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Until current trends are interrupted, health care will consume 34% of the gross domestic product (GDP) by 2040. Rising US health care costs have not produced measurable improvement in the overall health of the public, in comparison with other industrialized nations. Additionally, geographic regions spending more on health care have not seen commensurate improvements in quality or outcomes. While about a quarter of projected health care cost increases can be ascribed to the aging of the population, the remainder are likely due to rising health care costs from system inefficiencies and new (often important) technologies, coupled with patient and physician expectations for the “best” of Western medicine. Some estimate that we could reduce 5% of GDP spending by reducing system inefficiencies, without significant changes in service provision.

How can rising costs be slowed? Certainly, health care systems redesign experiments are occurring within the Affordable Care Act, and the medical marketplace is expanding into new care delivery modalities with direct-to-consumer solutions, such as telemedicine and expansion of midlevel provider services. Horizontal and vertical healthcare system integration may address some inefficiencies. In addition, individual patient and physician behaviors can be influenced. For instance, providing benchmarking data about physician performance has been shown to change behavior and choices within organizations, as does leadership focus.

This month in JGIM, Horn et al. demonstrate that displaying comparative laboratory costs to intervention physicians at the point of care reduced test ordering in comparison with controls. George Lundberg’s accompanying editorial “Calling All American Physician Leaders” provides insight into the larger context of health care reform. Within the Veterans Affairs (VA) hospital system, Restuccia et al. found that alignment of VA leadership and physicians around care goals lead to greater adoption of national quality improvement initiatives. When the price or compensation differential is sufficient, consumer behavior and physicians are both affected. Consulting groups have estimated that a difference of 20% of physician compensation is sufficient to influence the adoption of new approaches to care delivery. This month, JGIM authors Hoo and Sandy also remind us that a comprehensive approach to health care reform is necessary for systems transformation, including upgrading performance measures, monitoring for unintended consequences of new initiatives, using an expanded systems toolbox, and remembering that care provision is local.

Conceptually and practically, the current US fee-for-service (FFS) payment structure provides incentives for health systems to focus on service-intensive, extreme disease and disease complications, not on methods to prevent disease inception or progression. For instance, preventing a single patient from needing a cardiac-related hospitalization through better primary or secondary prevention would reduce system-wide costs by up to $40,000 per myocardial infarction hospitalization. To address these issues, national think tanks have convened to innovate around designing a better US health care system, including innovating around physician payments.

In March 2013, one such group, the National Commission on Physician Payment Reform (NCPPR), released a report with twelve recommendations to reform how physicians are paid, linking incentives to quality in patient care to curtail rising health care costs. The independent Commission was established by the Society of General Internal Medicine (SGIM) and partly funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the California Healthcare Foundation. Its report provided a 5-year roadmap to transition the United States from the current FFS reimbursement model to a blended payment system that better aligns practice and payment policy with Berwick’s triple aim of improving patients’ experience of care, improving population health, and reducing health care costs. As noted by then SGIM President Harry Selker, “It is natural that SGIM contribute to this; as general internists, we recognize our dual responsibilities both to our individual patients and to the public.” Following a Capitol Hill briefing and a New
England Journal of Medicine article describing the report by Commission Co-Chairs Steven Schroeder and former US Senator Bill Frist [R, TN], SGIM established an ad hoc Committee to advocate for implementation of the Commission recommendations. To that end, SGIM’s ad hoc Committee, co-chaired by Mark Schwartz and Robert Baron, is building a coalition of stakeholder organizations to work with Congress and Executive branch agencies to operationalize these policy strategies.

In this issue, SGIM ad hoc Committee members offer three Comments addressing the Commission’s recommendations. First, Selker and colleagues review the first three recommendations, which argue for phasing out the current volume-based, fee-for service (FFS) reimbursement model over 5 years, to be replaced by a system emphasizing value and efficiency, with incentives that promote high quality, coordinated, and cost-effective, patient-centered care. Then Siddiqui et al., addressing Commission recommendations four through nine, contend that while transitioning away from FFS, the US must strengthen the primary care foundation of high performing healthcare systems, notably evaluation, management and preventive services. Finally, Patel and Nadel examine the Commission’s last three recommendations, arguing that Medicare’s Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula be repealed and replaced with policy that rewards value rather than volume, and that is based on a valuation of physician work that rectifies the current relative value unit (RVU) bias in favor of procedural compared with cognitive-based services.

