CMS MDS Tech Issues E-Mail Box Questions and Answers
MDS Vendor Call
June 11, 2020

Reference Number	Question	Answer
2020-001	When can we expect the secondary I0020B table to be released?	We think it will be in July sometime. It will be posted in the same Access database as the primary I0020B table.
2020-002	When can we expect the STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD to be released?	That item should be on ALL assessments with target date of 10/01/2020 or later.
2020-003	What are the modifiers for an OBRA PDPM HIPPS?	I think modifier=assessment indicator. Therefore, there will be no modifier on OBRA PDPM HIPPS
2020-004	Why is an OBRA PDPM HIPPS only to be 4 characters and not 5?	The OBRA PDPM HIPPS is only 4 characters, since we won't be adding a modifier (the 5th character).
2020-005	Where should the OBRA PDPM HIPPS be calculated (historically this has been Z0200, however Issue ID #12 seems to call for Z0100)?	It will be placed in Z0100 for states that have indicated they want PDPM calculations for OBRAs. We are not using Z0200 because states may want to continue calculating RUGs as well.
2020-006	How will the rates be determined for a PDPM HIPPS Code? Will there be any Adjustment factoring for each component? Do the states determine the rates? If so, can they determine any specific rules they'd like (for example, we have specific programming in place currently for MN and WV as they have specific effective date situations in place). Or do all states conform to the same calculation	Answer in Progress, will be updated.

	standard as is currently in place with the PDPM HIPPS (an MDS starts it and an MDS ends it).	
2020-007	Texas currently utilizes RUG III in our NF payment methodology. If Texas opts to have the PDPM calculated on OBRA assessments, will there be any impact to the RUG III calculation on those same assessments?	Adding the PDPM calculation on NC and NQ will not disrupt the calculation of RUG III for those same assessments.
2020-008	Will a request for PDPM calculation require additional data be submitted by the NF on non-PPS assessments?	Yes, there are items required to calculate the PDPM that are not required on the standalone NC and NQ. If the state selects to calculate the PDPM on NC and NQ assessments, then those required items will be required for that state.
2020-009	The data specs provided indicate the location of the new indicator field. However, we are unable to determine the location of the PDPM value to be calculated. Will it appear in Section Z? In the HIPPS field?	The PDPM calculation is expected in Z0100A for both PPS assessments and the NC and NQ assessments. If the assessment is a PPS, then a five-character HIPPS code is expected in Z0100A. The fifth character is the federal assessment indicator (5-day or IPA). If the assessment is an NC or NQ OBRA assessment, then a four-character HIPPS code is expected in Z0100A, excluding the federal assessment indicator.

2020-010	Based on the training announcement sent by Econometricia, on the delay of *Share Data Elements* (SPADES) implementation, and delay of SNF QRP reporting post COVID-19 resolution, can you confirm there will be no other changes to the MDS, beyond the addition of the optional, STATE PDPM OBRA CD and routine non-substantive changes such as the addition of any new ICD-10 Codes?	Correct to the best of our knowledge. Initially, MDS ASAP October 2020 release included three approved state requested changes for Section S. Due to the delay in releasing the 1.18 item set changes, two of the state requests are also delayed/canceled. • The requests from CO and NY to add new items will not occur on October 1, 2020. The current MDS ASAP October 2020 release will now include one Section S request from Maine, which include: • End the collection of 16 Section S items for their state. • The documentation on QTSO to reflect the changes for Maine are available. • As a result, there are no changes to the data specs.
2020-011	Our initial interpretation of the added support for state reporting of PDPM HIPPS on OBRA assessments (where A0310B=99) was that we would now present and submit a PDPM HIPPS in field Z0200A (State Medicaid Billing Rate), and that this would be in addition to the normal inclusion of a PDPM HIPPS in the Z0100A field (Medicare Part A HIPPS Code). In that case, the only likely difference would be that the Z0200A HIPPS would consist of 4 characters, while the Z0100A HIPPS would contain the normal 5 characters (including the PPS type as the last character). However, issue #14 in the errata document refers to a change in the value submitted in Z0100A, not Z0200A. Can you please confirm what the expectation will be for how the PDPM HIPPS will be included in the OBRA assessments?	The PDPM calculation is expected in Z0100A for both PPS assessments and the NC and NQ assessments. If the assessment is a PPS, then a five-character HIPPS code is expected in Z0100A. The fifth character is the federal assessment indicator (5-day or IPA). If the assessment is an NC or NQ OBRA assessment, then a four-character HIPPS code is expected in Z0100A, excluding the federal assessment indicator. To specifically addresses the bulleted items: • Yes. • No, if it is PPS, include a five-character HIPPS code in Z0100A. If it is NOT a PPS, but is an

