

Reimbursement For Vascular Procedures Under CMS Is Deeply Flawed And Subject To The Bias Of Others: It Results In Unethical Compensatory Behavior: What Can Be Done About It

Sean P. Roddy, MD
 Professor of Surgery
 Albany Medical College
 Albany, NY

Nothing to Disclose

Vascular Procedural Compensation
 Based on the site of service

- Hospital outpatient ambulatory procedures
 - Physician bills CPT code → professional
 - Facility bills APC code → technical
- Office-based outpatient ambulatory procedures
 - Physician bills CPT code → professional + technical
- “global”

Vascular Procedural Compensation

- Payments are based on a hierarchy of CPT codes that describe specific interventions with more RVUs assigned for more work
- Unless a payor has a policy specifically defining requirements, the physician will be paid based on what he/she ultimately performs, not based on outcomes or appropriateness of indications

Hospital Outpatient Compensation
 Background

- HOPPS groups similar procedures into APCs and bases payments on historic hospital costs to charge ratios
- Typically, several “levels” with a hierarchy of increasing resource utilization payments
- If the cost to perform a procedure changes over time, APC payment changes can take years to catch up

Hospital Outpatient Compensation
 2025 HOPPS APC payments

<u>APC</u>	<u>Designation</u>	<u>Rate</u>
5191	<i>Level 1 endovascular</i>	\$3,216.41
5192	<i>Level 2 endovascular</i>	\$5,701.52
5193	<i>Level 3 endovascular</i>	\$11,340.57
5194	<i>Level 4 endovascular</i>	\$17,956.72

OBL Compensation “Global Payment”

- OBL payments to the physician
 - If a procedure has been assigned compensation in a “physician office” site of service, the payment is based on the CPT procedure code
 - The technical fee or overhead in the OBL is reimbursed through additional Practice Expense RVUs to the code
 - Physician bills “global” similar to vascular lab testing

OBL Compensation

How Is the PE (Overhead) Determined?

- A “*typical description of procedure*” must be created by specialty societies based on what is usually required to complete that intervention
- A list is generated of every supply or implantable item necessary for the procedure
 - Requirement to be on the list: must be utilized in “more than 51%” of these procedures across all provider groups

OBL Compensation How Is Overhead Determined?

- How long is the equipment being used
 - Differing equipment has its own payment rate
- What are the exact medical supplies required
 - All wires, catheters, stents, etc. - type and #
- Which staff are involved and for how long
 - RN, LPN, Angio tech, Rad Tech, etc.
 - Each has its own “payment rate per minute”

OBL Compensation Supply Items

- All required items (e.g.):
 - Alcohol wipes
 - PTA balloon(s)
 - Covered stents
 - Embolic protection / re-entry
 - Closure devices
- Items are “valued” and those costs are embedded into the compensation (regardless of whether the items are used or not)

Item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Alcohol Wipes	100	0.15	15.00
PTA Balloon	1	150.00	150.00
Covered Stent	1	250.00	250.00
Embolic Protection	1	100.00	100.00
Closure Device	1	120.00	120.00
... (many more items)

OBL Compensation Practice Expense Values

- When overhead is valued, it is priced based on typical cost in PE RVUs in that year and remains at that PE RVU value in the fee schedule for subsequent years
- Inflation and the annual CF will alter the overhead:
 - If the Medicare CF drops or does not receive an inflationary update, there is no methodology to pay the “actual price” – the MD may have to absorb a lower cost
 - If the price of an overhead item decreases over time or the MD buys in bulk to get better pricing, CMS does not alter the payment

OBL Compensation Background

- OBL overhead payments come from the part B Medicare annual pool of funds
- This is subject to Budget Neutrality calculations:
 - E/M code changes came with increased RVUs – to pay for this with out additional funding, CF lowered
 - G-code add-on created by CMS recently was similar
 - Clinical labor rate changes resulted in high cost OBL overhead being cut as a “pay for”

RUC Stance of OBL High Cost Overhead

- The American Medical Association and Specialty Society Relative Value Scale Update Committee (RUC) has been concerned for years about the OBL payment method
- Proposed all high-cost disposables over \$500 should be reimbursed directly from CMS by receipts from vendor
 - Remove any perverse incentive since there would no significant profit on these items
 - Removes these items from the ever-changing “budget neutrality discussions” of the CF