As the complex process of US health care reform moves forward, JGIM invites its readers to engage in dialogue, research, and action to align incentives and innovation for physician payment policy around the triple aim.
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Together, the first three recommendations of the National Commission on Physician Payment Reform¹ propose eliminating the fee-for-service method of paying for care. Fee-for-service payment is a major driver in the US of high healthcare costs, and yet lacks an intrinsic focus on value and quality. Therefore, the first recommendation calls for a transition to payment systems emphasizing value and efficiency, such as bundled payment, capitation, and increased financial risk-sharing. Calls to end fee-for-service are not new. The national conversation on physician payment reform has spanned decades, and fee-for-service persists. However, the Commission’s second recommendation articulates a finite time line for this transition: five years. Third, the Commission recommends that, whether based on remaining fee-for-service mechanisms, bundled payments, or some form of capitation, financial incentives should encourage high quality, coordinated, cost-effective, patient-centered care.

Although this vision would have been controversial a decade ago; now there is broad agreement among policymakers and throughout society that major changes in medical care payments are warranted. The Commission’s principles and recommendations are mainstream, if distinctive for their clarity and weight. Yet, although conceptually compelling for society and for patients, how might such a change be accepted and implemented in day-to-day practice?

The background is well known. Healthcare expenditures have grown unsustainably, and the key drivers have been payments to physicians, along with the high costs for services and goods controlled or influenced by physicians. The aim of improving the coordination and efficiency of care as a way to reduce costs drove interest in capitated managed care in the 1990s, and more recently, the emergence of accountable care organizations (ACOs), patient-centered medical homes (PCMHs), and other global or bundled payment arrangements with incentives that reward high value healthcare.

The Commission was created to examine the potential benefits and harms of various payment strategies and to include insights of major stakeholders, including the challenges posed by physicians’ dual responsibilities to individual patients and to society. As was the case during the managed care era, there are concerns with new value-based payment arrangements. As healthcare providers (physicians, hospitals, and other care organizations) assume financial responsibility for the overall health and medical care of groups of people—essentially undertaking health insurance functions—the needs of individual patients could be compromised by efforts to limit overall costs. Underuse of necessary care is a risk under any system that does not provide cost-plus reimbursement. However, fear of underuse does not allow us to ignore the imperative for efficiency and cost-containment in an age of increasing financial constraints. Healthcare expenditures divert funds that might otherwise be used to support other important social needs. Balance among competing priorities must be achieved in a way that accounts for individuals’ and society’s needs, costs, benefits, and risks.

The Commission’s recommendations endorse the principles of bundling and capitation (or global payments), which transfer much of the insurance function, including financial risk and gain, to care providers. However, in advocating for increased risk-sharing by providers, the Commission insists that clinicians and their organizations be prepared—and appropriately supported—to provide more coordinated and efficient care. Doing so will likely require some reallocation of resources: from episodic care to longitudinal care; from procedural care to cognitive care; from diagnostic profligacy to “choosing wisely,” and from care focused solely on the individual to a greater concern with population health—all supported by sophisticated health information systems.

In evaluating alternatives to fee-for-service, the Commission recognized that bundled payment and capitation are not equivalent. Rather, they define a spectrum of models in which providers assume more or less risk for a larger or smaller portion of total care. Clearly, the more financial risk providers assume, the greater the incentives for efficiency, but also for stunting on care. At one end of
the spectrum, bundling of services for discrete episodes of care (e.g. ambulatory cataract surgery, including preoperative and postoperative care) does not threaten the patient-physician relationship in any broad sense, but also offers limited opportunities for savings. Total global care capitation is riskier, particularly when the risks are shared among relatively few clinicians, but offers the prospect of radically transforming care. Safeguards such as publicly reported quality metrics (and especially measures of underuse) will be crucial for all forms of risk-sharing, but especially for the more ambitious, broader, forms of capitation.

An increased focus on payment mechanisms that reward value and efficiency could inadvertently diminish the patient-centered focus that characterizes high-quality healthcare. Patients find financial incentives to control costs concerning, are partially reassured by the addition of quality metrics to these payment schemes, and strongly favor disclosure of these incentives. Rather than devising new payment mechanisms in backrooms populated by policy experts, a broader dialog with the public and with our patients is warranted to reach a broader consensus about the risks and benefits of moving away from fee-for-service towards alternatives that all stakeholders, including patients, find acceptable.

