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Meet your speakers

Kim Ramey has over 20 years of experience in the health care industry in the areas of revenue cycle management including charge capture; coding (CPT, HCPCS, ICD-9, and ICD-10), billing and reimbursement; compliance, internal audits and regulatory risk. Most recently, Kim has served as interim compliance officer for multiple hospitals in a large health care system. Kim has developed and assisted in implementation of multiple compliance programs in large health care systems and academic medical centers. Prior to joining Deloitte, Kim served as the Chief Compliance Officer for a national leading provider of home-delivered diabetes testing supplies, mail order prescription medications and other Durable Medical Equipment (DME) products to eligible patients. Kim has assisted clients with developed and implemented the Corporate Compliance and Ethics Program and led provider through Corporate Integrity Agreement mandates.

Kim is a Registered Health Information Administrator (RHIA) and maintains her credentials through the American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA), of which she is an active member.

Dan is a Manager in Deloitte & Touche LLP’s Life Sciences and Health Care practice, specializing in consulting for health plans with more than 13 years of experience in consulting and the health care/plan space. Dan has extensive experience in compliance program implementation, execution and oversight; compliance program effectiveness reviews; delegated entity compliance program implementation and oversight; vendor oversight and auditing; government program mock audit ands; risk and control implementation and assessment; process review improvement (standard business and Medicare core processes); auditing; monitoring and quality assurance.

Getting to know the audience

What type of organization do you work for?

a) Hospital or health system
b) Independent physician practice
c) Other health care provider or supplier
d) Health insurance company
e) Pharmacy benefit manager (PBM)
f) Other third-party firm
What is compliance enforcement?

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has many mechanisms to enforce compliance with regulations and requirements. These mechanisms include:

- Evaluating health plans' consistency with the efficient administration of the Part C and Part D program requirements.
- Confirming that health plans correct deficiencies identified during program audits and that were the basis for intermediate sanctions and administrative actions.
- Program audits which evaluate sponsors' delivery of health care services and medications.
- Center for Program Integrity (CPI), which identifies matters concerning fraud, waste and abuse.


What are compliance penalties?

CMS has a wide-ranging disciplinary measures at their disposal when enforcing compliance. These measures include:

- Civil Monetary Penalties (CMP)
- Intermediate sanctions (suspension of marketing, enrollment, payment)
- Termination of contract

Focus areas of enforcement
During the last several audit periods, CMS has honed in on several enforcement areas:

- **Civil money penalties (CMP)**
- **Intermediate sanctions** (suspension of marketing, enrollment, payment)
- **Terminations** (termination of contract)

Provider directories

Provider outreach

Plan-directed care

Provider directories: Background
CMS issued a memorandum, January 17, 2017, reiterating guidance related to provider directory requirements:

- Is it clear if Providers are accepting new patients?
- Is the directory available online? From the website, are users able to request a hardcopy?
- Is information careful and up-to-date? (30 days to update hardcopy and online directories)
- What is CMS looking for in provider directories?
- Do providers have current contracts? Are effective and termination dates listed?
- Are the number, mix, and addresses of providers in a clear, and standardized format?

Source: Department of Health & Human Services Memorandum, Provider Directory Policy Updates, January 17, 2017
Provider directories are required to provide:
• provider's name
• address(es)
• telephone number(s)
• specialty area(s)
• hospital affiliation
• language(s) spoken
• whether new patients are being accepted

CMS found that 45% of directories contained inaccuracies. CMS is able to fine health plans up to $25,000 per Medicare beneficiary for errors in Medicare Advantage Plan directories.

Provider directories: Prospective

Maintenance of provider directories has a significant impact on both health plans and providers.

**Provider Perspective**
- Difficult to establish **communication preferences** due to undefined communication expectations
- **Reporting burden**; too many health plans to notify
- Failure to recognize role in proper maintenance, **access to care** issues, and patient dissatisfaction
- Inaccuracies may lead to higher **administrative costs**

**Health Plan Perspective**
- **Dynamic** provider information may make maintenance difficult
- Inflated numbers of **provider practice locations** may lead to **access to care** issues
- **Limited resources** may restrict ability to compare provider directory data
- Historical reliance on **credentialing** services and vendor support
- Inaccuracies may lead to consumer dissatisfaction and confusion
Provider directories: Proactive approaches

Maintaining careful provider directories requires cooperation from both health plans and providers

- **Routine Oversight and Monitoring**
  of online and hardcopy directories should be performed by both health plans and providers for accuracy

- **Contractual Agreements**, which include provisions and penalties surrounding relaying careful and timely provider directory data, should be maintained between health plans and providers

- **Hotline Number**
  which may likely put enrollees/plan staff in direct contact with providers if they discover an error or have a question

- **Leverage Internal Data**, which is already available to health plans (such as claims), to update directories

- **Data Repositories**
  where providers and health plans, after proving their identity, could compare and update their information

- **Provider Newsletter**, which may likely be frequently sent, reminding staff of requirements

