



HB 10-1332 Colorado Medical Clean Claims Transparency and Uniformity Act Task Force

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date:	November 19, 2014; noon – 2 PM MDT
Call-In Number:	1-866-740-1260; ID 8586318#
Web-Link:	https://cc.readytalk.com/r/xm06wcr6zua2&eom

I. Housekeeping Items – *Vatsala Pathy*

- a. Roll call
- b. Approve October 2014 meeting minutes (**Attachment A**)

II. Committee Reports:

- a. Specialty Society Outreach – *Alice Bynum-Gardner and Terrence Cunningham*
- b. Edit Evaluation Team – *Beth Wright, Beth Kujawski, Nancy Steinke and Wendi Healy*
 1. Draft database development summary (**Attachment B**) – **Consensus Item**
- c. Data Sustaining Repository (DSR) Committee – *Mark Painter and Barry Keene*
 1. Update from meeting with the Attorney General's office
- d. Legislative Update – *Barry Keene*
 1. Outline for 2015 legislative report (**Attachment C to be sent separately**)
 2. HHS Proposal

III. Other Business

- a. Vermont update

IV. Public Comment

Upcoming Task Force Meetings

Date(s)	Time (Mountain Time)	Meeting Type
December 17	12:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Conference Call

Draft

HB10_1332 MEDICAL CLEAN CLAIMS TRANSPARENCY AND UNIFORMITY ACT TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes
 October 22, 2014
 Call-in Number: 1-866-740-1260
 Conference ID: ID 8586318#

Attendees:

- Alice Bynum-Gardner
- Amy Hodges
- Barry Keene
- Beth Kujawski
- Beth Provost
- Beth Wright
- Dee Cole
- Doug Moeller, MD
- Kathy McCreary
- Marianne Fink
- Marilyn Rissmiller, CC
- Mark Painter, CC
- Nancy Steinke
- Wendi Healy

Staff :

- Connor Holzkamp, Admin
- Vatsala Pathy, Project Manager

Public:

- Carrie Winter (AANEM)
- David Hitzeman (AOA)
- Diane Hayek (ACR)
- David Kanter (AAP)
- David Mckenzie (ACEP)
- Heather McComas (AMA)
- Kelly Macnee (GMCB)
- Ruth Aponte (Aponte Public Affairs)
- Susan Crews (AUA)
- Todd Klemp (CAP)

Meeting**Objective (s):**

See Agenda

Key:

-TF = Task Force
 -TFM = Task
 Force Member
 -CC = Co-Chair



October 22, 2014

WELCOMING REMARKS & ROLL CALL:

Housekeeping Items:

- Minutes from September Task Force meeting were accepted with no changes.
- Barry provided an update on the status of the Task Force's proposal to the Department of Health and Human Services:
 - The Task Force received feedback from HHS stating that the proposal had been identified as an "unsolicited proposal," and that it would need to be reformatted according to the requirements listed in FAR Subpart 15.6, which addresses the requirements of an unsolicited proposal.
 - The response letter from HHS also stated that the Task Force's proposal would need to be divided into two separately written proposals:
 1. Performance metrics
 2. Funding the first year
 - Barry reported that he had worked with Vatsala/Connor to re-draft the proposal to fit the requirements of an unsolicited proposal to measure the effect of uniform claim edits in 2015 through 2018. In doing this, it became apparent that the Task Force must identify a third party administrator to make these performance measurements and the data analytics associated with them. Barry continues to meet with Amy Downs of the Colorado Health Institute to identify a third party administrator to measure the performance of a standardized set of edits.

Action Item: Barry continues to meet with Amy Downs of the Colorado Health Institute regarding the Task Force’s proposal to measure the impact of a standardized set of edits, and will report back to the group with more information next month.