	For organizations/states that choose to use the new optional PDPM logic, depending on the state specifications: • Are we to include a PDPM HIPPS in Z0100A for OBRA assessments, and simply truncate it 4 characters? • Are we to continue to the standard 5-character PDPM rate in Z0100A, and ALSO include a 4-character PDPM HIPPS in Z0200A? • Depending on the state specifications, are we correct that the 4-character PDPM HIPPS may also be submitted in Z0250A and/or Z0300A (as of 10/01/2020)?	OBRA NC or NQ, include a four-character HIPPS code in Z0100A • No. A PDPM HIPPS code is only expected in Z0100A.
2020-012	We would like some clarification relating to item numbers 12 and 13 in the errata document. The allowable set of ICD-10 codes for inclusion in I0020B has always been limited to a CMS-provided subset of the full set of ICD-10 codes. CMS has also always specified a mapping of that subset of codes to the correct corresponding Primary Clinical Categories. Item #13 in the errata document appears to simply perpetuate that logic. Item #12, however, includes reference to a secondary lookup table for OBRA assessments (for organizations/states wishing to leverage the new PDPM functionality). • What is the purpose of the secondary listing? • How will the contents of that secondary listing differ conceptually from the existing mappings? • Is the intent to control the use of "Return to Provider" codes differently for state	In the case of the OBRA NC and NQ assessments where the state has elected to calculate the PDPM, a valid ICD-10 code is expected in I0020B. There are a list of valid ICD-10 codes that may be appropriate for a non-skilled long stay resident (OBRA NC and NQ assessments) that are not in the original list for Medicare Part A stay residents. As of 10/1/2020, these additional ICD-10 codes ("Return to Provider") will be accepted in I0020B for the OBRA assessments when the state elects to calculate the PDPM on the OBRA NC and NQ. These Return to Provider codes will be mapped to a category of Medical Management.

	calculations than for the federal calculations?	
2020-013	Is there currently a plan to release any further official documentation or instructions related to these errata changes between now and 10/1/2020?	The MDS Vendor Call scheduled for June 11 will provide additional information, along with this Q&A document. Both the agenda minutes and the Q&A will be posted online. Additionally, version 1.0005 of the PDPM Grouper documentation will be posted in the Summer of 2020.
2020-014	Will a set of updated item sets be release along-side this Errata or will the existing v3.00.3 items sets remain the official item sets?	In response to State Medicaid Agency and stakeholder requests, CMS has updated the MDS 3.0 item sets (version 1.17.2) and related technical data specifications. These changes will support the calculation of PDPM payment codes on OBRA assessments when not combined with the 5-day SNF PPS assessment, specifically the OBRA comprehensive (NC) and OBRA quarterly (NQ) assessment item sets, which was not possible with item set version 1.17.1. This will allow State Medicaid Agencies to collect and compare RUG-III/IV payment codes to PDPM ones and thereby inform their future payment models.
2020-015	Will there be additional documentation to provide background information on Issues 06 through 14?	The MDS Vendor Call scheduled for June 11 will provide additional information, along with this Q&A document. Both the agenda minutes and the Q&A will be posted online. Additionally, version 1.0005 of the PDPM Grouper documentation will be posted in the Summer of 2020.
2020-016	Will an update to the v3.00 data specifications be released? If so, when?	The changes to the technical data specifications that support the Item Set modifications (v1.17.2) are contained in the Errata v3.00.4 which can be accessed the MDS 3.0 Technical Information page. The file, Data specs errata (v3.00.4) Final 04-30-2020, is in the

