Federal Regulatory Update

Kathy Reep, Senior Manager Business Development and Compliance Advisory July 7, 2020



Topics to Be Covered



- Fiscal year 2021 proposed rules
- Transparency
- On the horizon

Proposed Rules for FY2021





	Final FFY 2020	Proposed FFY 2021	Percent Change
Federal Operating Rate	\$5,796.63	\$5,979.74	+3.16%
Federal Capital Rate	\$462.33	\$468.36	+1.30%



- Some major proposals include:
 - Updated Core-Based Statistical Areas
 - 2-year transitional wage index with 5 percent stop loss
 - Full implementation FY2022
 - New DRG for CAR T-cell therapy
 - Use of FFY 2017 S-10 to determine UCC data for the distribution of Medicare DSH
 - Collecting hospitals' median payer-specific negotiated inpatient service charges for Medicare Advantage organizations and third party payers – TRANSPARENCY!



- Bad debt revisions
 - Proposes that certain provisions would be effective retroactively
 - Codify program instructions in Chapter 3 of the Provider Reimbursement Manual
 - Reasonable collection effort
 - Similar collection effort between Medicare and non-Medicare accounts with "like amounts"
 - Prohibited from claiming as bad debt while pending at collection agency
 - Determination of indigency excludes "dual eligibles"
 - Independent verification cannot rely on signed declaration
 - Consider patient's <u>total</u> resources (assets, liabilities, income, expenses)



- Other provisions effective with cost reporting periods beginning on or after October 1, 2020
 - Requirement to bill beneficiaries no later than 120 days after the date of the remittance advice (clarified as later of that from Medicare or secondary payer)
 - Bars providers from writing off a bad debt sooner than 121 days after issuing the bill
 - 121-day period resets after each partial payment
 - Only allowed to claim bad debt that is written off to a bad debt expense account
 - Cannot claim if written off to contractual allowance



- Comments due July 10
- Due to the significant allocation of resources to the COVID-19 response, waives the 60-day delay in the effective date of the final rule

Other Proposed Payment Rules



- LTCH, IRF, IPF, and SNF proposed rules all impacted by revised CBSAs
- IRF rule proposes removal of post-admission physician evaluation requirement
- Proposed rate changes compared to FY2020:
 - LTCH: -0.9 percent
 - IRF: +2.5 percent
 - IPF: +2.6 percent
 - SNF: +2.3 percent
- Home Health NPRM
 - Issued June 25
 - Increase in rates of 2.6 percent
 - Expansion of telehealth

Transparency Requirements: Current and Proposed



CMS Price Transparency: 2019



- Effective January 1, 2019
- Hospitals required to post standard charges for all items and services on a public-facing website in a machine readable format
 - Applies to all hospitals, including critical access, inpatient rehab, and inpatient psych
 - Revenue codes and charge codes not required
 - Concern regarding use of CPT/HCPCS codes (AMA copyright)
- Subsection (d) hospitals (those paid under IPPS) also required to publish charges by DRG

Executive Order: June 24, 2019



- Provided 60 days to develop requirements and propose regulations
 - Hospital publication of standard charge information including charges and information based on negotiated rates
 - Also post bundled charge information for common or shoppable services
- Provided 90 days for issuance of advance NPRM requiring providers and insurers to facilitate access to information about expected out-of-pocket costs for items or services to patients before they receive them

Actions Following Executive Order PYA

- Hospital pricing transparency proposed in outpatient prospective payment system rule for CY2020
 - Not addressed in final OPPS rule however
 - Separate final rule issued November 15, 2019
 - Effective January 1, 2021
- Transparency in coverage proposed rule also issued November 15, 2019
 - Comments originally due January 14; extended to January 29
 - Over 20,250 comments received

Pricing Transparency Final Rule



- Defines various terms
 - Standard charge
 - Includes both amounts contained in the chargemaster and payer-specific negotiated charges
 - Conflicts with Medicare reimbursement manual requirement for "like charges"
 - Charges should be related consistently to the cost of the service and uniformly applied to all patients whether inpatient or outpatient
 - Items and services
 - Includes both hospital services <u>and</u> physician/professional fees, if employed by the hospital

Five Types of Standard Charges

- Post in a machine-readable file on the website
 - Gross charges chargemaster rate
 - Payer-specific negotiated rates
 - De-identified minimum rates
 - De-identified maximum rates
 - Discounted cash price
- Other required information
 - Description of each item or service
 - Any code used by hospital for accounting or billing purposes (HCPCS code, DRG, APC, etc.)

