premiums for the contract term will be at or above the threshold at FAR 15.403–4(a)(1), OPM will require the carrier to provide the data and methodology used to determine the FEHB Program rates. OPM will also require the data and methodology used to determine the medical loss ratio (MLR) as defined in the ACA (Pub. L. 111–148) and as defined by HHS in 45 CFR part 158 for all FEHB community rated plans other than those required by state law to use Traditional Community Rating. The carrier will provide cost or pricing data, as well as the FEHB-specific MLR threshold data required by OPM in its rate instructions for the applicable contract period. OPM will evaluate the data to ensure that the rate is reasonable and consistent with the requirements in this chapter. If necessary, OPM may require the carrier to provide additional documentation.

(B) Contracts will be subject to a subsidization penalty if OPM determines that the FEHB group did not meet the FEHB-specific MLR threshold specified in the annual rate instruction to carriers. Such a subsidization penalty will be deposited into a Subsidization Penalty Account held at the U.S. Treasury. This Subsidization Penalty Account will be held in common with all community rated carriers and will be annually distributed to the contingency reserve accounts of all non-TCR community rated plans on a pro-rata basis.

(C) FEHB Program community-rated carriers will comply with the MLR criteria, including the FEHB-specific MLR threshold provided by OPM in the rate instructions for the applicable contract period. FEHB plans that are required by state law to use TCR are exempt from this requirement and will use the SSSG methodology outlined in paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section.

(4) Contracts will be subject to a downward price adjustment if OPM determines that the Federal group was charged more than it would have been charged using a methodology consistent with that used for the similarly-sized subscriber groups (SSSGs). Such adjustments will be based on the lower of the two rates determined by using the methodology (including discounts) the carrier used for the two SSSGs.

(5) FEHB Program community-rated carriers will comply with SSSG criteria provided by OPM in the rate instructions for the applicable contract period.

(d) The application of FAR 15.402(b)(2) should not be construed to prohibit the consideration of preceding year surpluses or deficits in carrier-held reserves in the rate adjustments for subsequent year renewals of contracts based, in whole or in part, on cost analysis.

[70 FR 31380, June 1, 2005, as amended at 76 FR 38285, June 29, 2011; 77 FR 19524, Apr. 2, 2012]

1615.404–4 Profit.

(a) When the pricing of FEHB Program contracts is determined by cost analysis, OPM will determine the profit or fee prenegotiation objective (service charge) portion of the contracts by use of a weighted guidelines structured approach. The service charge so determined will be the total service charge that may be negotiated for the contract and will encompass any service charge (whether entitled service charge, profit, fee, contribution to reserves or surpluses, or any other title) that may have been negotiated by the prime contractor with any subcontractor or underwriter.

(b) OPM will not guarantee a minimum service charge.

1615.404–70 Profit analysis factors.

(a) OPM contracting officers will apply a weighted guidelines method in developing the service charge prenegotiation objective for FEHB Program contracts. The following factors, as defined in FAR 15.404–4(d), will be applied to projected incurred claims and allowable administrative expenses:

(1) *Contractor performance.* OPM will consider such elements as the accurate and timely processing of benefit claims and the volume and validity of disputed claims as measures of economical and efficient contract performance. This factor will be judged apart from the contractor's basic responsibility for contract performance and will be a measure of the extent and nature of the contractor's contribution to the

FEHB Program through the application of managerial expertise and effort. Evidence of effective contract performance will receive a plus weight, and poor performance or failure to comply with contract terms and conditions a negative weight. Innovations of benefit to the FEHB Program will generally result in a positive weight; documented inattention or indifference to cost control will generally result in a negative weight.

(2) *Contract cost risk.* In assessing the degree of cost responsibility and associated risk assumed by the contractor as a factor to be considered in negotiating profit, OPM will consider such underwriting elements as the availability of margins, group size, enrollment demographics and fluctuation, and the probability of conversion and adverse selection, as well as the extent of financial assistance the carrier renders to the contract. However, the ''loss carry forward basis'' of experience-rated group insurance practices, which mitigates contract risk, will likely serve to diminish this profit analysis factor in an overall determination of profit. This factor is intended to provide profit opportunities commensurate with the contractor's share of cost risks only, taking into account elements such as the adequacy and reliability of data for estimating costs.

(3) *Federal socioeconomic programs.* OPM will consider documented evidence of successful, contractor-initiated efforts to support Federal socioeconomic programs such as drug and substance abuse deterrents and concerns of the type enumerated in FAR 15.404–4(d)(iii), as a factor in negotiating profit. This factor will be assessed by considering the quality of the contractor's policies and procedures and the extent of unusual effort or achievement demonstrated. Evidence of effective support of Federal socioeconomic programs will receive a positive weight; poor support will receive a negative weight.