AMA letter to CMS on the MPFS

High-Cost Disposable Supplies
 The RUC has long recommended that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies. The RUC makes this recommendation to address the outsized impact that high-cost disposable supplies have within the current practice expense RVU methodology. The current system not only accounts for a large amount of direct practice expense for these supplies but also allocates a large amount of indirect practice expense into the PE RVU for the procedure codes that include these supplies. Because of specialty pools and how the PE formula derives the code-level indirect practice expense in part as a multiple of the code-level direct practice expense inputs, when CPT codes include a high-cost disposable supply, a larger portion of indirect practice expense is allocated to the subset of practices performing the service which is subsidized by the broader specialty and all other Medicare providers. If high cost supplies were paid separately with appropriate HCPCS codes, the indirect expense would no longer be associated with that service. The result would be that indirect PE RVUs would be redistributed throughout the specialty practice expense pool and the practice expense for all other services. **The RUC recommends that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies priced more than \$500 using appropriate HCPCS codes. The pricing of these supplies should be based on a transparent process, where items are annually reviewed and updated.**

AMA letter to CMS on the MPFS

High-Cost Disposable Supplies
 The RUC has long recommended that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies. The RUC makes this recommendation to address the outsized impact that high-cost disposable supplies have within the current practice expense RVU methodology. The current system not only accounts for a large amount of direct practice expense for these supplies but also allocates a large amount of indirect practice expense into the PE RVU for the procedure codes that include these supplies. Because of specialty pools and how the PE formula derives the code-level indirect practice expense in part as a multiple of the code-level direct practice expense inputs, when CPT codes include a high-cost disposable supply, a larger portion of indirect practice expense is allocated to the subset of practices performing the service which is subsidized by the broader specialty and all other Medicare providers. If high cost supplies were paid separately with appropriate HCPCS codes, the indirect expense would no longer be associated with that service. The result would be that indirect PE RVUs would be redistributed throughout the specialty practice expense pool and the practice expense for all other services. **The RUC recommends that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies priced more than \$500 using appropriate HCPCS codes. The pricing of these supplies should be based on a transparent process, where items are annually reviewed and updated.**

AMA letter to CMS on the MPFS

High-Cost Disposable Supplies
 The RUC has long recommended that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies. The RUC makes this recommendation to address the outsized impact that high-cost disposable supplies have within the current practice expense RVU methodology. The current system not only accounts for a large amount of direct practice expense for these supplies but also allocates a large amount of indirect practice expense into the PE RVU for the procedure codes that include these supplies. Because of specialty pools and how the PE formula derives the code-level indirect practice expense in part as a multiple of the code-level direct practice expense inputs, when CPT codes include a high-cost disposable supply, a larger portion of indirect practice expense is allocated to the subset of practices performing the service which is subsidized by the broader specialty and all other Medicare providers. If high cost supplies were paid separately with appropriate HCPCS codes, the indirect expense would no longer be associated with that service. The result would be that indirect PE RVUs would be redistributed throughout the specialty practice expense pool and the practice expense for all other services. **The RUC recommends that CMS separately identify and pay for high-cost disposable supplies priced more than \$500 using appropriate HCPCS codes. The pricing of these supplies should be based on a transparent process, where items are annually reviewed and updated.**

CMS has refused this request

OEIS Proposal

- The society proposes to create a new site of service
 - Called “OBL” similar to the current “hospital outpatient”
- Pull the overhead for OBL work out of the funds for physician reimbursement
- Currently under discussion with the agency

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 Office of Inspector General

Medicare Payments for Lower Extremity Peripheral Vascular Procedures

The use of peripheral vascular procedures in an office setting has increased among the Medicare population over the past decade. In 2010 and 2012, Medicare paid approximately \$2.4 billion for lower extremity peripheral vascular procedures in office settings. These relatively invasive procedures aim to improve blood flow when arteries narrow or become blocked because of peripheral arterial disease but are generally recommended only after patients have tried medical and exercise therapy and have trouble finding symptoms. In addition, CMS and subcommittee staff investigators have identified these procedures as candidates for targeted audits. We will analyze Medicare fee for service for peripheral vascular procedures for questionable characteristics and review the program integrity activities of OIG and its contractors to control fraud, waste, and abuse specific to these procedures. Additionally, we will assess whether these procedures complied with CMS requirements and met applicable treatment guidelines.

Assessment or Review	Agency	Title	Component	Report Number(s)	Report Issue Date (FY)
June 2014	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services	Medicare Payments for Lower Extremity Peripheral Vascular Procedures	Office of Audit Services	W-08-24-1014	2015

Summary

- Vascular procedural compensation is based on what was performed with no regard for outcomes or appropriateness
 - Policing bad behavior by physicians is not an easy fix
- The CMS methodology for OBL compensation is flawed due to annual budget neutrality / legislative changes to the conversion factor as well as a lack of review to ensure proper overhead reimbursement