In-office imaging services still protected

Despite efforts to restrict or eliminate provisions that allow the testing, IOASE remains intact



Health Policy

By Adrienne Dresevic, Esq. and Carey F. Kalmowitz, Esq.

Carey F. Kalmowitz is a founding member of The Health Law Partners, P.C. He practices in all areas of healthcare law, with specific concentration on the corporate and financial aspects of healthcare. Contact him at (248) 996-8510 or ckalmowitz@thehlp.com.

Adrienne Dresevic is a founding member of The Health Law Partners, P.C. She practices in all areas of healthcare law and devotes a substantial portion of her practice to providing clients with counsel and analysis regarding Stark and fraud and abuse. Contact her at (248) 996-8510 or adresevic@thehlp.com.

DRESEVIC

KALMOWITZ

Despite recent efforts to restrict or eliminate the Stark Law's In-Office Ancillary Services Exception (IOASE), it remains intact and the prospect of a near-term wholesale elimination of appears remote.

Recent legislative initiatives to restrict or eliminate IOASE are, by no means, a new phenomenon.

Rather, over the last few years, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has introduced several significant proposals targeting the provision of diagnostic imaging (and other ancillary services) in the physician office setting, through proposed changes to the Stark regulations, independent diagnostic testing facility (IDTF) regulations, and other Medicare reimbursement regulations, such as the Medicare Anti-Markup Rule (AMR).

IOASE background

The Federal Stark law prohibits physicians from referring Medicare patients to entities that provide designated health services (DHS, including diagnostic imaging services) if the physician (or his/her immediate family member) has a financial relationship with that entity, unless a Stark exception applies.

The IOASE is the statutory vehicle that permits physicians and group practices to furnish DHS, such as diagnostic imaging services, with the goal of balancing convenience, efficiency, quality and continuity of care, against the prevention of abusive sham arrangements that do not have a bona fide nexus to the physician's core medical practice.

A substantial majority of office-based diagnostic imaging arrangements rely upon the IOASE to enable referring physicians to provide these services within their practices.

Specifically, this exception protects diagnostic imaging arrangements if the services are provided or supervised by the referring physician or his/her group, billed by the performing physician/group (or the group's wholly owned subsidiary), and provided either in the same building as the physician's/group's office or a centralized building site operated exclusively by the group practice.

Notably, the IOASE was contained in the original Stark statute adopted by Congress in order to preserve the long-standing practice of physicians integrating within their practices those ancillary services that complement the professional physician services they furnish.

CMS' proposals targeting the IOASE

In recent years, CMS has introduced various legislative proposals that, in one form or another, effectively attempted to restrict (or eliminate) the IOASE.

Most of these original proposals, however, were either never finalized or implemented in manner that did not substantially affect many common diagnostic imaging arrangements involving true in-office integration.

The 2008 Medicare Proposed Physician Fee Schedule, for example, contained commentary by CMS expressing concern that the IOASE was being inappropriately used for services that were not closely connected to the physician's practice.

At that time, CMS solicited comments on potential changes to the IOASE, including whether certain DHS should be excluded from the exception, whether the location requirements of the exception should be tightened, and whether the exception should be available for specialized services involving equipment owned by non-specialists.

CMS, however, has not introduced a formal proposal to materially restrict the scope of the IOASE, and any revisions to the IOASE will require a future notice of proposed rulemaking with provision for public comment.

CMS has noted that any future rulemaking will present a coordinated, comprehensive approach to accomplishing the goals of minimizing the threat of program abuse while retaining sufficient flexibility to enable arrangements that satisfy the requirements and intent of Stark.

In a related matter, recently CMS took a relatively flexible position when it finalized the AMR, which applies to many common diagnostic imaging arrangements.

The original AMR proposals would have placed restrictive payment limitations on a significant number of such arrangements.

In the form the AMR was adopted, if a physician group is willing to exercise certain operational flexibility, substantially all of its diagnostic imaging arrangements that are structured to comply with the IOASE can be structured in a manner that does not implicate the AMR's restrictive payment limitations.

Shared space still OK

Further, under the AMR, CMS permits the use of shared space imaging arrangements between physicians that occur in the "same building". CMS did caution that it may issue proposed changes to the IOASE in the future, but expressly noted that it had been asked to consider, and rejected, a complete elimination of the IOASE.

