
Primary Care Payer Action Collaborative

Chair



Charles Fazio, MD, MS
SVP and Medical Director,
HealthPartners, Inc.



Track 2: Operationalizing CPC+ Data Distribution and Aligning Quality Measure Sets and Reporting

Meeting 2 of 5

January 30, 2017

For technical issues, please contact Brian Silverman at: bsilverman@rippleeffect.com

Agenda

	Timeframe (ET)	Topic	Facilitators/Presenters
1	1:00 - 1:05 pm	Welcome, Meeting Overview and Guiding Principles	Charlie Fazio Michael Bailit
2	1:05 – 1:10 pm	Track 2 Kick-Off Recap	Michael Bailit
3	1:10 – 1:15 pm	Data Alignment Approaches	Michael Bailit
4	1:15 – 1:35 pm	Data Aggregation Approach: Michigan	Michael Bailit Diane Marriott Ellen Bunting
5	1:35 – 1:55 pm	Interim/Alternate Data Alignment Approach: Arkansas	Michael Bailit Sarah Wang
6	1:55 - 2:00 pm	Follow-up Activities: Feedback and Requests for Meeting #3	Michael Bailit

Antitrust Statement

PAC Participants agree that all activities are in compliance with federal and state antitrust laws. In the course of discussion, **no financial information from payer participants will be shared with other payers or the general public.**

During meetings and other activities, including all formal and informal discussions, each payer participant will refrain from discussing or exchanging information regarding any competitively sensitive topics. Such information includes, but is not limited to:

- ü PMPM
- ü Shared savings or incentive payments
- ü Information about market share, profits, margins, costs, reimbursement levels or methodologies for reimbursing providers, or terms of coverage

Primary Care Payer Action Collaborative

Guiding Principles

- ü Commit to active engagement, collaboration, and information sharing;
- ü Maintain confidentiality as part of the approach to learning and action;
- ü Agree to open, constructive, and respectful conversations;
- ü Treat other participants with grace, and demonstrate patience with mistakes and challenges along the way;
- ü Refrain from lobbying CMS, an active partner and/or fellow payers in this work; and
- ü Commit to sharing feedback with the LAN on what is or is not working in the facilitation and operations of the PAC, and support course corrections where necessary and appropriate.

CPC+ Payer Partner Collaboration Roadmap

10 Aligned Milestones



Track 2 Kickoff Recap

Participants shared their desire to support practices' use of data to improve care delivery by:

- § Providing practices with:
 - § timely, accurate, and actionable data providers will readily/easily use to understand practice patterns and care transactions and make changes
 - § network/peer comparison data that is weighted or adjusted for risk
 - § downstream data on patient hospital admissions and specialist use
 - § data identifying gaps in care that could be addressed by clinical integration/coordination
- § Ensuring data and feedback reach individual providers
- § Producing multi-payer practice reports with common content and formatting and/or availability through a common web portal
- § Aggregating multi-payer data to capture overall practice performance and reduce administrative burden on practices
- § Integrating claims and clinical data to improve data quality, utility, and timeliness
- § Increasing understanding of the value proposition represented by different referral decisions
- § Clearly communicating different data uses (e.g., practice quality improvement vs. public reporting and/or evaluation)
- § Developing ongoing, multi-lateral processes for data quality maintenance, shared learning, and governance

Track 2 Kickoff Recap

7

Participant Priorities and Experiences: Data Aggregation and Coordinated Data Sharing

§ Identified primary participant priorities related to milestone #6:

- § Coordinating payer efforts to send practices reports with common content and format
- § Aggregating payer data to produce reports for practices

§ Profiled data aggregation mechanisms:

- § Various states/regions aggregate claim data and distributes performance information to practices
- § A smaller proportion of states/regions aggregate clinical data or are planning a strategy to distribute performance information from aggregated clinical data to practices
- § Some states/regions don't have any plans to distribute any aggregated performance data to practices

§ Discussed a range of coordinated data sharing efforts and experiences with primary care practices. Heard from payers in:

- § Colorado, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island

Objectives for Meeting 2

For review and discussion

8

- ü Discuss continuum of data alignment approaches
- ü Share approaches for aggregating and distributing data to practices, in ways that are meaningful for practices
- ü Explore ideas and discuss "real-world" examples of interim or alternative steps for implementing a coordinated data alignment approach
- ü Challenge participants to share rough draft plans for data aggregation and dissemination strategy in an effort to advance data sharing across all regions

