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## Attribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>GMCB Budget</th>
<th>Actual *</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>33,474</td>
<td>39,702</td>
<td>6,228</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>44,211</td>
<td>42,342</td>
<td>(1,869)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBSVT QHP</td>
<td>34,943</td>
<td>20,838</td>
<td>(14,105)</td>
<td>-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Funded</td>
<td>9,962</td>
<td>9,962</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122,590</td>
<td>112,844</td>
<td>(9,746)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As of January 1st

- **Medicare**
  - Actual attribution started the year higher than the estimate used in the budget model
    - Budget model included a mix of actual data from the historical shared savings program and estimates for providers that weren’t previously part of the OCV network
  - CMS data projects final year-end attribution to be roughly 35k lives after attrition

- **Medicaid**
  - Attribution was slightly lower than the projection, but within a range that is reflective of typical attribution churn
  - We expect the attrition rate to be similar to the 2017 experience (roughly 1.7% per month) and end around 35k lives

- **BCBSVT QHP**
  - Attribution was substantially lower than what was included in the budget model
  - We will be monitoring attrition, but estimates are that we’ll finish with roughly 18k lives

- **Self-Funded**
  - We are still using an estimated figure and expect a rerun mid-April
## Total Cost of Care Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMCB Budget</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Blended PMPM</th>
<th>TCOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>33,474</td>
<td>$864.45</td>
<td>$347,240,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>40,184*</td>
<td>$246.44</td>
<td>$118,833,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBSVT</td>
<td>34,943</td>
<td>$318.13</td>
<td>$133,395,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$599,469,290</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recast Budget</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Blended PMPM</th>
<th>TCOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>35,460*</td>
<td>$856.48</td>
<td>$364,451,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>38,563*</td>
<td>$243.91</td>
<td>$112,873,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBSVT</td>
<td>20,004*</td>
<td>$426.18</td>
<td>$102,306,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$579,631,570</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Blended PMPM</th>
<th>TCOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>($7.97)</td>
<td>$17,211,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>-1,621</td>
<td>($2.52)</td>
<td>($5,960,268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBSVT</td>
<td>-14,939</td>
<td>$108.06</td>
<td>($31,089,099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>($19,837,719)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes an attrition factor

- Based mainly on attribution changes, the expected TCOC has decreased when compared to the budget model.
- The original budget model used the attribution “high water mark” for modeling the total cost of care for Medicare and BCBSVT.
  - Medicaid incorporated an attrition rate per actuarial input.
- The recast budget incorporates an estimated attrition rate for all payers to more accurately project the TCOC at final settlement.
Risk

• Because the TCOC has changed, the expected max risk has changed accordingly

• Functionally, there are two angles to max risk
  o The “quoted” max risk is the true ceiling we will not exceed
    ➢ This is built by applying the program risk corridors to the product of January 1\textsuperscript{st} attribution and preliminary benchmark PMPMs
    ➢ These amounts will be included in contract addendums
  o The “expected” max risk is the estimated ceiling based on forecasted attrition and, thus, is lower than the “quoted” amount
    ➢ Because the TCOC is dependent on attribution, as we experience attrition the actual annual TCOC will decrease
    ➢ The program risk corridors will be applied to the final TCOC to determine the actual max risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Risk</th>
<th>GMCB Budget</th>
<th>Quoted</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>$13,889,611</td>
<td>$16,321,936</td>
<td>$14,578,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>$3,564,999</td>
<td>$3,780,003</td>
<td>$3,386,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCBSVT</td>
<td>$4,001,872</td>
<td>$3,947,009</td>
<td>$3,069,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$21,456,481</td>
<td>$24,048,948</td>
<td>$21,033,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHM Spending Estimates

- Investments in population health management is largely driven by attribution
  - Because attribution has been updated, so too has the modeled PHM spending breakdown
- Two changes worthy of note:
  - The engagement rate for the Complex Care Coordination program has been reduced to account for additional ramp-up time
  - The model for the Blueprint payments has been updated by the Blueprint (i.e. not a change made by OneCare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>GMCB Budget</th>
<th>Recast Budget</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value-Based Incentive Fund</td>
<td>$4,305,223</td>
<td>$4,116,546</td>
<td>($188,677)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic OCV PMPM</td>
<td>$4,781,010</td>
<td>$4,041,185</td>
<td>($739,825)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Care Coordination Program</td>
<td>$7,064,722</td>
<td>$6,186,837</td>
<td>($877,886)</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP Comprehensive Payment Reform Pilot</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Program Investments</td>
<td>$1,577,600</td>
<td>$1,583,143</td>
<td>$5,543</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHT Funding Risk Communities</td>
<td>$1,771,057</td>
<td>$1,400,887</td>
<td>($370,170)</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHT Funding Non-Risk Communities</td>
<td>$747,841</td>
<td>$844,966</td>
<td>$97,125</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASH Funding Risk Communities</td>
<td>$2,364,691</td>
<td>$2,572,500</td>
<td>$207,809</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASH