



RULINGS ISSUED BY THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

The CMS hereby publishes summaries of rulings recently issued by the Complaints Adjudication Unit in respect of complaints lodged against regulated entities, in terms of Section 47 of the Medical Schemes Act.

These rulings are published solely for information purposes and may not be taken to be precedent setting in any way. Decisions articulated in these rulings may still be appealed in terms of Section 48 of the Medical Schemes Act. The CMS reserves the right to modify or remove any information published herein, without prior notice.

The contents of these rulings do not constitute legal or medical advice and may not be taken out of context. The findings and any opinions expressed in these rulings are based on the specific facts of each complaint, the evidence submitted, and applicable legal provisions.

The CMS does not assume liability or accept responsibility for any claims for damages or any errors, omissions, arising out of use, misunderstanding or misinterpretation, or with regard to the accuracy or sufficiency of the information contained in these publications.

Identifiable personal information of the complainants and any associated individuals have been redacted for their protection.

All rights reserved.

E v GEMS

The complaint concerned the Scheme's purported failure to extend the authorisation granted to the Member's dependent for her medical condition.

In its response to the complaint, the Scheme submitted that during the period 28 November 2022 and 19 January 2023 it received claims from a service provide on behalf of the Member's dependent. It indicated that the diagnosis related to ICD10 code G80.9 (cerebral palsy, unspecified). That the treatment plan for the latter condition made provision for tariff codes 66311 x1 and 66201 x2. It stated that Tariff code 66201 for service dates 2 November 2022 and 9 November 2022 under code G80.9 were approved within the PMB entitlement. It further stated that the approved treatment was however exceeded with the service dates of 28 November 2022 and 15 December 2022. Therefore, the two additional sessions were then declined because they were not clinically appropriate. The Scheme averred that it rejected to extend authorisation and thus the Member was liable for the additional sessions.

Upon investigation, the submissions made by both the Member and the Scheme were reviewed by the Registrar. The matter was referred to the Clinical Review Committee (CRC) for a clinical opinion. The CRC advised that the dependent's condition, G80.9 - Cerebral palsy, unspecified, is only a PMB where there is difficulty in breathing, eating, swallowing, bowel, or bladder control due to a non-progressive neurological (including spinal) condition or injury. The description for tariff code 66201 is observation and screening. That the Scheme provided the member with a care plan for the follow-up of the condition Cerebral palsy. It indicated that the Scheme paid for tariff code 66201 x2 as per available care plan benefit. It advised that there is no clinical information to confirm that the treatment related to difficulty in breathing, eating, swallowing, bowel, or bladder control, hence the condition is not PMB. CRC concluded that the Scheme's decision was correct.

Prescribed Minimum Benefit conditions(PMB) are those conditions listed in the Diagnosis and Treatment Pairs in Annexure A of the Regulations or any emergency medical condition. PMBs consist of a set of defined benefits to ensure that all medical schemes members and their

beneficiaries have access to certain minimum health services irrespective of which benefit option the member belongs to. In terms of the provisions of Regulation 8(1) of the Act, the diagnosis, treatment and care of a PMB condition must be paid in full by a medical scheme.

A ruling was therefore issued confirming that the Scheme's decision was compliant with the Act and its rules since the dependent's condition was non-PMB. It was found that the Scheme discharged its funding liability in accordance with its protocol. The complaint was effectively dismissed.