

---

# HEALTH PLAN WEEK

---

## Streamlining Provider Data Management Could Save Billions...but Is It Possible?

For health insurance companies, an accurate, easy-to-update standardized database for network provider data is the Holy Grail. Along with being a major source of frustration for members, inaccurate provider information negatively impacts claims processing, provider credentialing and the ability to ensure compliance with network adequacy rules. It also can create obstacles for providers that want to create a value-based benefit approach.

Collectively, hospitals, doctors and health insurers spend more than \$2.1 billion a year on inefficient and redundant tasks aimed at ensuring the accuracy of provider data — about two-thirds of that cost is incurred by insurance carriers, according to an estimate from CAQH, a non-profit alliance of health plans and trade associations that also works with providers and their trade groups. But maintaining vast amounts of ever-fluctuating data, and ensuring its accuracy, is critical for carriers when performing essential business functions.

The costs are so high because health insurers have very few trusted sources of high-quality provider information. And that causes disparate efforts to gather information. It also creates a variety of approaches and expectations, explains Atul Pathiyal, managing director of CAQH Solutions. The biggest issue to overcome is building consensus and creating a shared vision across the industry, he says.

The provider community has viewed data collection as burdensome because historically they had to submit nearly identical information to multiple health plans through a variety of formats. And they are regularly asked to update it, adds CAQH Executive Director Robin Thomashauer.

Provider data management encompasses a health plan's supply chain of physicians, hospitals and care providers. To effectively manage their provider relationships, health insurers rely on credentialing data, contracting information, practice profiles and information about dispute resolution. But because no central database exists to house such information, each health plan maintains its own unique database. And each physician and hospital has its own way of contributing information, which increases administrative costs on both sides, explains Robert Booz, director of Healthcare IT & Initiatives at the

University of Connecticut School of Business. He points to one large carrier that has more than 1,500 employees dedicated solely to provider-data management issues. "It's a significant, but often underemphasized problem for carriers. It's the supply chain for a health plan, and if you mess it up, you are in deep trouble," he says.

Historically, provider directories have never been entirely accurate, and they never really had to be. In the wholesale world, the insurer sold directly to an employer's human resources department. If an employee complained that a provider wasn't in network, the human resources department would ask that that provider be added to the network, or give the employee other options. But directories have come under scrutiny from state and federal regulators, particularly as insurance carriers have trimmed provider networks to keep premiums in check. A spotlight was shined on the problem in 2014 when carriers began selling individual coverage through public exchanges. As those consumers — along with Medicaid managed care and Medicare Advantage beneficiaries — became more responsible for their health care decisions, provider networks became an important tool for evaluating coverage options.

This month, CMS announced results from the first phase of its directory accuracy pilot. Of the 54 Medicare Advantage organizations whose online provider directories were reviewed, 21 received letters warning that if they fail to correct the deficiencies, they could be subject to enforcement actions such as fines, *HPW's* sister publication *Medicare Advantage News* reported Jan. 26.

### CAQH Envisions Road Map

Provider data is an issue that CAQH has been working on for the past 15 years. At its 2016 Provider Data Summit last September, CAQH began sketching out a "road map" that outlines the organization's vision for a standardized and accurate set of data that carriers need from providers.

To remove the burden for providers, requests for information need to be easy to complete, and the format must be consistent across all carriers. "Building up that handshake between providers and health plans around data quality is a first step," says Pathiyal. "Providers and

health plans need to develop a shared understanding of what is high quality data and their respective roles in pursuing the goal.”

CAQH is now convening a task force to begin building a roadmap to harmonize existing data sets, create a universal standard data set and build consensus thresholds for quality.

### Asking the Right Questions Is Key

Availity, a health care information technology company that serves health plans and providers, began looking into provider data management solutions about two years ago, says Mark Martin, director of payer solutions and provider data management. “Getting the right information to the right person at the right time is hindered

when you are dealing with provider data that is often old and stale,” he says.

Provider information is continually changing, and administrative staffs can become overwhelmed by constant requests from carriers. Availity estimates a typical physician has contracts with between 15 and 25 health plans. And each carrier has different questions and unique ways of accepting information. After receiving updated information from a provider, an insurance company rep might call to verify that information. “Do it 15 or 25 times for the same information, and you see what a huge burden it is for providers,” says Martin, adding that providers sometimes don’t know how to accurately answer questions about their own businesses.

