Draft Report on the Plan Year 2018 Recommendations
For Network Adequacy Standards

Presented by:
The Network Adequacy Advisory Council

To:
Barbara Richardson
Commissioner of Insurance
Nevada Division of Insurance

Prepared by:
Deborah Loesch-Griffin, Ph.D.
NAAC Facilitator

August 17, 2016

DRAFT
Network Adequacy Standards for Plan Year 2018

Overview of the NAAC Recommendations Process. This section includes a description of the:

1) ~~commencement~~ Commencement of the Network Adequacy Advisory Council (Council or NAAC)~~;~~
2) ~~process~~ Process of NAAC meetings~~;~~
3) ~~timeline~~ Timeline and significant discussions made at each of the five meetings~~.~~

The NAAC is comprised of nine individuals representing--consumers across Nevada, providers of health care services, and health insurance carriers. The Council met first on June 15, 2016 as dictated by regulation RO49-14 and continued to meet through September 12, 2016, ~~at which point they finalized~~to finalize the recommendations for Plan Year 2018. ~~These are standards t~~The Council recommends these standards to achieve network adequacy for individual and small employer group health benefit plans.

At the June 15, 2016 meeting the Council created ~~a~~ its vision for ~~what it hoped to achieve during~~ the 2016 sessions. The vision ~~was~~is:

- Standards are pragmatic, achievable and meaningful.

In addition, the Council wanted to ensure that conditions were created that would:

1) ~~m~~Maximize access to care and insurance for all consumers~~;~~
2) ~~ensure~~ Ensure that services were affordable across the state~~; and~~
3) ~~c~~Costs were contained for providers offering products to consumers~~.~~

The data that the DOI ~~was~~ were able to provide the Council assisted the Council to: 1) make some recommendations that aligned with its vision and 2) consider what the implications of such recommendations might be on the three conditions it had established as requisites for achieving its vision. It should be noted that the DOI was unable to provide some of the data ~~that was~~ requested ~~was not able to be provided to~~by the Council. This will be discussed more fully in the section following the recommended standards.

A total of five public meetings were conducted. The result of these meetings is contained in this Report that will be submitted to the Commissioner of Insurance on September 15, 2016.[1]

Comment [D1]: Add appendix with minutes

[1] The video recordings of the meetings and supporting materials are available on the Division website at http://doi.nv.gov/Insurers/Life_and_Health/Network_Adequacy_Advisory_Council/. Included in the Appendix of this Report are the minutes of each meeting.

June 15th – At this ~~This~~ meeting , the Council laid out the vision and process ~~the Council would adhere to in~~for subsequent sessions, using a workshop format. The Council established agreements for ~~how it would make decisions~~decision-making, communicatione~~,~~ and consideration of multiple perspectives, from both within the Council and ~~from~~ the public.

July 22nd –At ~~T~~this meeting, the Council reviewed the data requested. The Council generated a series of nine recommendations and/or considerations and ~~held a discussion regarding~~discussed the value, feasibility and practicality of each ~~of these~~.

August 1st –~~T~~ At this meeting, the DOI presented the Council ~~was presented~~ with additional findings from ~~data~~ analyses requested at the July 22nd meeting. The Council ~~and~~ considered the impact of this information on its nine recommendations ~~it had put forth with this new information~~. ~~The Council was able to use and reflect on the findings~~Based on new information, the Council ~~to~~ eliminated some of the earlier recommendations ~~it had made earlier~~.

August 17th – At ~~T~~this meeting, the DOI presented the Council ~~was presented~~ with additional findings from data analyses requested at the August 1st meeting and the Council reconsidered the recommendations ~~it had put forth with~~given this new information. The Council reviewed and revised the draft of this Report.

September 12th – At this meeting, the Council created and approved the final Report.

Council's Recommendation for Plan Year 2018.

The Council recommends the following:[2]

1. Add pediatrics as a separate provider category with modification to time/distance criteria: changing METRO to 25 minutes/15 miles and CEAC to 105 minutes/90 miles.

It is important to note that as part of the process, NAAC members ~~were the Council~~are ~~il is well~~ aware that while the plan year 2017 standards~~, while they~~ reference ~~some~~ Nevada regulations/~~-~~laws, they are largely the requirements of CMS. These have not yet been implemented nor has data been collected to determine whether this level of network adequacy can be met and what the consequences of delivering services under the plan year 2017 standards will yield. That said, if ~~neither of~~ the Council's ~~two~~ recommendation~~s~~ meets with ~~its~~ approval, the Council discussed retaining the standards as presented for 2017 and to continue to meet

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

[2] The recommendation was based on a majority vote

over the course of the next year as new data and new methodology are explored to determine what additional standards can be imposed.

Comment [NH2]: I tried to edit this paragraph but I'm not sure what it's trying to say.

