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Chairman Hatch, Ranking Member Wyden, and members of the Committee, thank you for the
invitation and the opportunity to discuss the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services’
(CMS’s) work to implement the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015
(MACRA). We greatly appreciate your leadership in passing this important law, which provides
a new opportunity for CMS to partner with physicians and clinicians to support quality
improvement and develop new payment models to further our nation’s shared goals of a health
care system that achieves better care, smarter spending, and healthier people and puts
empowered and engaged consumers at the center of their care. As we take our initial steps to
implement this important law, we have and will continue to work closely with you and listen to
the physicians and clinicians providing care to Medicare beneficiaries, with the goal of creating a
new payment program that is focused on the needs of patients and responsive to the day-to-day
challenges and opportunities within physician practices. As we continue to transform the
Medicare program, we are working to move beyond “one size fits all” measurements to an
approach that recognizes and supports the diversity of medical practices that serve Medicare
beneficiaries and offers multiple paths to value-driven care. To inform this effort, CMS is
meeting with practicing physicians across the country, including those in big practices and small
practices, specialists and primary care providers, and those in new payment models and in
traditional fee-for-service.

CMS is committed to finding ways, to deliver better care at lower costs. Today, over 55 million
Americans are covered by Medicare¹ — and 10,000 become eligible for Medicare every day.²
For most of the past fifty years, Medicare was primarily a fee-for-service payment system that
paid health care providers based on the volume of services they delivered. In the last few years,

28.html
² http://www.medpac.gov/documents/reports/chapter-2-the-next-generation-of-medicare-beneficiaries-(june-2015-
report).pdf?sfvrsn=0
we have made tremendous progress to transform our nation’s health care system into one that works better for everyone and rewards value over volume. Key to this effort is changing how we pay physicians and other clinicians, so they can focus on the quality of care they give, and not the quantity of services they deliver or order. Already, we estimate that 30 percent of traditional Medicare payments are tied to alternative payment models (APMs). Generally speaking, an APM is a model that puts the outcome of the patient at the center and holds care teams accountable for the quality and cost of the care they deliver to a population of patients by providing a financial incentive to coordinate care for their patients. This can help patients receive the clinically appropriate care for their conditions and reduces avoidable hospitalizations, emergency department visits, adverse medication interactions, and other problems caused by inappropriate care or siloed care. Hospital and physician participation in APMs is a major milestone in the continued effort towards improving quality and care coordination. We expect this progress to continue, and we are on track to meet our goal of tying 50 percent of traditional Medicare payments to APMs by 2018 – especially in light of MACRA.

The enactment of MACRA, which replaced the Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula with a more consistent way for paying physicians and other clinicians, provided new tools to modernize Medicare and simplify quality programs and payments for these professionals. Currently, Medicare measures the value and quality of care provided by physicians and other clinicians through a patchwork of programs. Some clinicians are part of APMs such as Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs), the Comprehensive Primary Care Initiative, and the Bundled Payments for Care Improvement Initiative—and most participate in programs such as the Physician Quality Reporting System, Physician Value-based Payment Modifier (“Value Modifier Program”), and the Medicare Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Program. Thanks to Congress, MACRA streamlined these various programs into a single framework where clinicians have the opportunity to be paid more for providing better value and better care for their patients. CMS has proposed to implement these changes through the unified framework called the Quality Payment Program.

The Quality Payment Program gives physicians and clinicians the flexibility to participate in one of two paths. First, the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) streamlines three existing
CMS programs into a single, simplified program with lower reporting burden and new flexibility in the way clinicians are measured on performance. MIPS allows Medicare clinicians to be paid for providing high value care through success in four interrelated performance categories: Quality, Advancing Care Information, Clinical Practice Improvement Activities, and Cost.

For physicians and clinicians who take a further step towards care transformation, the Quality Payment Program rewards physicians and clinicians through a second path, participation in Advanced APMs. Under Advanced APMs, physicians and clinicians would accept more than a nominal amount of risk for providing coordinated, high-quality care for a set portion of their practice, such as through Tracks 2 and 3 of the Medicare Shared Savings Program and the Next Generation ACO model.