Recently, CMS has also promulgated some significant federal Stark regulatory changes that impact diagnostic imaging arrangements. These include eliminating the use of "per-click" fee and percentage-based payments in space and/or equipment leases when the payments reflect services provided to patients referred between the parties.

Notably, however, these changes do not prohibit the overwhelming number of common diagnostic imagining arrangements that are structured to comply with the IOASE.

In yet another attempt to target certain IOASE diagnostic testing arrangements, in 2008, CMS introduced a proposal that would have required any physician furnishing in-office diagnostic testing services to enroll as an IDTF.

The result would have been that these practices' diagnostic imaging operations would be subject to most IDTF performance standards.

If adopted, this proposal would have eliminated physician practices' ability to share diagnostic imaging and other testing equipment and facilities, even if located in the "same building" as defined under Stark.

As a practical matter, this proposal also would have resulted in a significant decline in the number of physician practices that furnish diagnostic testing services to their patients. Notably, CMS declined to implement this IDTF proposal.

However, CMS did finalize its earlier proposal to require mobile IDTFs to enroll and bill Medicare directly for the TC services that they provide.

Implementation of this final rule appeared to prohibit many common arrangements in which mobile entities lease diagnostic testing equipment and technicians to physicians who furnish and bill for such tests in their offices.

In a noteworthy development, CMS posted a frequently asked question on its Web site clarifying that companies that merely lease or contract with a Medicare provider for non-physician personnel and/or equipment (but do not provide physician supervision) are not required to enroll and directly bill for such services.

CMS noted that it continues to evaluate these arrangements.

Nonetheless, absent further guidance from CMS to the contrary, the common imaging paradigm whereby a physician leases equipment and non-physician personnel from a mobile leasing entity can continue to bill for these services, provided that the physician group supervises the service and otherwise complies with the IOASE.

The current state of the IOASE

In recent years, through a serious of proposals, CMS has heightened its focus on certain diagnostic imaging arrangements, including arrangements structured in compliance with the IOASE.

However, despite these proposals, the IOASE remains intact as the statutory vehicle that permits physicians to furnish diagnostic imaging services in their offices.

Physicians furnishing in-office diagnostic testing services should remain attentive to potential future regulatory changes that might further restrict the scope of the IOASE.

As a result, parties to such arrangements should consider inclusion of well-designed strategies to unwind or restructure these transactions if regulatory changes preclude physicians' participation in such arrangements.

At this point, however, the prevailing thinking among industry insiders is that near-term elimination of the IOASE remains a remote prospect.

The MMSEA has teeth.
The reporting requirements are reinforced by a penalty of $1,000 per day, per claim. Imagine the devastating impact of missing a single reportable event, only to have it discovered a year later when the penalty is $365,000.

Reporting

Continued from page 5

Claims that must be reported by an insurer or other business entity to CMS include just about every payment to, or write-off for, the benefit of a Medicare beneficiary. The key here is that the claim must arise out of some injury to an individual, as the precise language in the rules for reporting refers to "the injured party."

However, payments made by a business to Medicare beneficiaries who did not receive medical care in relation to the events alleged in a claim, such as claims solely for property damage, do not have to be reported.

Although avoiding reporting by allocating a medical payment of a Medicare beneficiary to property damage is enticing on the surface, if there is any potential of liability for medical expenses released by the payment, the allocation will not absolve a RRE from the reporting responsibility.

Erring on the side of reporting is recommended due to the possibility of significant fines if Medicare disagrees with the allocation.

As such, any business that reasonably anticipates the need to report under this statute must register with CMS between May 1, 2009, and Sept. 30, 2009. Once registered, test files can be submitted until March 31, 2010, to work out any difficulties.

After testing is complete, "actual" reporting is scheduled to begin April 1, 2010. Once actual reporting starts, reports must be submitted each quarter thereafter (even if there is no payment to report for that quarter).

Greater awareness will be required as to which patients are potential Medicare beneficiaries, especially when managing claims or even debt collections and bill write-offs.

Clearly, the law will necessitate more cooperation of physicians, hospitals, insurers and attorneys to avoid the potentially costly mistake of not reporting.

Moreover, whether or not a provider organization is a RRE, the requirements of the MMSEA will likely mean increased time and costs arising from intensified enforcement of the Medicare Secondary Payer law.

So get ready!