		Downloads section. Supporting materials including the 1.17.2 Item Change History report and the revised 1.17.2 Item Sets can be accessed from the MDS 3.0 Technical Information page.
2020-017	How will we know what value to put in the new STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD item? Will this be provided by CMS or by each individual state?	States are responsible for notifying and educating their providers if implementing these changes. In addition, states are responsible for notifying the vendor community so vendors may make the required changes to their software products for their state providers. CMS will provide vendors with updated technical data submission specifications to allow the calculation of PDPM along with updated and new edits. CMS will not be providing vendors with a list of states opting to calculate the PDPM.
2020-018	There are multiple references to the "DMS value". Can you explain what "DMS" stands for and how the value is set and used?	The DMS stands for Data Management System. This is an application used by states to manage MDS data at the state level. States can perform assessment merges or splits (to assign an assessment to the correct Resident ID) and can make Medicaid payment selections (RUG III/RUG IV). With this release, the DMS will be updated to allow states to select if they want to calculate the PDPM on NC and NQ OBRA assessments.
2020-019	Where and when will the pdpm_icd_codes_FYxxxx and pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx files be available? What is the difference between the two files?	We think it will be in July sometime. It will be posted in the same Access database as the primary I0020B table. The secondary table will contain the Return to Provider codes that were previously excluded.
2020-020	Will there be an updated RAI manual that will accompany these changes? If so, when will it be available?	CMS will post coding instructions, but a complete RAI manual will not be occurring at this point.

2020-021	In the below edit – how is a vendor supposed to determine the state target dates? Are you talking about the dates that a state or other payers would indicate where they want to start or stop including the PDPM calculation in OBRA assessments or are you stating that states would be able to modify the due dates for ARD per assessment type? 07 | The ASAP system will use the DMS, not the submitted value in STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD, to determine whether PDPM values should be calculated for the state where the assessment was performed. The state will be able to specify begin and end dates for OBRA PDPM calculations. If the value submitted in STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD does not match the DMS value specified by the state for the date range where the target date of the assessment falls, then the user will be notified of the mismatch, and the PDPM value will be recalculated by the ASAP system using the DMS value. | A new WARNING edit, -3966, will be issued by ASAP if A0310A=[01,02,03,04,05,06] and A0310B=[99] and the DMS value specified by the state for the date range where the target date of the assessment falls does not match the submitted value for STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD. This edit will only apply for assessments with target date on or after October 1, 2020. | This change will be made in the next version of the MDS 3.0 Data Submission Specs. It will be implemented in production on October 1, 2020.	Yes, this is referring to the dates that a state would indicate where they want to start or stop including the PDPM calculation on the OBRA assessments.
2020-022	We noticed that the new Item Sets were released and that Z0100 is still labeled as Medicare Part A Billing. Was there an intent to rename these to be more accurate? Or are the Item Sets released final?	The Item Sets are final.
2020-023	We are also having problems interpreting issues 08-09 in relation to b1 and b on both. Those options state that if STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD is active and STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = [0], then…. How can this option ever be ACTIVE and be equal to 0 as 0 indicates No. I guess the fact that there are options that state this option will active or not active doesn't make sense as issues 06-07 state that this must be active on all MDS' sent post 10/1/2020. We are just trying to program to match the edits but are getting a bit confused as to how this option would ever be inactive on an MDS.	STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD will become an active item for all assessments <u>with target date on or after 10/01/2020.</u> That does not mean that every state will want the PDPM calculated on OBRAs, though. If they don't want it, set the value for STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD to 0. If the state does require PDPM on OBRAs, though, set the value for STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD to 1. Since we revised certain edits that are in production now (as opposed to adding new edits), we needed to cover the situation where STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD is not

		an active item, i.e., all assessments <u>with target date prior to 10/01/2020.</u> I think the confusion may be the assertion that all MDS assessments on or after 10/01/2020 must have STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD. It is all MDS assessments <u>with target date</u> on or after 10/01/2020. Therefore, corrections could be submitted without STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD. Of course, if an older assessment was submitted with STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD, ASAP would ignore it because it ignores inactive items.
2020-024	In the errata concerning pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx Just want to confirm that for FY2020 there was an April update to the ICD_20 codes and those tables. And so the pdpm_icd_codes-2 is not for an ongoing usage of a new table perhaps for states or something?	The pdpm_icd_codes_2 table will become relevant on 10/01/2020. It will only be used in the processing of PDPM for OBRAs, so it has not been posted yet, as it will have FY2021 codes. (We will not be processing OBRAs for the PDPM with target date prior to 10/01/2020.) We did update the pdpm_icd_codes table in April to include U071 for COVID-19, and that is posted on the MDS Tech Info page.
2020-025	Errata Issue 06 specifies where the new STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD value should appear in the fixed-length string. However, we transmit XML-formatted MDS files to CMS. I am assuming that since the DMS will have this switch set by the state it will not be transmitted on the MDS but to be sure here is the question. a. How/where should the new field appear in the XML formatted files?	I don't think order matters, as long as the item is within the XML file. However, in the future data spec dictionary, it will be the last item in the Control section, right after FAC_DOC_ID. Note that the item MUST be included in XML submissions with target date on/after 10/01/2020, even though ASAP will be using the DMS to determine the state setting.