Formatted: Highlight

2017 Network Adequacy Template

	Specialty		Metro		Micro		Rural		CEAC	
		Specialty Codes	Max Time (Mins)	Max Distance (Miles)	Max Time (Mins)	Max Distance (Miles)	Max Time (Mins)	Max Distance (Miles)	Max Time (Mins)	Max Distance (Miles)
Provider	Primary Care	001,002,003,005, & 006	15	10	30	20	40	30	70	60
	Endocrinology	12	60	40	100	75	110	90	145	130
	Infectious Diseases	17	60	40	100	75	110	90	145	130
	Mental Health	029, 102, & 103	45	30	60	45	75	60	110	100
	Oncology - Medical/Surgical	21	45	30	60	45	75	60	110	100
	Oncology - Radiation/Radiology	22	60	40	100	75	110	90	145	130
	Rheumatology	31	60	40	100	75	110	90	145	130
	Pediatrics	*101*	*25*	*15*	*30*	*20*	*40*	*30*	*105*	*90*
Facility	Hospitals	040 & 043	45	30	80	60	75	60	110	100
Facility	Outpatient Dialysis	44	45	30	80	60	90	75	125	110

Rationale and Criteria for Recommended Standards. The recommendations above are based on ~~extensive~~ discussion by the Council related to ~~ww~~whether ~~these~~ additional standards would have a positive impact on:

- ~~n~~Network adequacy~~,~~
- ~~c~~Consumer access to high quality health services~~,~~
- ~~a~~Affordability and the capacity of carriers to offer products to both individuals and small groups~~, an~~
- ~~d wherever possible, e~~Expan~~d~~sion of the number of insured

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

~~.~~ Going forward, the Council agrees to maintain service areas as the geographic criteria for establishing network adequacy. County level data revealed that in many counties, network adequacy standards could not be met, based on the CMS floor for required provider categories and facilities. Further, the risk of carriers dropping coverage for a particular county, or withdrawing products from consumers was too great at this time to warrant a county level criteria for network adequacy.

The rationale for including pediatric services as a stand-alone category is based on state statute which requires insurance policies and plans to provide an option of coverage for screening and treatment of autism and the importance of pediatrics as a stand-alone category and an essential provider of primary care. The Council perceived that meeting this law would be challenging without a parallel standard to insure pediatricians are made available to consumers. Current time and distance criteria, presented by DOI staff, indicated that in two service areas~~,~~ pediatrics did not meet these requirements. Therefore, the Council agrees that along with ~~this~~ the recommendation to include it as a stand-alone category, it will also adjust the time/distance criteria to the level where networks in all four service areas can meet the requirement, but it does not materially affect access.

Future Considerations. Throughout the meetings, the Council brought up data and definitional issues. The primary ~~consideration regarding~~concern with existing data is that it is inadequate for calculating the true impact of ~~the Council's~~ decisions to improve network adequacy ~~on the key conditions the Council believes must be in place to ensure improvements don't~~ and not have unintended negative consequences. ~~Specific c~~Considerations for future action were ~~recommended to adequately~~discussed to prepare the Council ~~and give it~~with a better understanding of what additional standards might be added in 2019 and beyond. The timeframe for making recommendations for plan year 2018 was ~~significantly restricted~~shortened, therefore the members~~, first and foremost,~~ believe ~~that~~ it is critical to establish an ongoing meeting schedule ~~where it is ready~~ to respond to ~~new~~ CMS changes as information becomes available. In addition, the following considerations were put forth:

1) Explore whether data can be collected from other state departments or sources or added as categories of information to existing network submission forms for understanding what access/adequacy issues are at stake:

   a. Wait time
   b. Provider/enrollee ratios (determining what provider categories in addition to primary care would be a meaningful addition)
2) Identify and operationalize opportunities for providers to systematically report on data useful to the Council.
3) Look at existing network adequacy across the state for all the different requirements imposed by different regulatory bodies (i.e., Medicaid/Medicare/ fully insured non-ACA products, etc.).
4) Advocate for workforce development in critical provider categories required for network adequacy.
5) Examine the impact of Network Adequacy regulations on the insurance market place for 2018 and beyond.
6) Work toward a data collection system that more adequately represents provider counts based on the Full-Time Equivalent of employed staff (FTE) or their actual availability at a given site; currently the count is one provider per site regardless of how available they are to that site and its consumer base (FTE or days/week).
7) Improve data on provider availability on open/closed panels.
8) Further explore network adequacy as it pertains to ECP's.
9) Explore further network adequacy of mental health and the necessity of separating out psychiatrists from other mental health professionals.
10) Request that the DOI provide a description of the existing data collected, their definitions, and how they are validated, if at all. Present this information at the first meeting of the 2019 plan year.