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ACTIVITY DISCLAIMER

The material presented here is being made available by the American Academy of Family Physicians for educational purposes only. Please note that medical information is constantly changing; the information contained in this activity was accurate at the time of publication. This material is not intended to represent the only, nor necessarily best, methods or procedures appropriate for the medical situations discussed. Rather, it is intended to present an approach, view, statement, or opinion of the faculty, which may be helpful to others who face similar situations.

The AAFP disclaims any and all liability for injury or other damages resulting to any individual using this material and for all claims that might arise out of the use of the techniques demonstrated therein by such individuals, whether these claims shall be asserted by a physician or any other person. Physicians may care to check specific details such as drug doses and contraindications, etc., in standard sources prior to clinical application. This material might contain recommendations/guidelines developed by other organizations. Please note that although these guidelines might be included, this does not necessarily imply the endorsement by the AAFP.

DISCLOSURE

It is the policy of the AAFP that all individuals in a position to control content disclose any relationships with commercial interests upon nomination/invitation of participation. Disclosure documents are reviewed for potential conflict of interest (COI), and if identified conflicts are resolved prior to confirmation of participation. Only those participants who had no conflict of interest or who agreed to an identified resolution process prior to their participation were involved in this CME activity.

All individuals in a position to control content for this session have indicated they have no relevant financial relationships to disclose.

The content of my material/presentation in this CME activity will not include discussion of unapproved or investigational uses of products or devices.

Learning Objectives

1. Identify patients for whom physicians will be held accountable in a value-based payment environment by the attribution models used by Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and other major payers.
2. Recognize how patient attribution will affect physician future payments under MACRA, MIPS, and Advanced APMs.
3. Develop a plan for how and when to address incorrect attribution of patients.

Associated Sessions

• Harnessing the Power of Primary Care Access to Improve Cost of Care
• MACRA: Medicare's Shift to Value-based Delivery & Payment Models
• MACRA Medicare's Shift to Value-based Delivery & Payment Models: Ask the Expert
• What is Risk? Am I Ready for Advanced Alternative Payment Models
• Your Prescription for MIPS
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Agenda

• Learn how to identify patients for whom physicians will be held accountable in a value-based payment environment by the attribution models used by Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and other major payers
• Learn how patient attribution will affect physicians’ future payments under MACRA, MIPS, and Advanced APMs
• Learn how and when to address incorrect attribution of patients.

Whose patients are they anyway?

• Physician’s perspective
• Payor’s perspective
• Patient’s perspective

A Tale of Two Clinics

• One Doctor
• Two Clinics
• Two Tax ID’s
• 3,817 feet

Whose patients are they anyway?

• Physician’s perspective
• Payor’s perspective
• Patient’s perspective
How do you identify your patients?

- Do you look forward or backwards?
  - Prospective (21%)
  - Retrospective (64%)
- How far back?
  - One year (32%)
  - More than one year (7%)
  - Choose another timeframe (39%)

- Which doctor gets credit?
  - Plurality of care (46%)
  - Majority of care (11%)
  - Just one visit (7%)
  - Some arbitrary number (7%)

How far down do you go?

- One doctor (79%)
- Multiple doctors (14%)

Which method(s) do the major commercial plans use?

- Aetna
  - Majority of total charges OR plurality of total charges
- BCBS
  1st: Physician who billed the plurality of Total RVU’s
  2nd: Physician who billed plurality of outpatient E&M codes
  3rd: Physician who billed plurality of charges
- United Healthcare
  - Primary care physician who billed majority of charges

Which method(s) do HMO’s and Medicare Advantage plans use?

- Patient chooses Primary Care Physician from list of approved physicians
- Patient must initiate change in attribution (except when HMO / MA plan changes it)

Whose patients are they anyway?

