare workforce development report will further describe the growth and development of the healthcare workforce across participating hospitals and the impact of these payments on enhancing access and the delivery of services across the spectrum of care.

44. Please complete the following questions regarding having an evaluation plan to measure the degree to which the payment arrangement advances at least one of the goals and objectives of the State's quality strategy. To the extent practicable, CMS encourages States to utilize existing, validated, and outcomes-based performance measures to evaluate the payment arrangement, and recommends States use the CMS Adult and Child Core Set Measures, when applicable.

a. ☒ In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 438.6(c)(2)(ii)(D), use the checkbox to assure the State has an evaluation plan which measures the degree to which the payment arrangement advances at least one of the goals and objectives in the quality strategy required per 42 C.F.R. § 438.340, and that the evaluation conducted will be *specific* to this payment arrangement. *Note:* States have flexibility in how the evaluation is conducted and may leverage existing resources, such as their 1115 demonstration evaluation if this payment arrangement is tied to an 1115 demonstration or their External Quality Review validation activities, as long as those evaluation or validation activities are *specific* to this payment arrangement and its impacts on health care quality and outcomes.

b. Describe how and when the State will review progress on the advancement of the State's goal(s) and objective(s) in the quality strategy identified in Question 42. For each measure the State intends to use in the evaluation of this payment arrangement, provide in Table 8 below: 1) the baseline year, 2) the baseline statistics, and 3) the performance targets the State will use to track the impact of this payment arrangement on the State's goals and objectives. Please attach the State's evaluation plan for this payment arrangement.

TABLE 8: Evaluation Measures, Baseline and Performance Targets

Measure Name and NQF # (if applicable)	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Statistic**	**Performance Target**	**Notes[1]**
Example: Flu Vaccinations for Adults Ages 19 to 64 (FVA-AD); NQF # 0039	*CY 2019*	*34%*	*Increase the percentage of adults 18–64 years of age who report receiving an influenza vaccination by 1 percentage point per year*	*Example notes*
i. Hospital Emergency Room (ER) Diversion Rate in Hours	SFY 2022	16.94%	16.26%	Lower is better.
ii. NTSV Cesarean Births	SFY 2022	25.58%	24.3%	Lower is better.
iii. 30-Day All-Cause Readmission	SFY 2022	4.41%	<=4.0%	Lower is better. Limited to readmissions to the index stay hospital.
iv.				

1. If the State will deviate from the measure specification, please describe here. If a State-specific measure will be used, please define the numerator and denominator here. Additionally, describe any planned data or measure stratifications (for example, age, race, or ethnicity) that will be used to evaluate the payment arrangement.

c. If this is any year other than year 1 of a multi-year effort, describe (or attach) prior year(s) evaluation findings and the payment arrangement's impact on the goal(s) and objective(s) in the State's quality strategy. Evaluation findings must include 1) historical data; 2) prior year(s) results data; 3) a description of the evaluation methodology; and 4) baseline and performance target information from the prior year(s) preprint(s) where applicable. If full evaluation findings from prior year(s) are not available, provide partial year(s) findings and an anticipated date for when CMS may expect to receive the full evaluation findings.

Please see attachment " Q44c_PY4_SFY25 GA-STRONG_Evaluation Findings ".