2020-026	The errata includes an update to skip patterns for 3 of the 4 significant OBRA PDPM items (GG0130, GG0170, and J2100), however, it neglects to include one for I0020. Edit -3919 controls the skip pattern for the I0020A and I0020B fields. This may be an oversight? a. Should specs be updated to consider the new STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD field like the edits for the other 3 items were?	The edit -3919 forces both I0020 and I0020B to not be blank ("^") in the case of a PPS (A0310B = 01 or 08). However, this edit does not apply or enforce any scenario when the assessment is an OBRA. However, row 13 of the errata speaks to a new edit -3967 that ensures if the state has selected to calculate the PDPM on an OBRA that the value in I0020B should be a valid ICD-10 code. This is just a warning edit and not a fatal edit. If the provider chooses to not add a valid ICD-10 code the assessment will be processed, but a PDPM HIPPS code will not be calculated.
2020-027	What is the nature of the pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx table? a. What is the nature of the icd codes in this table and how do they differ from those in the pdpm_icd_codes_FYxxxx table? b. Is pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx table only used for the OBRA assessments in edit -3967? c. Does pdpm_icd-codes_2_FY impact edit -3945?	The list of PDPM codes includes codes identified as "Return to Provider". These codes are not a valid ICD-10 code in I0020B when the assessment is a PPS assessment, however, are valid in I0020B when processing an NC or NQ stand-alone OBRA. The secondary table only applies to the OBRA assessments (When A0310B=[99]) and the state has selected to calculate the PDPM for an NC/NQ stand-alone OBRA. In the errata, row 13 indicates that edit -3945 will be updated to only trigger when A0310B=[01,08] and so the secondary table will not impact this edit.
2020-028	Does CMS expect/want the facilities to calculate the PDPM values and transmit them in the MDS transmission file if the STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD field = [1]?	Yes. If the state has selected to calculate the PDPM for an NC/NQ standalone OBRA, a calculated HIPPS code is expected in Z0100A on the MDS assessment. The ASAP system will call and calculate the PDPM Grouper in this situation and if the value submitted in Z0100A

	a. If so, should we transmit them in the same Z0100 fields that we do for the PPS assessments? b. Will all regular edits that apply to the PDPM values for PPS assessments also apply to the OBRA assessments? In other words, will they receive a warning if the PDPM value transmitted doesn't match the value that CMS calculates?	does not match the ASAP calculated value a warning message will appear on the Final Validation Reports.
2020-029	Are we to continue to use 1.17 as the value for ITM_SET_VRSN_CD and 3.00 for SPEC_VRSN_CD?	Please see the response to 2020-14
2020-030	For assessments types other than NC and NQ where a state *has elected* OBRA PDPM calculations, should the submitted value for STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD still be 1? a. Edit -3966 indicates that STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD is only reviewed on OBRA assessments, so perhaps the value does not matter on non-OBRA assessments (i.e., PPS-only assessments)?	Yes, the item is active for all ISC types, but edit -3966 warning message will only fire if it is an stand-alone NC or NQ when the value in STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD does not match what the state has selected.
2020-031	Will there be any limits placed on when and how often states can make changes to their STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD election? For example, are changes only allowed once per year effective 10/01/xx? Or could a state make changes several times per year?	At this point, there is not a limit on how often a state can make a change to the State_PDPM_OBRA_CD election. This is also true for states to select their Medicaid RUG options as well.
2020-032	When and where will the ICD codes used for the new pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx table be posted?	Please see the response for 2020-001
2020-033	Will there be an updated GROUPER to accommodate the new pdpm_icd_codes_2_FYxxxx table? a. If so, when will this be posted?	The PDPM grouper will be updated to version 1.0005 to accommodate the modifications described in the Final Errata dated 4/30/2020 and to accommodate the updated