Since the enactment of MACRA a little over a year ago, CMS has been developing our approach toward implementation of the new law, and on April 27, 2016, CMS issued a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM).³ In our efforts to draft a proposal that would be simpler and meaningful for physicians and clinicians, we reached out and listened to over 6,000 stakeholders before we published the proposed rule, including state medical societies, physician groups, consumer groups, and federal partners. We asked for comments⁴ from the stakeholder community on key topics related to how to develop the measurements, scoring, and public reporting for the Quality Payment Program. We conducted multi-day workshops and visited with physicians in their communities individually and in groups to understand how the changes we considered may positively impact care and how to avoid unintended consequences. Just as stakeholder input has been instrumental in the development of the proposed rule, the feedback we have received will be essential in our development of final regulations. Since proposing the rule, CMS has conducted extensive outreach to providers and other stakeholders to ensure that we get their feedback on our proposal. These efforts have stretched across the country and have been both large and small, with more than 200 outreach events. We have also hosted numerous webinars that have seen more than 64,000 participants. We received 3,875 comments during the public
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comment period. We are currently reviewing the comments and feedback we received and expect to issue final rulemaking after this review is complete.

The input we have received from stakeholders throughout the process has been very valuable: physicians and clinicians want support for a care system that focuses on quality, but too many unaligned quality programs, measures, and technology requirements can hinder their best efforts to accomplish these goals. Based on what we learned, our approach to implementation has been guided by four principles. First, patients are, and must remain, the key focus. Financial incentives should work in the background to support physician and clinician efforts to provide high quality services, and the needs of the patient, not measurements, need to be the focus of our approach. Second, success will come from adopting approaches that can be driven by the physician practice. Quality measurement needs to accurately reflect the needs of a diverse range of patient populations and practice types and give physicians and other clinicians the opportunity to select elements of the program and measures that are right for their practice. Third, in everything we do, we must strive to make care delivery as simple as possible, with more support for collaboration and communication through delivery system reform. Fourth and finally, we must focus on the unique concerns of small independent practices, as well as rural practices and practices in underserved areas.

We relied heavily on stakeholder input we received over the last year to inform our proposal of a scoring methodology for MIPS that aims to improve upon and streamline existing measures in the quality, cost, and advancing care information categories, which are based in part upon current CMS programs. In particular, we have been working side-by-side with the physician and consumer communities to address needs and concerns about the Medicare EHR Incentive Program, often known as Meaningful Use for physicians, as we transition it to the Advancing Care Information category in MIPS. The new approach heightens focus on the patient, increases flexibility, reduces burden, and concentrates on aspects of health information technology, such as health information exchange, that are critical for delivery system reform and improving patient outcomes. We also used this feedback when proposing the new clinical practice improvement activities category, which the statute created. When developing the proposed activities for this
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category, we listened closely to specialty societies and associations when creating options to allow clinicians to select activities that match their practices’ goals.

While we expect that most clinicians will participate in MIPS for the first years of the Quality Payment Program, we will continuously search for opportunities to expand and refine our portfolio of payment models in order to maximize the number of physicians and other clinicians who have the opportunity to participate in Advanced APMs. It is our intent to allow as much flexibility as possible for clinicians to switch between MIPS and participation in Advanced APMs based on what works best for them and their patients. The proposed rule is the latest step in our efforts to work in concert with stakeholders on the front-line of care delivery to draw upon their expertise and incorporate their input into the policies for the Quality Payment Program so that together, we can achieve the aim of the law.

**Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM)**

In our proposed rule, we provide details and descriptions of the proposed policies that will allow us to implement the important new provider payment provisions included in MACRA.

*Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS)*

Currently, Medicare measures physicians and other clinicians on how they provide quality care and reduce costs through a patchwork of programs, with clinicians reporting through some combination of the Physician Quality Reporting System, the Value Modifier Program, and the Medicare EHR Incentive Program. Through the law, Congress streamlined and improved these reporting programs into the Merit-based Incentive Payment System. Under MIPS, eligible physicians and clinicians will report their performance under four categories and will receive a payment adjustment based on their overall performance, or composite performance score.

Consistent with the goals of the law, the proposed rule would improve the relevance of Medicare’s value and quality-based payments and increase clinician flexibility by allowing clinicians to choose measures and activities appropriate to the type of care they provide. Under our proposed rule, performance measurement under the new program for physicians and other eligible clinicians would begin in 2017, with payments based on those measures beginning in
2019. MIPS allows Medicare clinicians to be paid for providing high quality, efficient care through success in four performance categories:

1. **Quality (50 percent of total score in year 1; replaces the Physician Quality Reporting System and the quality component of the Value Modifier Program):** Clinicians would choose to report six measures versus the nine measures currently required under the Physician Quality Reporting System. This category gives clinicians reporting options to choose from to accommodate differences in specialty and practices.