SPECIALTY SOCIETY OUTREACH – Alice Bynum-Gardner and Terry Cunningham

- The Specialty Society continues its charge to act as the “liaison between the task force and the AMA’s Federation of Medicine, which includes 122 national specialty societies and 50 state medical societies in order to assess if public code edit and payment policy libraries meet the needs of national medical societies and state medical associations by reaching out and obtaining feedback from these groups.” The committee reported that the medical specialty societies remain on alert for the forthcoming edit review process.

EDIT EVALUATION TEAM—Beth Wright, Nancy Steinke, Beth Kujawski and Wendi Healy

- The co-chairs for the Edit Evaluation Team have been meeting to develop the on-going process that will be used to develop and maintain the edit set, and spent the majority of the last two days refining a draft document which explains this process.
 - During this two day meeting, the co-chairs walked through the entire process, using real data that had been submitted by a supplier/loaded into the database by Bishop. The co-chairs reported that this had been a very useful exercise, and the group was able to expose several gaps in the process that needed to be addressed.
 - The exercise also helped the group explore the mechanics of the database, testing the various functions of the software and identifying additional functionality that would need to be built-in by Bishop.

Action Item: The Edit Evaluation Team will bring a draft database development document to the full Task Force for consensus next month. This document will outline the process that will be used to create/maintain the common edit set.

DATA SUSTAINING REPOSITORY COMMITTEE – Mark Painter and Barry Keene

- Barry reported that the DSR Committee has been awaiting feedback from the Attorney General’s (AG) office on the committee’s revised proposal for a permanent entity that will sustain the work of the Task Force. The DSR will resume working on the proposal for a permanent entity after hearing back from the AG.

Action Item: Barry, Marilyn, Mark and Vatsala will be meeting with the Attorney General’s office in November, and report back to the Task Force next month.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Ongoing items:
 - The Task Force continues discussions with Bishop Enterprises Corporation regarding phase two of the contract to develop and maintain the database. Once Bishop provides Mark Painter with a contract proposal, it will be brought to the full Task Force for consideration.
 - The Task Force will work with the AMA to discuss how to reformat the CPT™ data so that it can be loaded into the database.
 - The Task Force is required to submit a report to the state legislature by December of 2014. Staff will be working to develop this report in the coming months.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

<Meeting Adjourned>

DATABASE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS DECISION-MAKING SUMMARY

The Database Development Process document supplies detailed instructions for use by the data analytic subcontractor, as well as the task force's Edit Evaluation Team, in establishing the Colorado Common Edit Set. The task force is being provided with a copy of the Database Development Process document for information, comment or questions.

This Summary is being provided to task force members for discussion and consensus. The Summary document describes the decision-making process that will be used in the evaluation of edits as outlined within the full Database Development Process document. As edits are loaded into the database the following process will be utilized:

Legend – in this document the term ADDED means that the edit is loaded into the database for the review by the Edit Evaluation Team. The term ACCEPTED means the edit that was ADDED into the database has gone through the task force and/or Edit Evaluation Team process and a decision has been made to include it into the COMMON EDIT set.

Phase One – Load Data into Database

- Data from Public sources (as defined in the legislation) that do not conflict with the current data are ACCEPTED into the database. Note: Data ACCEPTED into the database is to be considered the ultimate source, therefore any submitted data that conflicts with an edit in the existing database will be treated as a VARIANCE regardless of current database supplier/source and subject to processes in Phase 2.
 - Conflicts can exist with Public sources when data containing the same procedure code and/or code pair has a variation in any other field (e.g., reverse order bundling edit), or the code/code pair edit has been previously evaluated and rejected by the Edit Evaluation Team and it is subsequently resubmitted.
 - Data from Public sources may change and/or may conflict with other supplier data within the database. Data changes attributed to the same source whether it is submitted by the same supplier or not will be treated as VARIANCE and subject to processes in Phase 2.
- Data from other sources (e.g., vendors, health plans) will be blinded before evaluation by the task force/Edit Evaluation Team. All data that does not conflict with the existing database AND is properly sourced (to one of the public sources identified in the legislation) will be ADDED into the database, and subject to processes in Phase 2.
 - Data from other sources may change and/or may conflict with other supplier data within the database. Data changes attributed to the same source whether it is submitted by the same supplier or not will be treated as VARIANCE and subject to processes in Phase 2.

