



Advising the Congress on Medicare issues

Modifying the A-APM incentive payment

Kate Bloniarz and David Glass

November 1, 2018

Outline

- Background and current incentive payment structure for clinicians participating in Advanced Alternative Payment Models (A-APMs)
- Policy option for changing the A-APM incentive payment (described in the June 2017 Report to the Congress)
- Interest in moving to a draft recommendation in December?

Background

- Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (MACRA)
 - Eliminated SGR
 - Created two paths for clinicians
 - Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS)
 - Advanced Alternative Payment Models (A-APMs)
 - MedPAC supports the goals of moving the Medicare program towards comprehensive, patient-centered care delivery models
- A-APMs are a set of CMS models that:
 - Require entities to assume more than nominal risk
 - Require EHR technology
 - Use quality measures comparable to MIPS
- 9 models currently qualify as A-APMs
 - 4 ACO models, 1 ACO specialty model, 2 bundling models, 1 medical home model, and 1 other

5 percent A-APM incentive payment

- Clinicians (or entities) can qualify for an incentive payment if they meet a certain threshold of A-APM participation
- Threshold of revenue through A-APM rises over time
 - 25% of revenue in 2019 and 2020
 - 50% of revenue in 2021 and 2022
 - 75% of revenue in 2023 and 2024
- If the clinician/entity qualifies, an incentive payment of 5 percent of the clinician's Medicare FFS revenue is paid in a lump sum
- Also exempts the clinician/entity from MIPS

Details of CMS's A-APM assessment

- CMS will assess clinician eligibility for the A-APM incentive payment using a number of methods
 - Entity-level versus individual-level assessment
 - Revenue versus patient count
 - Period of time (eligibility reviewed at three points during the year)
 - Medicare A-APM participation versus other-payer A-APM participation (starting in 2021)
- If clinician (or entity) qualifies via any one of these combinations, they receive the incentive payment and the exclusion from MIPS


Summary of concerns

- Administrative complexity
- All-or-nothing incentive
 - Inequitable: Clinician just under the threshold gets nothing, one just over gets reward on *all* revenue
 - No incentive to increase A-APM participation once threshold is met
 - Amount of incentive sized to total FFS revenue (not A-APM participation)
- As thresholds increase over time, uncertainty for clinicians about qualifying will increase


Policy option

- Eliminate threshold and provide 5 percent incentive on the clinician's Medicare FFS revenue coming through an A-APM
- Incentive would be proportional to share of Medicare FFS revenue coming through A-APM, not all or nothing
 - More equitable
 - Less complex to administer
 - Continuous incentive to increase share of revenue through A-APM

Effect of policy option at 25 percent threshold (2019 and 2020)



Potential impact of policy option



Impact of policy option, by year

Measurement year	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Revenue threshold	25%	25%	50%	50%	75%	75%
Number of clinicians qualifying (relative to current law)	Small increase	Small increase	Moderate increase	Moderate increase	Large increase	Large increase
Average payment (relative to current law)	<i>Moderate reduction from current law in all years</i>					

Discussion

- Policy option: Modify the A-APM incentive payment so the 5 percent incentive applies to Medicare FFS clinician revenue coming through an A-APM
- Consideration of policy option as a draft recommendation for December/January