2. **Advancing Care Information (25 percent of total score in year 1; replaces the Medicare EHR Incentive Program for physicians, also known as “Meaningful Use”):** Clinicians would choose to report customizable measures that reflect how they use health information technology in their day-to-day practice, with a particular emphasis on interoperability and secure information exchange. Unlike the existing Meaningful Use program, this category would not require quality reporting, which would be assessed within the Quality category.

3. **Clinical Practice Improvement Activities (15 percent of total score in year 1):** Clinicians would be rewarded for clinical practice improvement activities such as activities focused on care coordination, beneficiary engagement, and patient safety. Clinicians may select activities that match their practices’ goals from a list of more than 90 options. In addition, clinicians would receive credit in this category for participating in APMs and in Patient-Centered Medical Homes.

4. **Cost (10 percent of total score in year 1; replaces the cost component of the Value Modifier Program, also known as Resource Use):** The score would be based on Medicare claims and require no reporting by physicians or other clinicians. This category would integrate more than 40 episode-specific measures to account for differences among specialties.

The law requires MIPS to be budget neutral. Therefore, physicians’ and clinicians’ MIPS scores would be used to compute a positive, negative, or neutral adjustment to their Medicare Part B payments. In the first year, depending on the variation of MIPS scores, adjustments are calculated so that negative adjustments can be no more than 4 percent, and positive adjustments are generally up to 4 percent; the positive adjustments will be scaled up or down to achieve
budget neutrality. Also, in the first six years of the program, additional bonuses are provided for exceptional performance.

*Advanced Alternative Payment Models (APMs)*

For clinicians who take a further step towards care transformation, the law creates another path. Physicians and clinicians who participate to a sufficient extent in Advanced APMs would qualify for incentive payments. Importantly, the law does not change how any particular APM rewards value. Instead, it creates extra incentives for participation in Advanced APMs. For years 2019 through 2024, a physician or clinician who meets the law’s standards for Advanced APM participation in a given year is excluded from MIPS payment adjustments and receives a 5 percent Medicare Part B incentive payment. For years 2026 and later, a clinician who meets these standards is excluded from MIPS adjustments and receives a higher annual fee schedule update than those clinicians who do not significantly participate in an Advanced APM.

Under the law, Advanced APMs are those in which clinicians accept risk and reward for providing coordinated, high-quality, and efficient care. As proposed, Advanced APMs must generally:

1. **Require participants to bear a certain amount of financial risk.** Under our proposal, an Advanced APM would meet the financial risk requirement if CMS would withhold payment, reduce rates, or require the entity to make payments to CMS if its actual expenditures exceed expected expenditures, consistent with parameters we specified in the rule.

2. **Base payments on quality measures comparable to those used in the MIPS quality performance category.** To meet this statutory requirement, we propose that an Advanced APM must base payment on quality measures that are evidence-based, reliable, and valid. In addition, at least one such measure must be an outcome measure if an outcome measure appropriate to the Advanced APM is available on the MIPS measure list.

3. **Require participants to use certified EHR technology.** To meet this requirement, we propose that an Advanced APM must require that at least 50 percent of the clinicians use certified EHR technology to document and communicate clinical care information in the
first performance year. This requirement increases to 75 percent in the second performance year.

In addition, under the statute, medical home models, which are a popular and patient-centered approach for primary care practices to coordinate care, that have been expanded under the Innovation Center authority qualify as Advanced APMs regardless of whether they meet the financial risk criteria. While medical home models have not yet been expanded, the proposed rule lays out criteria for medical home models to ensure that primary care physicians have opportunities to participate in Advanced APMs.

The rule proposes a definition of medical home models, which focus on primary care and accountability for empaneled patients across the continuum of care. Because medical homes tend to have less experience with financial risk than larger organizations and limited capability to sustain substantial losses, we propose unique Advanced APM financial risk standards, consistent with the statute, to accommodate medical homes that are part of organizations with 50 or fewer clinicians.