- Data that is not tied to current procedure codes within the existing database will be REJECTED.
- Reports of the VARIANCES, ACCEPTED, ADDED, REJECTED edits will be generated for use by the Edit Evaluation Team.

Phase Two – Analysis and Query – this phase of processing will include both analysis that is automated and analysis that is directed through automated and manual intervention according to governance protocols developed by the CCCTF.

- Data from any Supplier (not considered a Source) that is properly Sourced, Formatted and Valid for the dates the edit will be effective are compared to existing Common Edit set (database) and if the edit does not conflict with a previously loaded or rejected edit the edit is loaded into Common Edit set. ADDED
- Data that is formatted correctly but does not have a proper Source or is not Valid for the effective dates is returned to the supplier with reason. RETURNED
- Data that is not formatted correctly is returned to supplier. RETURNED
- Data from any supplier that is properly Sourced, Formatted and Valid for the dates the edit will be effective is compared to the Common Edit set. If a newly supplied edit is in conflict with any existing edit or an edit that has been previously REJECTED or REVISED by the TF will be considered a VARIANCE and treated as such.
- Data that is ACCEPTED into the database or ADDED in the Phase One Load of Data that is attributed to an accepted source is immediately sent to the Source (as a list of edits) for verification.
 - The Edit Evaluation Team will not review ADDED edits that are sent to a Source until and unless edit is returned to TF as a REJECT with reason or labeled as VARIANCE and subject to VARIANCE protocol established by TF Policy below.
 - ADDED edits sent to an attributed source will be handled as follows:
 - If the attributed source does not respond after 60 days, the ADDED edits will automatically be changed to ACCEPTED in the database with the annotation of “no response from attributed source”.
 - Edits returned by the attributed source with an indicator of ACCEPTED will be changed to ACCEPTED in the database without review by the TF. It will be annotated “based on attributed source review”.
 - Edits returned by the attributed source with an indicator of REJECT with substantiating rationale will be changed to VARIANCE and subject to VARIANCE protocol established by TF Policy.
 - If the ADDED edit is attributed to a Public Source (e.g. CMS) the edit will be changed from ADDED to VARIANCE and subject to VARIANCE protocol established by TF Policy below.
- The Edit Evaluation Team will review Public Source (e.g. CMS) edits labeled VARIANCE using the following VARIANCE protocol:
 - Edit Evaluation Team will have 45 days to review for source accuracy and discuss as a group:

- Team members will review edits assigned and document their decision to accept, revise, reject, or research edit.
 - Edit Evaluation Team will review individual team members preliminary decisions and:
 - If there is consensus among the Edit Team it is ACCEPTED (retain edit), REJECTED or REVISED based on Team discussion. **OR**
 - If there is no consensus, it goes to TF for resolution.
- The Edit Evaluation Team will review supplier edits attributed to an accepted Source that have been labeled VARIANCE using the following VARIANCE protocol:
 - The Edit Evaluation Team will have 45 days to review edits labeled VARIANCE.
 - Team members will review edits assigned and document their decision to accept, revise, reject, or research edit.
 - Edit Evaluation Team will review individual team members preliminary decisions and:
 - If there is consensus it is ACCEPTED (retain edit), REJECTED or REVISED based on Team discussion. **OR**
 - If there is no consensus, it goes to TF for resolution.
- The Task Force will review:
 - Informational report of ACCEPTED, REJECTED, and REVISED edits.
 - Review and make final decisions on non-consensus edits presented by Edit Evaluation Team.
 - Final decision (add, revise, delete) and rationale will be documented and Co-chair will communicate actions to be taken by the data analytic subcontractor.
 - Appropriate notifications will be sent to suppliers and attributed sources as necessary.