Data Alignment Approaches

✓ Aligning content/format of report to providers

- § Common report file format (e.g., Excel)
- § Common file layout
- § Common data elements

✓ Aggregating claims data or clinical data or both

Ways of Providing Data to Practices

● Sending separate but aligned reports

● Making reports accessible via a common portal

● Sending a single report to practices

● Making data available via a web portal or web-based tool

Data Aggregation Approaches

Profile of Regions/States

Region/State	Approach
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing aggregated claims data to practices via a single web portal • Payers are primarily driving and funding effort
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregating claims and clinical data from participating payers and practices through a statewide multi-payer database • Distributing data to practices through a web-based tool
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sending practices aggregated claims data • State-wide HIE
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregating claims and clinical data from participating payers and practices through HIE • Send separate cost reports to the practices
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sending practices aggregated claims and clinical data in separate reports • All-payer claims database

Data Aggregation Approaches

Live interview with colleagues in Michigan



Diane Marriott
Manager
Michigan Primary Care
Transformation

Lecturer
Department of Health
Management and Policy,
University of Michigan



Ellen Bunting
Manager
Michigan Data
Collaborative, Michigan
Medicine

Interim/Alternate Data Alignment Approaches 12

Profile of Regions/States

Region/State	Approach
Arkansas	Sending practices reports with common content and format
Oregon	Sending practices reports with common format

Interim/Alternate Data Alignment Approaches 13

Live interview with colleague from Arkansas



Sarah Wang

Manager

Medical Informatics Research
and Development

Meeting Follow-Up Activities & Feedback

14

Before Track 2 Meeting #3...

1. The LAN will:

- Ü Distribute a summary of Meeting #2, including participant ideas for interim strategies
- Ü Look for opportunities to further support payers efforts in a targeted way through future PAC and CPC+ learning activities

2. Participants will:

- Ü Share rough draft plans for data aggregation and dissemination strategy – near-term and medium-term
- Ü Incorporate priorities in this area into shared vision statements, focusing on regional approach for getting data into the hands of providers

Meeting Feedback:

- Ü How was this meeting and how can the next meeting be more effective?
- Ü Have you any requests for future meeting content?

Looking Ahead

Track 2: Sessions 3-5

Schedule	Virtual Meeting Activities
Meeting 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Live interview of a second promising practice state or region with a different data aggregation approach than discussed in Meeting #2, including but not limited to discussion of governance, vendor strategy and processes to support effective practice use of supplied data lessons learned and pitfalls to avoid• Two pre-selected participants share their rough draft plans for feedback and discussion
Meeting 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review CPC+ clinical measure set• Discuss whether the CPC+ measure set should be supplemented at the state/regional level , and if so, top opportunities to supplement that set• Review steps to create an aligned measure set• Buying Value Measure Selection Tool presentation
Meeting 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation by an organization that has created an aligned multi-payer primary care measure set• Q&A discussion regarding challenges and solutions to measure set alignment

PAC Team

Primary Points of Contact

16

Michael Bailit

mbailit@bailit-health.com

Lauren Icard

lauren.icard@us.gt.com

Candi Waller

ccwaller@mitre.org

Back Up Slides

LAN Resources on Data Infrastructure

Supplemental Resources to Those Shared in this PAC Track

- Webinar: “Building a Robust Data Infrastructure that Supports Alternative Payment Models” October 5, 2016 Available at <https://hcp-lan.org/events/11-2016-10-05/>
- White Paper: “Accelerating and Aligning Population-Based Payment Models: Data Sharing” August 8, 2016 Available at <https://hcp-lan.org/groups/pbp/ds-final-whitepaper/>
- LAN Summit Presentations:
 - “Data Infrastructure to Support APMs at Scale” April 26, 2016 Available at: <https://www.lansummit.org/spring2016/blog/sessions/6b/>
 - "Data Sharing: Accelerating and Aligning Population-Based Payment Models" April 26, 2016 Available at: <https://www.lansummit.org/spring2016/blog/sessions/11d/>