## AHIP Pilot Identifies Provider Directory Challenges

Last spring, trade group America’s Health Insurance Plans (AHIP) launched a 12-insurer, three-state pilot program to identify ways to improve the accuracy of provider directories and enhance collaboration with their provider networks. The six-month pilot, which ended in September, offered some insight into how the processes of updating directory information can be made less daunting to providers and more useful to consumers.

Provider directories have come under increased scrutiny at the federal and state level for lacking accurate information, which leaves consumers in the dark about which providers are actually available when seeking in-network care.

Availity, one of two information technology firms that participated in the program, worked with five carriers in Florida. A workflow created by the company whittled more than 700 data elements down to about 40 that were important for the directories. Consolidated information from each of the five carriers was compiled and used to populate a record for providers throughout the state. Providers were allowed to validate and update the record in real time, 24 hours a day, says Mark Martin, director of payer solutions and provider data management at Availity. Each time a provider updated a record, the carriers moved closer to having the same record for that provider. While he says he was pleased with the progress, he admits “this isn’t going to be magic overnight where databases automatically get in sync. It takes time,” he says.

Rather than receiving requests or inquiries from multiple health plans, the pilot was designed to facili-

tate one primary point of contact for providers. The results are being shared with federal and state policymakers, insurance commissioners, Medicaid directors and others, AHIP spokesperson Kristine Grow tells AIS Health. Health plans will use the findings to inform their own plans for improvement. Here’s a look at some of the key findings:

- ◆ **Accurate data depends on a strong partnership** between doctors and health plans. Health plans depend on doctors to submit accurate and up-to-date information, and doctors depend on insurers to educate them on how to keep the information updated.
- ◆ **Standard formats help make it easier for doctors** to submit and update information.
- ◆ **No one channel works best for all.** Doctors have different preferences (e.g., phone, email, electronic portal, fax) when it comes to how they submit information.
- ◆ **Data management solutions can help.** Vendors are working on solutions that show promise. More work needs to be done to encourage effective use of these solutions by providers and plans, says Grow.

The pilot took place in California, Florida and Indiana. Participating AHIP members were Anthem, Inc. (California and Indiana), AvMed (Florida), Blue Shield of California, Cigna Corp. (Florida), Florida Blue, Health Net, Inc. (California), Humana Inc. (California, Indiana and Florida), L.A. Care Health Plan (California), Molina Healthcare of California, SCAN Health Plan (California), WellCare Health Plans, Inc. (Florida) and Western Health Advantage (California).

“You won’t get the right information unless you get really good at asking the question correctly.”

But creating a standardized format is no easy feat (see box). In provider data management, there can be a variety of contexts for identical data. Asking where a doctor performs services might seem like a straightforward question. But a doctor might see only Medicare patients on Mondays at a downtown office, and might see Medicaid patients on Tuesdays and Thursdays at another office. And maybe two of a doctor’s three offices aren’t accepting new patients.

“The permutations start to get really ugly really fast,” says Booz. Health plans, he says, need to be better at managing the information, and the industry has to come up with a common format that providers can use to submit and update information, he adds.

### **Feds, States Add Regs**

In October 2015, California Gov. Jerry Brown (D) signed legislation (SB137) that required the Dept. of Managed Health Care (DMHC) and the Dept. of Insurance to develop provider directory standards. Carriers now must update directories every other week, rather than 90 days as CMS requires. Both carriers and providers face penalties if directories are inaccurate or incomplete.

Carriers that sell coverage in California and in other states must comply with federal in addition to state regulations. That can result in carriers maintaining multiple parallel processes that require the collection and posting of data in different formats and on different timelines.

The California Association of Health Plans lobbied for providers to be held accountable for their role in ensuring directory accuracy. Unlike in federal law, California health plans have a stick that allows them to hold onto a payment if the provider fail to update the information, says Martin. Texas also enacted such rules, but they aren’t as strong as California’s. Other states are considering similar action.

California also is attempting to create a centralized repository for all provider data, which in theory would let anyone log onto a state-run website and find information about network doctors and hospitals without having to go to the health plan.

See CAQH’s whitepaper, “Defining the Provider Data Dilemma: Challenges, Opportunities and Call for Industry Collaboration,” at <http://tinyurl.com/jv3dnr3>.

Contact Leslie Ward for Thomashauer and Pathiyal at [lward@caqh.org](mailto:lward@caqh.org), Martin at [mark.martin@availability.com](mailto:mark.martin@availability.com) and Booz at [robert.booz@uconn.edu](mailto:robert.booz@uconn.edu). ✧