Primary Care Spend Standard: Evidence for Non-Fee for Service Investments

Patrick M. Tigue Principal Policy Associate

Health Insurance Advisory Council Meeting November 20, 2012



Overview

- Introduction
- Assessing Non-FFS Investments
- Moving Forward



Reminder: Key Findings from Last Time

- The commercial health insurers are compliant in meeting their targets under the primary care spend standard.
- Primary care spending is rising while total medical spending is falling.
- Patient centered medical homes (PCMHs) and other non-fee for service (non-FFS) methods drive the rise in primary care spending.
- Primary care spending will continue to grow in the years ahead. Which investments will yield the best return?

Future Primary Care Spending Should Prioritize Non-FFS

- In original guidance, HIAC emphasized need for growth in primary care spending outside of FFS payment system. The question is not whether we should emphasize non-FFS investments, but rather which non-FFS investments should receive priority.
- Why? Some spending will yield better results than others.
- Priorities should be aligned across insurers to maximize the potential to build a system centered on affordable and coordinated care.
- OHIC is looking to HIAC for guidance on this important issue.



Overview

- Introduction
- Assessing Non-FFS Investments
- Moving Forward



What We Did

- Took major categories of non-FFS spending from OHIC monitoring reports
- Asked insurers to rate effectiveness of this spend (to lower cost and improve quality) based on local or national evidence



Insurer Spending on and Rating of Non-FFS Investments

Potential of Non-FFS Investments to Lower Costs and Improve Quality

| Type | 2012 Forecasted Spend* | Potential to Lower Costs/Improve Quality** = Low |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| 1. Rhode Island Chronic Care Sustainability Initiative | \$1,958,967 | |
| 2. Patient-Centered Medical Home (Other) | \$11,368,114 | 1/2 |
| 3. Incentive Payments to Providers | \$4,318,495 | |
| 4. Other*** | \$2,866,883 | 1/2 |
| 5. Electronic Medical Records Incentives | \$574,000 | ↑ 1/2 |
| 6. CurrentCare | \$2,203,000 | |
| 7. Loan Forgiveness | \$350,000 | W |

^{*}Figures represent the combined 2012 forecasted spend for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Rhode Island, Tufts Health Plan, and United Healthcare

^{***}Includes initiatives such as: accountable care organizations, practice coaching, and community grants



^{**}Ratings represent the average rating given by insurers for each investment type

Rationale for Ratings Provided by Insurers

- Limited evidence available from insurers to support the ratings
- Consensus across insurers around CSI-RI and other PCMH investments as most promising
- Insurer consensus supported by local and national evidence



RI-CSI Results

- 8% reduction in emergency department visits for ambulatory care sensitive conditions (CSI-RI)
- 6% reduction in rates of hospitalization (CSI-RI)
- BCBSRI and United internal evaluations show slowing of cost trends at their PCMH sites.



National PCMH Results

- 37% reduction in emergency department visits (Capital Health Plan in FL)
- 39% reduction in emergency department visits (HealthPartners in MN)
- 15% reduction in rates of hospitalization (BCBSCA)



National PCMH Results (Continued)

- 10% reduction in rates of hospitalization (BCBSNE)
- 9% lower health care costs among PCMH patients (Capital District Physicians' Health Plan in NY)
- 10% lower health care costs among PCMH patients (BCBSNJ)



Rationale for Ratings Provided by Insurers (Continued)

- Incentive payments, such as pay-for-performance, seen as valuable as well but not to same extent
- These payments can enhance the focus on preventive care and chronic disease management to ensure proper attention
- Other investments either seen as having more limited potential or as difficult to assess
- Note, however, there is policy consensus around importance CurrentCare, although too early for evidence



Overview

- Introduction
- Assessing Non-FFS Investments
- Moving Forward



Discussion Questions

- Which non-FFS investments should be prioritized?
- How prescriptive should OHIC be in its new primary care spend standard guidance?
- Should guidance be issued for 2013 or 2013 and 2014?



Next Up

- December 2012 HIAC Meeting: Finalize recommendations on new primary care spend standard guidance
- OHIC issues new primary care spend standard guidance in December 2012 incorporating HIAC's recommendations
- March 2013 HIAC Meeting: Review Affordability Standards evaluation