Pricing Transparency Final Rule

- Requires charge data to be posted in machine-readable format
 - Individual charge level both actual charge and payernegotiated charge
 - Payer-specific charge for at least 300 shoppable bundles
 - 70 bundles identified by CMS provider must have total of at least 300 even if not all 70 are offered at facility
 - Easily searchable and consumer-friendly
 - Providers deemed as meeting this requirement if it maintains an Internet-based price estimator tool
 - Per day penalty for non-compliance \$300; non-compliance noted on CMS website; potential CoP (interoperability rule pending)

Response to CMS: Providers



- Discussion confuses terms price, charge, rate, and cost
- Requirement to post negotiated "rates" exceeds CMS' statutory authority
- Many managed care contracts include "gag" clauses
 - Can new contracts be negotiated by January 1?
- Considerable administrative burden to comply
- Inclusion of employed physician services confusing for the consumer and hospital
 - Not all hospitals employ the same types of physicians
 - Service packages would not be consistent when viewed by the consumer
 - Physician charges not included in hospital chargemaster



- CMS does not have authority to require disclosure of payer-specific negotiated charges/rates
- Question of the First Amendment
 - Unconstitutionally compels speech
 - Disclosure of individual rates privately negotiated
- Confidentiality of trade secrets
- Arbitrary and capricious
- Concern with security risk
 - HIPAA compliance of third party apps

Pending Litigation: DISMISSED

- The court found
 - "...the fact that Congress chose not to use that term [chargemaster] is strong evidence that 'standard charges' does not mean ... only 'chargemaster charges'"
 - "It is undisputed that chargemaster rates are not the amounts paid on behalf of 90% of hospitals' patients, and thus it is hard to see how they can be considered usual, common, or customary."
 - "The word 'charge' means 'the price demanded for something. Yet chargemaster rates are rarely demanded for payment..."
 - "The statute's requirement that the list of standard charges include those for DRGs is, at a minimum, inconsistent with Plaintiffs' argument that 'standard charges' unambiguously means chargemaster charges."
 - Comparison to menu prices

Proposals in FY2021 IPPS NPRM

- Hospitals would report median payer-specific negotiated <u>charge</u> by MS-DRG in their cost reports
 - Effective for cost reporting periods ending on or after January 1, 2021
 - Applies to all third party payers, including Medicare Advantage
 - Hospitals would be required to report
 - Median payer-specific negotiated charge for all Medicare Advantage plans by MS-DRG
 - Median payer-specific negotiated charge for all third party payers, including Medicare Advantage, by MS-DRG
 - CMS considering using this information to calculate future MS-DRG relative weights beginning in FY2024

Transparency in Coverage: NPRM

- Would require group health plans/health insurance issuers to disclose cost-sharing information for a covered item or service from a particular provider/providers
 - Individual and group markets
 - Upon request only
 - Self-service tool on the Internet
 - Information also available in paper format
 - Information updated monthly

Transparency in Coverage: NPRM

- Information to be disclosed
 - Estimated cost-sharing liability
 - Negotiated rate
 - Out-of-network allowed amount
 - Items and services included in bundled payment
 - Prerequisites to coverage
 - Disclosure notice

Implications for Hospitals



- Transparency is the right thing to do
 - Need to be assured that we are posting/reporting accurate and useful information
 - Patients need to know their responsibility
 - Can't address shoppable services only across hospitals
 - What about ASCs and other care sites?

On the Horizon



Other Issues



- Regulatory watch
 - Outpatient PPS NPRM: OMB display 4/21/20
 - 340B drug pricing
 - Physician fee schedule NPRM: OMB display 5/12/20
 - Site neutral payment policies
 - Telehealth

Questions: Kathy Reep kreep@pyapc.com



ATLANTA | KANSAS CITY | KNOXVILLE | NASHVILLE | TAMPA



The Premier Organization for Revenue Cycle Professionals

FLORIDA SUNSHINE CHAPTER

What is the Florida Sunshine Chapter AAHAM?

Florida Sunshine Chapter AAHAM is a networking group of Healthcare Revenue Cycle Management professionals throughout Florida. Florida Sunshine Chapter's mission is to provide education, certification, networking, career guidance and opportunities and advocacy for all healthcare revenue cycle professionals.

AAHAM is dedicated to giving you the inside intelligence you need to thrive professionally. As a member, you have access to information on critical topics like education and advocacy in the areas of reimbursement, admitting and registration, data management, medical records, patient relations and so much more.

For more information on benefits and to join online, visit www.floridaaaham.com

Interested in joining FL AAHAM? Email us at membership@floridaaaham.com

Follow us on LinkedIn https://www.linkedin.com/company/florida-sunshine-chapter-aaham

Join us on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/florida.sunshine.aaham

AAHAM Florida Sunshine Chapter 2020 Corporate Partners

We would like to thank all of our Corporate Sponsors for making a financial commitment to our Chapter and we ask that all members make a special effort to thank them for their continued support and include them in evaluation of needs and/or RFP process when applicable.

<u>Platinum</u>

OSGDiamond Healthcare Solutions

<u>Gold Partners</u>

Change Healthcare Gulf Coast Collection Bureau, Inc

<u>Silver Partners</u>

C3 Revenue Cycle Solutions Penn Credit Corporation SNS Recovery, Inc.

Bronze Partners

Bacen & Jordan, P.A. DECO, LLC EnableComp Firm Revenue Cycle Health Pay 24 MSCB, Inc. MyCare Finance NobleBiz OVAG International Sage Law Offices