- Physician’s perspective
- Payor’s perspective
- Patient’s perspective
How does CMS attribute patients?
- Attribution models vary somewhat from program to program
  - Value-based Payment Modifier
  - Physician Quality Reporting System
  - Electronic Health Record Incentive Program ("Meaningful use")
- But they tend to share common elements

Value-Based Payment Programs Use Common Structure
- Retrospective
  - "Look back" 1-2 years
- Plurality of allowed charges for outpatient services (not ER/urgent care)
- Attribute to 1 physician using Taxpayer ID Number (TIN)
- 2 step algorithm with shared tie breaker approach
- Common definitions of outpatient primary care codes and primary care providers

Medicare ACO Programs
- Perspective varies
  - Medicare Shared Savings Track 1 and 2 used retrospective approach
  - MSSP Track 3 and Next Generation ACO’s used prospective approach
- All ACO programs use
  - Common exclusions
  - 2 year "look back" period
  - Plurality of allowed charges for outpatient E&M codes
  - Common definitions of outpatient primary care codes and providers
- For Next Generation ACO, AWV with PCP in ACO automatically attributes patient to that ACO

Whose patients are they anyway?
- Physician’s perspective
- Payor’s perspective
- Patient’s perspective

Medicare’s Two Step Method
- Step 1: Is patient excluded from attribution?
  - Yes → Not attributed
  - No → Go to Step 2
- Step 2: Did patient receive 1° care services from a primary care physician?
  - Yes → Attributed to PCP who billed plurality of 1° care services
  - No → Go to Step 3
- Step 3: Did patient receive 1° care services from PA, APN, CNS, or physician at same TIN?
  - Yes → Attributed to provider group that billed plurality of 1° care services
  - No → Not attributed
- Step 4: Did patient receive 1° services from physician at same TIN as providers in Step 3?
  - Yes → Attributed to provider group that billed plurality of 1° care services
  - No → Not attributed

How would these patients be attributed?
- RJ
  - Previously attributed to me via MSSP ACO in which Physicians at Sugar Creek participates
    - In 2015
      - Saw resident physician 4 times
    - In 2016
      - Saw me at Village Family Practice once
      - Saw LKB at Physicians at Sugar Creek once
    - No AWV done in 2015 or 2016
    - In 2016 admitted for stroke then discharged to SNF
How would my patients be attributed?

**TC**
- 2015
  - Saw Dr. M for years with 3 acute visits and one physical before he sold his practice (Family Practice of Ft. Bend) to Village Family Practice
  - Saw ObGyn for well woman exam
- 2016
  - Changed PCP to me because Dr. M plans to retire soon
  - Saw me 4 times (3 acute visits, 1 physical)
  - Saw ObGyn for well woman exam
- 2017
  - Saw me for 2 acute visits

How would my patients be attributed?

**KG**
- Only goes to a doctor for acute issues
- Sees Dr. B for annual well woman exam
- Too busy traveling for work to schedule well woman exam this year or last year
- Went to urgent care for UTI recently

How would my patients be attributed?

**BW**
- Has been my patient for 7 years
  - Chose me as PCP for her Medicare Advantage plan
- 2015
  - Saw me at Physicians at Sugar Creek 5 times (2 acute visits, 2 chronic care visits, 1 AWV)
- 2016
  - Has seen me 4 times at Village Family Practice (1 acute visit, 2 chronic care visits, 1 AWV)
- 2017
  - Has seen me 3 times, including 1 AWV

How would my patients be attributed?

**CN**
- Has been going to county health clinic for years
- On turning 65, enrolled in Medicare parts A and B and scheduled appointment in 2016 with husband’s PCP

What will happen to under current rules?

**RJ**
- Attributed to Physicians at Sugar Creek
  - Was enrolled in MSSP/ACO under their TIN

**TC**
- Attributed to Dr. M because he billed plurality of Medicare part B allowable charges in 2015 and in first half of 2016

**KG**
- Not attributed
  - Did not receive recognized primary care services from a Medicare-designated primary care provider

**BW**
- Attributed to Physicians at Sugar Creek
  - Has seen me 3 times, including 1 AWV

**CN**
- Not attributed
  - Did not receive recognized primary care services from a Medicare-designated primary care provider
  - Has been going to county health clinic for years
  - On turning 65, enrolled in Medicare parts A and B and scheduled appointment in 2016 with husband’s PCP

And then it happened…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.I.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So how will attribution change under MACRA?

- Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS)
- Advanced Alternate Payment Model (AAPM)

Attribution in Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS)

- To participate as a physician, you must:
  - Not have started billing Medicare during current performance year (not eligible until second performance period)
  - Have ≥100 Medicare patients attributed to you
  - Have ≥$30,000 Medicare Part B allowed charges
  - Not be a Qualified Participant in an Advanced Alternate Payment Model

Attribution in MIPS

- Retrospective
- Look back two year (Calendar Year 2017 for Payment Year 2019)
- Plurality of Medicare Part B allowed charges for office visits, wellness visits, assisted living care, home visits

Attribution in MIPS

- Single primary care provider (physician, PA, APN, CNS, and CRNA)
  - BUT proposed provider-patient relationship codes signal multiple attribution are coming
- Individual physician
  - BUT for physicians who use group reporting option, positive / negative payment adjustment based on group performance

Attribution in MIPS

- “MIPS eligible clinician identifier”
  - Provider groups:
    - Patients attributed first to provider’s NPI
    - Patients then assigned to group practice of which provider is a member, based on group Taxpayer ID Number (TIN)
  - Individual providers: Patients attributed based on National Provider Number (NPI)
  - Tie breaker will be same as Value-based Payment Modifier
- Patient attributed to whomever billed most recent primary care E&M service

Advanced Alternate Payment Models (AAPM)

- You may be a Qualifying Participant if you participate in:
  - Medicare Shared Savings Program (MSSP) Track 2 and Track 3
  - Comprehensive Primary Care Plus (CPC+) initiative
  - Next Generation Accountable Care Organization
  - Vermont Medicare Accountable Care Organization initiative (part of Vermont All-Payer ACO Model)
Advanced Alternate Payment Models (AAPM)

- AAPM Entity must do one of these for its eligible clinicians to be qualifying participants (QPs):
  - 25% of Medicare Part B payments received through AAPM
  - See 20% of its Medicare patients through AAPM
  - QPs will receive an annual 5% lump-sum bonus in payment years 2019-2024.
  - QPs excluded from MIPS reporting requirements.
  - QPs receive 0.75% increase to their Medicare physician fee schedule beginning in 2026.

- If AAPM Entity does not meet payment threshold or patient threshold
  - Can participate in MIPS instead
  - Will be scored using APM scoring standard

What will happen to under MACRA?

But CMS is wrong! What can I do?

“MIPS eligible clinicians or groups may request a targeted review of the calculation of the MIPS adjustment factor under section 1848(q)(6)(A) of the Act, and, as applicable the calculation of the additional MIPS adjustment factor under section 1848(q)(6)(C) of the Act to such MIPS eligible clinician for a performance year”

Because I Said So: Potential Reasons to Request “Targeted Review”

- MIPS eligible clinician believes
  - Measures or activities submitted to CMS have “calculation errors or data quality issues”
  - Errors were made by CMS

  - Examples from CMS:
    - “performance category scores were wrongly assigned to the MIPS eligible clinician”
    - clinician believes low-volume threshold exclusion should have been applied

Timeline of MIPS Appeals Process

- Physician must request targeted review within 60 days after close of data submission period
- CMS will decide whether targeted review is warranted
- Formal hearing not required
- Clinician must respond to requests for additional information within 10 calendar days

Areas Excluded From a Targeted Review

- Methodology used to determine the amount of the MIPS adjustment factor
- Methodology used to calculate performance scores
- Performance standards
- Performance period
- Actual calculation of the performance scores
- Measures and activities specified for a MIPS category
Questions to Ask About Patient Attribution

• Who wants to know?
  – Payor
  – HMO
  – ACO

• Why do they want to know?
  – Cost
  – Quality

Then ask for details

• Timing
  – Prospective
  – Retrospective

• Measurement period
  – How long?
  – How far back?

• Threshold for attribution
  – Single visit
  – Plurality
  – Majority
  – Arbitrary minimum

• Data used
  – Claims (allowed charges)
  – Visits
  – Enrollment (empanelment)

• Exclusivity
  – Single clinician
  – Multiple clinician

• Level of attribution
  – Individual provider
  – PCP
  – Group
  – ACO

• Means of identifying provider
  – TIN
  – NPI

Questions

• General

• MACRA
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