Gainsharing Arrangements Proceed Slowly

BY MARY ELLEN SCHNEIDER New York Bureau

Costs—a concept known as gainsharing because of legal fears, D. McCarty Thornton, said during an audioconference on gainsharing sponsored by the Integrated Healthcare Association.

"It's clear, I think, that gainsharing is not on the fast track," said Mr. Thornton, a partner with the law firm of Sonnenschein, Nath, and Rosenthal LLP, based in Washington.

In the long run, gainsharing approaches that can save money without affecting patient care are likely to take hold, he said,

The industry is keeping an eye on two demonstrations of the gainsharing concept in the Medicare fee-forservice program that are set to begin this year. aring approachvithout affecting ike hold, he said, but first hospitals need clarification from Congress, the Health and Human Services secretary, and the Office of Inspector General about what arrangements are allowed. In 1999, the HHS Office of

HHS Office of Inspector General issued a

special advisory bulletin saying that the civil monetary penalty provision of the Social Security Act prohibits most gainsharing arrangements. Under that provision, hospitals are prohibited from making payments to physicians to reduce or limit services to Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries.

The bulletin said that these types of arrangements could also trigger the antikickback provisions of the Social Security Act, which prohibit arrangements used to influence the referral of patients in federal health care programs.

"Historically, the office has been somewhat leery of gainsharing arrangements," said Catherine A. Martin, OIG senior counsel.

Since the 1999 bulletin, the OIG has issued several advisory opinions that outline gainsharing arrangements that would be allowable. In general, in order to give the green light to a gainsharing arrangement, the OIG looks for transparency and accountability, quality of care controls, and safeguards against kickbacks, Ms. Martin said.

In order to be transparent, any actions taken to save costs need to be clearly and separately identified and fully disclosed to patients. Hospitals must also put in place controls to ensure that cost savings do not result in the inappropriate reduction of services. OIG officials also want to see ongoing monitoring of quality by the hospital and an independent outside reviewer, Ms. Martin said.

But the OIG is not the only regulator that hospitals and physicians need to consider when embarking on gainsharing arrangements, Ms. Martin said. Hospitals and physicians must also keep from running afoul of the Stark self-referral prohibitions, which fall under the purview of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. In addition, gainsharing arrangements must meet Internal Revenue Service rules, and hospitals are at risk for private lawsuits, she said.

But the industry is keeping an eye on two demonstration projects that test the gainsharing concept in the Medicare feefor-service program. Both projects are set to begin this year. The first project, which is required under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, will involve six hospitals and will focus on quality and efficiency for inpatient episodes and during the 30-day postdischarge period.

The DRA provision waives civil monetary penalty restrictions that would otherwise prohibit gainsharing.

The second project will focus on physician groups and integrated delivery systems and their affiliated hospitals. The demonstration will include inpatient episodes, as well as the pre- and posthospital care over the duration of the project. This demonstration was mandated the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003.

Participants in both demonstrations will be required to standardize quality and efficiency improvement initiatives, internal cost savings measurement, and physician payment methodology, said Lisa R. Waters, a project officer with the division of payment policy demonstrations at CMS.

TOP SPECIALIST JOURNAL IN THE FIELD OF SCHIZOPHRENIA

