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Operating rules
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Mandate for electronic payments

- **Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA)**
  - Legislation calls for both standards and operating rules as key drivers in reducing administrative cost
  - Medicare payments to EFT by January 1, 2014
  - Established Standards and Operating Rules for Healthcare EFT Payments
    - CAQH CORE responsible for drafting operating rules
    - NACHA selected as standards development organization for maintenance of the healthcare EFT standard

- **Health and Human Services (HHS) issued Healthcare EFT Standard Final Rule on January 10, 2012**
  - Became final rule on July 10, 2012
  - Defined Health Care EFT as a transaction under HIPAA
  - Identified NACHA CCD+ as the HIPAA EFT standard format and content required for health plans to perform EFT transactions
# ACH CCD+ Becomes HIPAA standards for EFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Payers</th>
<th>Plan Sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td>** Functions</td>
<td>** Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility verification</td>
<td>270 (eligibility inquiry)</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271 (eligibility information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-authorization and referrals</td>
<td>278 (referral authorization and certification)</td>
<td>Pre-certification &amp; adjudication</td>
<td>834 (benefit enrollment &amp; maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148 (first report of injury)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added to HIPAA transaction set for EFT payments under Administrative Simplification in PPACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service billing claim submission</td>
<td>837 (claims submission)</td>
<td>Claims acceptance</td>
<td>811 (invoice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275 (claims attachment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims status inquiries</td>
<td>276 (claim status inquiry)</td>
<td>Claims adjudication</td>
<td>820 (payment order/RA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277 (claim status response)</td>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable (AR)</td>
<td>835 (healthcare claim payment advice) ACH CCD+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications
Medicare & Commercial Insurers

• All Medicare claims reimbursement payments must be made using the Healthcare EFT transaction by January 1, 2014 (CCD+addenda)

• For commercial insurance:
  – If a healthcare provider requests payment using the Healthcare EFT Standard from their health plan, effective January 1, 2014, the health plan must be able to send the CCD+ addenda to the provider
  – There is no mandate included in the ACA requiring the healthcare provider to accept the Healthcare EFT Standard from commercial health plans
  – However, industry is starting to see many health plans require providers accept electronic claims payments (ACH) to participate in their network
Potential impacts
EFT and ERA rules on key stakeholders

**PAYER/HEALTH PLAN**

- Must be able to provide healthcare EFT transaction if requested by provider
  - Requires health plans to transmit EFT within three days of transmission of ERA
  - Must provide Reassociation Trace Number (TRN segment) for inclusion with payment
- Must educate providers to talk to their financial institutions to ask for Minimum CCD+ Data Elements to reassociate payments with ERA when received

**ODFI**

- Must comply with EFT and ERA standard and operating rule if making a healthcare payment that meets EFT and ERA standards and operating rules:
  - Must provide Reassociation Trace Number (TRN segment) for inclusion with payment
  - Must assure healthcare payments are identified by ‘HCCLAIMPMT’ in Entry Description Field of batch header
Potential impacts
EFT and ERA rules on key stakeholders

**PROVIDER**

- Must proactively contact financial institutions to arrange delivery of CORE-required Minimum CCD+ Data Elements
  - What should you ask your financial institution to provide? Who should you ask?
  - What requirements will systems and operations staff have for receiving CORE required minimum CCD+ Data Elements? Can they be received electronically?

**RDFI**

- Must arrange to deliver required Minimum CCD+ Data Elements upon request from provider within two business days from settlement:
  - Effective Entry Date
  - Amount of Payment
  - TRN Data Elements

- Financial institution employees that deal with customer/providers must be educated to answer questions and help
  - How do I enroll for EFT payments?
  - How do I reconcile payments to the remittance advice?
  - Can I receive the full addenda record from my financial institution?
ACH

Not the only form of health claim payment

Allows for EFTs conducted outside the ACH network

- The healthcare EFT standard does not apply to EFTs conducted outside the ACH network
- Final rule “neither prohibits nor adopts any standards for health care EFT transmitted outside the ACH network”
- References use of both wire transfer and card payments
- **BUT if a provider requests use of the healthcare EFT standard the health plan or third party provider must use the CCD+ Addenda to deliver the claims reimbursement**
Payer considerations
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Payer Considerations for Healthcare Reform