Provider outreach: Background

CMS audits continue to focus on and evaluate processes surrounding outreach by health plans

- **Health plans should consider making reasonable efforts to obtain required information, including medical records documentation, from the enrollee’s provider if they do not have the information needed to make a coverage decision**

- **Health plans are required to conduct outreach within the applicable adjudication timeframe and to document their efforts**

- **“Sponsor did not demonstrate sufficient outreach to prescribers or beneficiaries to obtain additional information...”**
  was on the list of five most commonly cited conditions in 2016’s Program Audit Enforcement Report (for both CDAG and ODAG)

- **On February 22, 2017, CMS wrote a memorandum, updating guidance on outreach for information to support coverage decisions**

CMS clarified guidance and leading practices regarding outreach by health plans

Organization Determinations, Appeals & Grievances (ODAG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th># Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard OD - Payment</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard OD - Pre-Service</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited OD</td>
<td>72 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Reconsiderations (RC)</td>
<td>30 days (pre-service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 days (payment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited RC</td>
<td>72 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coverage Determinations, Appeals & Grievances (CDAG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th># Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage Determinations (CD) - Payment</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard CD - Benefits</td>
<td>72 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited CD</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Redeterminations (RD)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited RD</td>
<td>72 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Timing of Outreach Attempts**, varies (between a day to 4 days) depending upon type of coverage decision
- **Ways of Contact**, should differ to increase the likelihood of making contact with the provider
- **Methods for Requesting Information**, should vary depending on the type of request and the adjudication timeframe (i.e. telephone, fax, email, mail)

Health plans and providers both have a different perspective on addressing the enforcement trend related to provider outreach

Provider vs Health Plan

- Providers are not trained on health plan requirements
- Administrative burden
- Lack of accountability/incentive
- Not having a centralized person or group submitting/responding to requests for coverage (lack of institutional knowledge)
- Defective outreach may lead to limited access to care, increased administrative costs and patient dissatisfaction
- Reliance on receiving timely responses from providers
- Inadequate quality processes to confirm outreach processes
- Making coverage decisions on limited information
- Increased administrative costs, appeal rates and consumer dissatisfaction
- Incomplete policies/procedures and inadequate resources to conduct outreach results in not meeting CMS expectations
Provider outreach: Proactive approaches
Obtaining the information required to make coverage decisions is a two-way relationship, and health plans and providers should work together to achieve a common goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractual relations</th>
<th>between health plans and providers which allow health plans to obtain requested documentation from contracted providers in a reliable and timely manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider preferred methods/times of contact</td>
<td>should be recorded and updated on regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review enabling tools</td>
<td>including technology, dashboards and performance indicators which track and monitor outreach effectiveness with providers and provide recommendations to enhance program monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish automated tools</td>
<td>which help document outreach attempts and manage workflow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan-directed care: Background
There has been an increase in the number of health plans receiving audit findings related to plan-directed care.

Who?
- Members receive direction from a plan-contracted physician (which CMS considers a health plan representative)

What?
- Care a member believes he or she was instructed to obtain
- CMS requires health plans to pay for plan-directed care (except for items or services which are not covered, or if a member notified in advance of an adverse coverage)
- Member receives care from a out-of-network provider or physician at the direction of his/her primary care physician or network specialist
- Claim is rejected and service not covered when submitted by the out-of-network provider

How?
- Member receives care from a out-of-network provider or physician at the direction of his/her primary care physician or network specialist

Why?
- Neither provider nor enrollee request a pre-service organization determination from health plan

Source: Medicare Managed Care Manual, Chapter 4 - Benefits and Beneficiary Protections.
Plan-directed care: Prospective

Health plans and providers should consider jointly assume responsibility for minimizing unapproved out-of-network referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Health Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Participating providers should consider be aware of the network status of physicians and facilities</td>
<td>• Ultimate responsibility for a referral to an out-of-network provider by an in-network provider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of resources to determine if providers are in-network</td>
<td>• Inadequate contracting and oversight tools to confirm that participating providers abide by regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providers are not trained on health plan requirements</td>
<td>• Paying for plan-directed care services can be a financial burden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of accountability/incentive</td>
<td>• Administrative burden to confirm the compliance of contract providers and to maintain appropriate claims to review referrals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of patients due to confusion and stress of appeals process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan-directed care: Proactive approaches

Health plans and providers should work together to achieve a common goal of reducing the financial burden of unapproved out-of-network referrals

Training
Contracting physicians/providers should receive additional training on how to determine whether specific items and services are covered in which their patients/members are enrolled and their responsibilities related this requirement

Data
Health plans should consider data analytics to identify and follow-up with contracted providers who are frequently in violation of referring members to non-contracted physicians and providers

Penalties
Health plans should consider contractual requirements to implement penalties (up to terminating in-network status) for frequently referring members to non-contracted physicians and providers without prior authorization

Team
Providers should consider dedicating an individual or team to confirm insurance requirements related to specific provider referrals and establish an internal database for this
Questions?
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