Beyond the Report’s scope are potential risks for the healthcare industry, such as consolidation of healthcare systems that could limit patients’ options, reduce competition, and increase costs. These and similar system risks, along with stinting of care for individuals, will need to be monitored. This will be a multi-stakeholder societal discussion, but primary care physicians, with responsibilities to our individual patients and to the public, and with leadership roles in healthcare, must be especially attentive to these issues and deeply involved in this conversation. And in this, special attention must be given to potential conflicts of interest that might raise concern. To take advantage of bundling of care and payment while also protecting individuals and the public, all relevant viewpoints must be incorporated.
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In its middle six recommendations (#4–9), the National Commission on Physician Payment Reform recognized that while it is imperative that we transition to fixed payment models, our existing fee-for-service (FFS) structure needs recalibration. FFS is currently the dominant payment model for physicians and will remain the basis for many new payment models. The Commission, therefore, enumerated transitional policies to more appropriately value and strengthen the base of the physician workforce pyramid that provides most of the evaluation and management (E&M) services in the United States. They provide next steps for addressing imbalances in payment policies, emphasizing quality, connecting smaller practices to leverage change, and focusing first where there is greatest potential for savings.1

Among some recent steps to support primary care, the Affordable Care Act provided a 10% increase in Medicare payment rates for primary care services. The undervaluation of preventive care and care coordination has led the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to endorse additional codes for managing transitions of care from a facility-based setting to the community. Care transitions involving moderate to high complexity decisions can now be billed separately from other E&M services. Non-face-to-face communications, such as telephone and email, have been included as a component of the transitions of care codes, reflecting the significant work required in providing care management. A proposal has also been put forth by CMS to pay for non-face-to-face, complex, chronic care management services for Medicare beneficiaries who have two or more significant chronic conditions. Complex, chronic care management services would include the development and revision of a plan of care, communicating with other treating health providers, and medication management. All this will help, but continuing recalibration of relative value units (RVUs) is essential to ensure that these services are appropriately valued.

With its fourth recommendation, the Commission recognized that for this recalibration to occur, annual valuations should be increased for E&M RVUs, and that assessments for any procedural codes that may be overvalued should be frozen for a period of three years. Adjustments to RVUs by CMS must be cost neutral by law. In most years, RVU adjustments associated with E&M services have been lower than those for procedures, although the work effort needed for many procedures diminishes as physicians gain experience. New procedures are often initially assigned a high RVU due to the related practice expense and the input cost of training. Given that the time needed to perform a procedure and the associated practice expense usually increase with experience, the Relative Value Scale Update Committee (RUC) assessments have not necessarily reflected these adjustments. CMS has the responsibility to ensure accurate RVUs, and freezing overvalued procedure codes for three years will allow the opportunity to use outside experts and data from additional sources to reassess values.

To further recalibrate the existing FFS structure, through its fifth recommendation the Commission endorsed equivalent payments across alternative delivery systems. The physician fee schedule payment to an office-based provider is generally higher than the payment to a provider performing a similar service in a hospital-associated outpatient department. When a service is provided in a hospital-based facility, however, Medicare makes a separate payment to the facility in addition to the physician’s fee, which makes the total reimbursement for a facility service much higher than the amount the physician in the office-based setting would receive from the physician fee schedule alone. A recent report by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) identified 66 groups of services frequently performed in freestanding offices for which reducing payment differences between settings would reduce program spending and beneficiary cost sharing by $900 million per year. The report further identified 12 groups of services performed in ambulatory surgical centers (ASCs) that would lead to $600 million annual savings if outpatient hospital payment rates were lowered to the level of ASCs.2

Higher facility reimbursements have also contributed to physicians moving services from office to hospital settings, leading to increased total Medicare spending and higher
beneficiary cost sharing. Many physicians are becoming salaried employees of hospitals because of this payment incentive. A survey conducted by the American College of Cardiologists found that the share of cardiologists who are employed by hospitals tripled between 2007 and 2012, from 11 percent to 35 percent. During that period, the proportion of cardiologists who work for physician-owned practices fell from 59 percent to 36 percent. The Commission recognized that to promote transparency and fairness, Medicare should be neutral on rate setting and, in the absence of comparative outcome data, should not pay more simply because something is done in a hospital. Facility payments are often used to subsidize other activities for safety net institutions, and alternative funding sources may need to be explored for these organizations while monitoring access.

The recognition that FFS payments have been so wholly disconnected from outcomes led to the Commission’s sixth recommendation to incorporate quality metrics into negotiated reimbursement rates within existing FFS contracts. While a transition away from FFS to fixed payment models will require aligning payment with quality metrics, it will be challenging to determine appropriate outcome measures and reach consensus across health systems and payers. Quality metrics must be instituted in a way that encourages evidence-based practice and improved health outcomes for individual patients and populations.

A range of efforts are currently concentrated on incorporating quality metrics into payment models, and begs the question of which measures to choose. Should the metrics of the Medicare Physician Quality Reporting System be the standard? Should the determination of appropriate metrics be left to individual states? Should each private payer make its own assessment? Many programs are in early stages of experimentation. Evaluation of these models will provide important lessons moving forward. With the significant variation in metrics deployed by multiple payers in the marketplace, however, the administrative burden on health systems is not sustainable. Providers who are less dependent on these metrics may be left questioning the relevance of these measures to the health of their patients. Provider buy-in to promote behavior change may be limited by an environment that does not have targeted, consensus driven, and patient relevant outcomes. Incorporating quality metrics within FFS contracts will require stakeholders to agree upon appropriate measures, harmonized across payers and systems.

Promoting quality improvement should be a high priority in all settings. The Commission’s seventh recommendation acknowledged that although many recent innovations have disproportionately favored larger practices, FFS reimbursement should also encourage small practices (those having fewer than five providers) to form virtual relationships and share resources to achieve higher quality care. To support vibrant small practices that are able to embrace meaningful quality improvement strategies and participate in the innovations, the Commission recognized that virtual relationships would enable providers to retain independence, but pool their resources to provide better and more coordinated care.

Incorporating quality metrics into the existing FFS structure is a first step in moving towards fixed payment models such as bundled payments and capitation. In its eighth recommendation, the Commission acknowledged the complexity of this transition and advised that as a first step CMS target areas with the most potential for cost savings. Chronic conditions including diabetes, coronary artery disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and cerebral vascular disease represent a significant share of disease burden and have evidence-based guidelines for management. Established quality metrics may thus be more easily instituted across payers if they focus on these high cost areas that could lead to significant savings. Given the high numbers of readmissions following inpatient hospital procedures, additional cost savings could be achieved by aligning quality improvement efforts in this domain with fixed payment strategies.

Although transitioning to fixed payment models has significant potential for cost savings, the Commission acknowledged in its ninth recommendation that monitoring the impact of these payment models on physician access will be essential. To ensure that providers are not “cherry picking” patients that are low complexity and low cost, adequate risk adjustment will be critical. Moreover, continuing evaluation and monitoring efforts will be required to be certain that services are not inappropriately withheld, as this often has the greatest adverse impact on those at the lowest end of the socioeconomic spectrum with historically worse health outcomes.

Transitioning from a system based solely on FFS to one that embraces fixed payments is a paradigm shift that has already begun. This evolution will not be easy. The Commission appreciated this in its considered approach to overhauling the current underlying valuation methodology, linking FFS to quality metrics, and focusing on high yield areas for fixed payment models. This stepwise approach will be critical to enabling an improved payment system, mindful of cost, and driven by outcomes.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they do not have a conflict of interest.

Corresponding Author: Mona Siddiqui, MD, MPH: Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Hampton House, Room 626, 624 North Broadway, Baltimore, MD 21205-1901, USA (e-mail: msiddiq2@jhmi.edu).
REFERENCES


Improving the Quality and Lowering the Cost of Health Care: Medicare Reforms from the National Commission on Physician Payment Reform

Kavita K. Patel, MD, MSHS and Jeffrey Nadel, BA

The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, USA.

J Gen Intern Med
DOI: 10.1007/s11606-014-2786-0
© Society of General Internal Medicine 2014

The final 3 of the 12 policy recommendations by the National Commission on Physician Payment Reform (NCPPR) dealt specifically with how Medicare should reimburse, finance, and determine the value of healthcare services provided by physicians.

With the US health care system facing dual crises of waning quality and exorbitant costs, policy-makers must take action to improve the outlook of US health care. Expenditures in the US health care system total almost $3 trillion per year and account for 18% of the gross domestic product (GDP) or about $8,000 per person annually.

Even with immense funding allocated to health care, health outcomes in the US are poorer than in most other developed nations. According to the World Health Organization, the US ranks 37th in overall health status, behind such countries as Oman and Morocco. The Institute of Medicine (IOM) concluded that Americans are in poorer health and live shorter lives compared to the citizens of other high-income countries.