		PDPM ICD codes for the new Fiscal Year (FY). It is anticipated that the new grouper will be posted in July sometime along with the new codes.
2020-034	Will it be possible for combined assessments (for example OBRA Admission combined with a PPS 5-day) to yield two different PDPM calculation results? a. If yes, since only one PDPM HIPPS code can be included in Z0100A, and assuming this is the PPS PDPM HIPPS code, then how will the state get the OBRA-specific PDPM HIPPS code?	If the assessment is a PPS assessment, a 5-character HIPPS code is expected. The fifth character is a federal assessment indicator. If the assessment is a PPS combined with an OBRA, a 5-character HIPPS code is still expected. If the assessment is a stand-alone OBRA NC or NQ*, a 4-character HIPPS code is expected. There will not be a federal assessment indicator for stand-alone OBRAs NC or NQ. For the combination PPS and OBRA assessments, the states should drop or ignore the fifth character of the HIPPS code which is the Federal Assessment Indicator. *The NC or NQ stand-alone OBRA could also be combined with a physical discharge (A0310F = 10 or 11)
2020-35	Will there be any Section S changes by states for 10/01/2020? These are normally posted on the qtso website in the Reference & Manuals section, but nothing has been posted for 2020 yet.	There are no new Section S items for October 2020. Maine is ending the collection of 16 items as of 9/30/2020. The October 2020 Section S items by state is posted on the QTSO as of early June.
2020-036	I see that there is a modifier option of “6” as a HIPPS Character for the modifier. This is specified as for OBRA Assessment. Why is this not being utilized on stand-alone OBRAs instead of no modifier?	One of the early PDPM presentations indicated that 6 would be used as the modifier for A0310B=99. However, that was changed later, to not have a modifier for assessments with A0310B=99.
2020-037	Issue 06:	We have not been collecting PDPM scores for A0310B=[99], just A0310B=[01,08]. As of 10/01/2020,

	How does the new item **STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD** make things different? Z0100 (PDPM score) is already active and required on OBRA assessments (NC and NQ). Are we now handling Z0100 differently depending on whether STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = 0 or 1? Do we leave Z0100 blank on OBRA assessments if STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = 0?	if the state decides to collect PDPM scores for assessments with target date on or after 10/01/2020 where A0310A=[01,02,03,04,05,06] and A0310B=[99], then STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD should be set to 1, so that VENDOR validation software will know to allow non-blank (i.e., not the caret) values for the GG0130, GG0170 and J2100 items. Meanwhile, ASAP will use the DMS, not STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD, to make the determination on how to validate the GG0130, GG0170 and J2100 items. PDPM results will be stored in Z0100A. If the state does NOT collect PDPM scores for these OBRAs, then set STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD to 0; Z0100A can be left blank (i.e., set to caret).
2020-038	Issue 07: Are you saying that the value of STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD can change at any time? Does that mean a state can set up something like this: 10/01/2010 – 10/31/2020: STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = 1 11/01/2020 – 12/31/2020: STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = 0 01/01/2021 – 01/31/2021: STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD = 1 Etc., etc.?	Yes, no restrictions have been defined on when or how often the state can make that change.
2020-039	Does the value of STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD impact Medicare/Medicaid billing in any way?	No
2020-040	Can you simply confirm that Version 1.18 of the MDS are delayed by the IFC rule that delays the associated QRP transfer of health measures? And confirm that the earliest that version or modified version would be effective would be October 1, 2022? Rule info Here is the link to the iFC rule	Correct, October 1, 2022

	You will see a summary of items on page six that mentions the delay of the QRP and then the clip I sent earlier Is on page 163-164 https://s3.amazonaws.com/public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2020-09608.pdf?utm_campaign=pi+subscription+mailing+list&utm_source=federalregister.gov&utm_medium=email	
2020-041	Should STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD Be in all item sets?	Yes, IF the target date of the assessment is on or after 10/01/2020.
2020-042	How will we find out which states have STATE_PDPM_OBRA_CD set to Yes (1)?	The states are responsible to notify the vendors, CMS cannot commit to providing a list at this time, although it will be considered.
2020-043	What is the website we can check if a state has turned on PDPM for OBRA assessments?	There is no website at this time.
2020-044	The CASPER Reporting MDS Provider User's Guide, Section 7 specifies the fields that are returned in the validation report. The description for the XML File Name element does not make it clear what this file name is. The field is shown on Page 7 of the PDF: XML File Name | The name of the XML file. My specific question is: *Is this file name returned in this field the same XML file name that was used for this resident in the submission file?*	Yes