- Multiple claim platforms and payment engines with varying functionality due to rapid industry consolidation – how to ensure compliance of each system:
  - CCD+ requirement for EFT payments
  - Inclusion of TRN segment within payment
  - Coordination of timing (within three days) of payment and ERA

- Provider relations and coordination
  - EFT Enrollment
    - Tools to maximize enrollment
    - Overcoming Provider resistance
  - Method for providing EFT and ERA details to Providers
    - Payer portal
    - Provider bank reporting
    - Vendor options
3 Barriers to electronic adoption
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Today’s environment

Electronic payments

- 5 billion medical claims / year
- 1 billion payment transactions; 34% from commercial payers
- CMS expects commercial electronic rate to rise from 15% today to 79% by 2023
- Only 10-20% of commercial payer claim payments are electronic as small providers slow to adopt electronic payment and reconciliation processes

EFT adoption rate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigna</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSC</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regence</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHC</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFT adopters still receiving checks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigna</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSC</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regence</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHC</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *AMA 2012 National Health Insurer Report Card., Metrics 3 & 3A
EFT
Provider’s barriers to electronic processes

Medium to small-sized providers cite EFT obstacles as:

- Trusting government and commercial payers with your practice’s bank account information: 26% very significant, 12% significant, 23% somewhat significant, 16% of little significance, 19% not significant.

- A potential threat of insurance payers taking back money from your account: 12% very significant, 21% significant, 21% somewhat significant, 21% of little significance, 14% not significant, 12% not at all significant.

- Systems do not accept automated posting of electronic remittance advices across all payers: 9% very significant, 30% significant, 19% somewhat significant, 16% of little significance, 16% not significant, 9% not at all significant.

- The cost of supporting EFT: 7% very significant, 43% significant, 19% somewhat significant, 24% of little significance, 24% not significant, 6% not at all significant.

- Lack of standardized enrollment format and process across all payers for EFT: 9% very significant, 28% significant, 23% somewhat significant, 14% of little significance, 21% not significant, 5% not at all significant.

- Not all payers we support offer EFT as an option: 9% very significant, 12% significant, 26% somewhat significant, 30% of little significance, 21% not significant.

Source: Aite Group survey of 225 small U.S. healthcare providers, November to December 2012
**ERA**

**Provider’s barriers to electronic processes**

The electronic remittance information challenges for medium to small-sized providers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Not something we consider</th>
<th>Not at all significant</th>
<th>Of some significance</th>
<th>Very significant</th>
<th>Of very low significance</th>
<th>Extremely significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding difference in information received on electronic remittances</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack a standardized enrollment process across all payers for ERA</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of supporting ERA</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all payers support electronic remittances</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aite Group survey of 225 small U.S. healthcare providers, November to December 2012
Bank account holdings
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Proliferation of bank account information

- Across all industries, payment related data is being shared with increasing number of non-bank service providers
  - On-line merchants
  - Digital wallets
  - Third party processors

- Healthcare is no different than other industries. The healthcare payment ecosystem has many players and multiple solutions – a formula for fragmentation

- Healthcare EFT mandate will accelerate proliferation of data across 1,200+ payers and their service providers
  - Where will this data be stored?
  - Who will have access to provider bank account data?
  - Are parties prepared to take on incremental risk?
Non-bank payment services

Safety and soundness concerns

- A plethora of new participants with innovative payment solutions, many of which fall outside of formal prudential and consumer regulation
- Many of the protections in place for traditional ‘bank-grade’ payments, are at best optional in the new models, and rarely auditable and enforceable
  - Know Your Customer (KYC)
  - Data security

Alternative payment categories

- Banks
- Payments facilitators
- Stored value cards
- Bill to mobile
- Virtual currencies

INCONSISTENT SAFETY, SOUNDNESS, SECURITY, AND CONSUMER PROTECTIONS
Examples
Key safety and security questions must be addressed