The physician payment system contributes substantially to the high cost of US health care. Although physician salary and related expenses constitute just 20% of overall health care spending, physician decisions drive an additional 60% of health care costs. These factors prompted The Society of General Internal Medicine to convene The National Commission on Physician Payment Reform (NCPPR) to propose new forms of physician payment that will improve health outcomes while lowering the cost of care.

First, the NCPPR recommended that Medicare’s Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) be eliminated. The SGR was enacted by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and intends to manage the total cost of Medicare by adjusting payments to clinicians based on expenditures from the previous year and target expenditures for the following year. However, the system has long been dysfunctional.

Recently, calls for repeal of the SGR have been multilateral and bipartisan. Several of the fundamental flaws in the SGR legislation include the SGR’s failure to control volume growth in Medicare and that setting spending caps on the program without addressing the roots of the issue—volume and price of services and health outcomes—is an insufficient answer to a problem requiring a long-term solution; there is little incentive for individual physicians to attempt to hold down costs since the SGR affects physician payment in aggregate.

In looking at an immediate SGR replacement, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) should harmonize the myriad of payment adjustments and quality improvement efforts—meaningful use of electronic medical records (EMR), e-prescribing, patient quality reporting system, and others—and apply those funds to a care coordination payment, which would give physicians more support for moving to more bundled payments based on episodes of care.

Amidst widespread support for SGR repeal, questions remain on how to fund it. The second NCPPR Medicare recommendation was that repeal of the SGR should be paid for with cost-savings from the Medicare program as a whole. This year, due to a sustained period of constrained finances and innovative efforts at Medicare reform, the cost to repeal the SGR is $139.1 billion, down from the November 2012 estimate of $243.7 billion.

In 2011, the IOM reported that annual excess spending in Medicare amounted to more than three-quarters of a trillion dollars, a savings that far exceeds the cost of SGR repeal. The excessive costs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unnecessary services</th>
<th>$210 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiently delivered services</td>
<td>$130 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess administrative costs</td>
<td>$190 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices that are too high</td>
<td>$105 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed prevention opportunities</td>
<td>$55 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>$75 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With substantial room for waste reduction in Medicare, mobilizing efforts to reduce these excess costs and inefficiencies would provide enough savings to cover the cost of the sorely needed legislative action without substantially burdening providers themselves.
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A properly aligned payment system, one that reimburses the provision of high-quality, evidence-based care, has the potential to encourage savings in these areas. Enhancing relevant clinical and financial data exchange between payers and providers, and doing so quickly—ideally in real time—would provide the necessary utilization and efficiency data to payers and outcomes data to providers. Furthermore, as previously described, paying providers for various quality and efficiency elements with a care coordination payment would help to increase preventive care and patient education efforts, reduce administrative costs, and encourage the efficient delivery of the proper services at the right time.

The final NCPPR Medicare recommendation was that the Relative Value Scale Update Committee (RUC) should continue to make changes to become more representative of the medical profession as a whole and to make its decision making more transparent. Medicare reimburses physicians for services using a fee schedule informed by relative value units (RVUs). The RUC is the principal advisory body providing RVU update recommendations to CMS.

The composition and operating procedures of the RUC have been widely criticized. The RUC is composed of 31 members, theoretically representing the entirety of the medical profession. But currently, only nine seats represent specialties that consist of evaluation and patient management services such as general internal medicine, family medicine, neurology, and pediatrics. Since the RUC is structurally skewed toward procedure-based specialties, there is concern that it undervalues cognitive-intensive specialties, overvalues technology-intensive specialties, and thus reimburses less for the evaluation and management services that are shown to improve health and lower costs. Furthermore, RUC meetings are closed to the public, individual voting records are not released, and transcripts of the meetings are never published. A body such as the RUC should make an effort to be transparent since CMS has historically adopted more than 90% of its recommendations.

Notwithstanding, the RUC has made positive strides in recent years. In 2012, the AMA added new primary care and geriatrics seats to the RUC and now requires that all vote totals be made publically available. Increasing the representation of cognitive-oriented specialty seats should continue. Furthermore, opening RUC meetings to the public and publishing meeting transcripts, to increase accountability, would be a positive step.

With rapidly rising costs and care of disproportionately lower quality, reform of the US health care system is pressing. While reforms to Medicare and the US health care system cannot be implemented overnight, the transition to new models of physician payment has already begun and shows promise. From payment reforms such as bundled payments and capitation to systems-based reforms such as Accountable Care Organizations and Patient-Centered Medical Homes, innovation in health care payment and delivery has the potential to curb the growth of health care spending and better align payments with quality care efforts.
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