The proposed rule includes a list of models that would qualify under the terms of the proposed rule as Advanced APMs. These include:

- Comprehensive ESRD Care (Large Dialysis Organization arrangement)
- Comprehensive Primary Care Plus (CPC+)
- Medicare Shared Savings Program – Track 2
- Medicare Shared Savings Program – Track 3
- Next Generation ACO Model
- Oncology Care Model – Two-sided risk (available in 2018)

Under the proposed rule, CMS would update this list annually to add new payment models that qualify. CMS will continue to modify models in coming years to help them qualify as Advanced APMs. In addition, starting in performance year 2019, clinicians could qualify for incentive payments based in part on participation in Advanced APMs developed by non-Medicare payers, such as private insurers, Medicare Advantage plans, or state Medicaid programs.
We recognize the substantial time and money commitments in which APM participants invest in order to become successful participants. Under the proposed rule, physicians and clinicians who participate in Advanced APMs but do not meet the law’s criteria for sufficient participation in Advanced APMs, and those who participate in certain non-Advanced APMs, would be exempt from the Cost category in MIPS, would be able to use their APM quality reporting for the MIPS Quality category, and would receive credit toward their score in the Clinical Practice Improvement Activities category. We want to make sure that in addition to encouraging physicians and other clinicians to improve quality of care by participating in APMs that best fit their practice and patient needs, physicians and clinicians are not subject to duplicative, overly burdensome reporting requirements.

**Physician-Focused Payment Model Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC)**

To help spur innovation for models that meet the needs of the physician community, MACRA established a new independent advisory committee, the Physician-Focused Payment Model Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC). The PTAC will meet at least quarterly to review physician-focused payment models submitted by individuals and stakeholder entities and prepare comments and recommendations on proposals that are received, explaining whether models meet CMS criteria for physician-focused payment models. The eleven members of the PTAC, who were appointed by the Comptroller General, are experts in physician-focused payment models and related delivery of care, including researchers, practicing physicians, and other stakeholders. The PTAC has met twice and presentations from the meeting are available online. We encourage physician specialists and other stakeholders to engage with the PTAC to suggest well designed, robust models. CMS is committed to working closely with the PTAC and are looking forward to reviewing their recommendations for new physician-focused payment models.

**Technical Assistance**

We know that physicians and other clinicians may need assistance in transitioning to the MIPS, and we want to make sure that they have the tools they need to succeed in a redesigned system.

---

Congress provided funding in MACRA for technical assistance to small practices, rural practices, and practices in medically underserved health professional shortage areas (HPSAs).

Last month, CMS announced the availability of $20 million of this funding for on-the-ground training and education for Medicare clinicians in individual or small group practices of 15 clinicians or fewer. These funds will help provide hands-on training tailored to small practices, especially those that practice in historically under-resourced areas including rural areas, HPSAs, and medically underserved areas. As required by MACRA, HHS will award $20 million each year for five years, providing $100 million in total to help these practices successfully participate in the Quality Payment Program.

In addition to MACRA implementation efforts, last month, CMS launched the second round of the Support and Alignment Networks under the Transforming Clinical Practice Initiative. This opportunity will provide up to $10 million over the next three years to leverage primary and specialist care transformation work and learning that will catalyze the adoption of APMs on a large scale. Support and Alignment Network 2.0 awardees’ activities, coaching, and technical assistance will help practices transform the way they deliver care. The ultimate goal is for these practices to participate in APMs and Advanced APMs. Critical to this approach is the capacity for awardees to accurately identify large numbers of clinicians and practices in advanced states of readiness through sound data analytics capabilities, to enroll them into the Transforming Clinical Practice Initiative, to provide them with tailored technical assistance, and to align them with the most suitable Alternative Payment Model options. Further, awardees will need to customize direct technical assistance and support services that are tailored to these clinicians' and practices’ needs.

Conclusion
MACRA will help move Medicare towards more fully rewarding the value and quality of services provided by physicians and other clinicians, not just the quantity of such services. For it to be successful – in other words, for MACRA to improve care delivery and lower health care costs – we must first demonstrate to clinicians and patients both the value of these new payment programs established by MACRA and the opportunity for these participants to shape the health
care system of the future. The program must be flexible, practice-driven, and person-centered. It must contain achievable measures; it must support continued and improved information sharing through innovations and advancements in interoperability and the health IT infrastructure; it must engage and educate physicians and others clinicians; and it must promote and reward improvement over time.

Our proposed rule incorporates valuable input received to date, but it is only a first step in an iterative process for implementing the new law. Moving forward, we will continue to gather feedback from our stakeholders, to inform an implementation approach that leads to better care, smarter spending, and improved patient outcomes. We will continue partnering with Congress, physicians and other providers, consumers, and other stakeholders across the nation to make a transformed and improved health system a reality for all Americans. We look forward to working with you as we continue to implement this seminal law.