(4) *Capital investments.* This factor is generally not applicable to FEHB Program contracts because facilities capital cost of money may be an allowable administrative expense. Generally, this factor will be given a weight of zero. However, special purpose facilities or investment costs of direct benefit to the FEHB Program that are not recoverable as allowable or allocable administrative expenses may be taken into account in assigning a positive weight.

(5) *Cost control.* OPM will consider contractor-initiated efforts such as improved benefit design, cost-sharing features, innovative peer review, or other professional cost containment efforts as a factor in negotiating profit. OPM will use this factor to reward contractors with additional profit opportunities for self-initiated efforts to control contract costs.

(6) *Independent development.* OPM will consider any profit opportunities that may be directly related to relevant independent efforts such as the development of a unique and enhanced customer support system that is of demonstrated value to the FEHB Program and for which developmental costs have not been recovered directly or indirectly through allowable administrative expenses. OPM will use this factor to provide additional profit opportunities based upon an assessment of the contractor's investment and risk in developing techniques, methods, and practices having viability to the program at large. OPM will not consider improvements and innovations recognized and rewarded under any of the other profit factors.

(b) The following weight ranges for each factor are used in the weighted guidelines approach:

Profit factor	Weight ranges (percent)
1. Contractor performance	−.2 to +.45
2. Contract cost risk*	+.02 to +.2
3. Federal socioeconomic programs	−.05 to +.05
4. Capital investments	0 to + .02
5. Cost control	0 to + .35
6. Independent development	0 to + .03

*The contract cost risk factor is subdivided into two parts: group size (.02 to .10) and other risk elements (0 to .10). With respect to the group size element, subweights should be assigned as follows:

Enrollment	Weight (percent)
10,000 or less	.06 to .10
10,001–50,000	.05 to .09

Enrollment	Weight (percent)
50,001–200,000	.04 to .07
200,001–500,000	.03 to .06
500,001 and over	.02 to .04

1615.406–2 Certificates of accurate cost or pricing data for community rated carriers.

(a) The contracting officer will require a carrier with a contract meeting the requirements in 1615.402(c)(2) or (3) to execute one or more of the Certificates contained in this section. A carrier with a contract meeting the requirements in 1615.402(c)(2) will complete the appropriate Certificate(s) and keep such on file at the carrier's place of business in accordance with 1652.204–70. A carrier with a contract meeting the requirements in 1615.402(c)(3) will complete and submit the appropriate certificate(s) to OPM.

(b) A carrier using the SSSG methodology described in 1615.402(c)(3)(i) will submit the ''Certificate of Accurate Cost or Pricing Data for Community-Rated Carriers (SSSG methodology)'' along with its rate reconciliation during the first quarter of the applicable contract year. A carrier using the MLR methodology described in 1615.402(c)(3)(ii) will submit two forms. The ''Certificate of Accurate Cost or Pricing Data for Community-Rated Carriers (MLR methodology)'' will be submitted along with the rate reconciliation during the first quarter of the applicable contract year. The ''Certificate of Accurate MLR Calculation'' will be submitted when the carrier submits its FEHB-specific MLR calculation to OPM.

(Beginning of first certificate)

Certificate of Accurate Cost or Pricing Data for Community-Rated Carriers (SSSG methodology)

This is to certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief: (1) The cost or pricing data submitted (or, if not submitted, maintained and identified by the carrier as supporting documentation) to the Contracting officer or the Contracting officer's representative or designee, in support of the _____*FEHB Program rates were developed in accordance with the requirements of 48 CFR Chapter 16 and the FEHB Program contract and are accurate, complete, and current as of the date this certificate is executed; and (2) the methodology used to determine the FEHB Program rates is consistent with the methodology used to determine the rates for the carrier's Similarly Sized Subscriber Groups.

*Insert the year for which the rates apply.

Firm:

Name:

Signature:

Date of Execution:

(End of first certificate)

(Beginning of second certificate)

Certificate of Accurate Cost or Pricing Data for Community-Rated Carriers (MLR methodology)

This is to certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief: (1) The cost or pricing data submitted (or, if not submitted, maintained and identified by the carrier as supporting documentation) to the Contracting officer or the Contracting officer's representative or designee, in support of the _____*FEHB Program rates were developed in accordance with the requirements of 48 CFR Chapter 16 and the FEHB Program contract and are accurate, complete, and current as of the date this certificate is executed;

*Insert the year for which the rates apply.

Firm:

Name:

Signature:

Date of Execution:

(End of second certificate)

(Beginning of third certificate)

Certificate of Accurate MLR Calculation

This is to certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief: the determination of the carrier's FEHB-specific medical loss ratio for * is accurate, complete, and consistent with the methodology as stated in §1615.402(c)(3)(ii).

*Insert the year for which the MLR calculation applies.

Firm:

Name:

Signature:

Date of Execution:

(End of certificate)

[77 FR 19524, Apr. 2, 2012]