- What security protocols should be in place?
- Who bears the loss from theft or fraud? Can it be shared?
- How can issuers protect customers and themselves from a 3rd party's vulnerabilities?
- How can consumers maintain control of their data?
- What standards are needed to ensure that consumers and bank fraud detection, AML/OFAC, and other systems have a clear view into critical transaction details?
Industry solutions
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Enrollment utility

Key attributes

- Single nationwide database of providers enrolled for healthcare EFT payments
- Housed by trusted third party, shared by all payers and banks
- Providers enroll once, enter bank account information
- Payers use a masked DDA rather than real account number
Provider view
Value to providers

Strategic opportunity
• Control payment preferences & distribution of data
• Account info security via pseudo account number

Operational efficiencies
• Update bank data once in centralized location for all payers
  – No need to provide banking info repeatedly
  – One location to maintain payment preferences
• Cost savings associated with staff time used for EFT enrollment & maintenance
• Improve cash flow by receiving funds faster

Fraud prevention
• Improve security of confidential information through limited distribution of true bank account data
• Decrease vulnerability to data breach/compromise through use of pseudo bank account information
• Additional security of debit block feature with use of pseudo account number
Payer view

Value to payers

Strategic opportunity
• Reduce cost, improve accuracy of electronic payments
• Compliance with legislative mandates

Operational efficiencies
• Migrate payments to electronic: instantaneously grow number of providers paid via EFT
• Reduce cost of making payments
• Reduce payment errors

Fraud prevention and migration tools
• Help eliminate exposure to data breaches associated with provider bank account data
  – Providers' banking info held in centralized repository
  – Health plans use pseudo account information for initiating payments
• Reduce risk of fraud through financial institution validation of provider banking information
Changing payment landscape

New payment mechanisms

- **Payers investigating electronic alternatives to ACH because of provider reluctance to enroll**
- **Virtual card payments**
  - Allows payers to easily move away from paper check, but…
  - Current implementations create problems for providers (lack of standardization, paper remittance)
  - With improvements could provide value to both payers and providers
- **Digital disbursements/alias payments**
  - Primarily in consumer space, but opportunity for payers to reach small and out-of-network providers

Evolving reimbursement methodologies

- **How will payment flows be impacted by the move away from fee-for-service?**
  - Many structures being explored – Accountable Care Organizations, bundled payments, quality incentives, will effect reimbursement but impact on payment flows and transaction volumes minor
  - Structures like capitation agreements and provider-plan integration could have significant impact
  - Plans will still need claim data from providers
- **Bundled payments and ACOs expand providers’ need to pay other providers**
  - Will providers take advantage of new tools to distribute payments electronically, or will they perpetuate the use of paper checks?
UnitedHealth Group solution
Healthcare reform solutions and challenges
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Progress to date

UnitedHealth Group

Key objective: Ensure compliance with new regulations while simplifying internal workflow and the provider experience in order to maximize electronic adoption

- UnitedHealth Group is the most diversified health care company in the United States having grown organically and through acquisition
- New acquisitions are integrated quickly in order to leverage the best technology
- UHG has a compliant solution for all PPACA and NACHA EFT requirements which we use internally and provide to other payers:
  - CCD+ ACH format
  - Inclusion of TRN to associate claim payment with remittance details
  - Payment timing and ERA delivery synchronized
- UHG paid over $65B in claims electronically to providers in 2012; estimate over $75B in 2013
Remaining challenges/strategy

UnitedHealth Group

• UHG’s diverse product offering (individual, commercial non-risk, commercial risk, Medicaid, Medicare, etc.) creates a complex technology infrastructure with multiple claim adjudication platforms and payment applications

• Providers are looking to simplify their processes with UHG – want consolidated payments and uniform presentation of claim detail and EFT enrollment

• Shift to “Payment Highway” to connect all UHG platforms to Electronic Payments and Statements (EPS):
  – Provides fully compliant EFT solution
  – Provides single provider touch point for EFT enrollment
  – Provides single portal for remittance presentment to providers
  – Eliminates need for redundant upgrades by payment platform
  – Provides opportunity for more comprehensive provider relationship management

• 60% of total claim volume and 75% of claim dollars now processed through this EPS and Payment Highway solution

• Working on additional options such as virtual cards to increase Provider enrollment
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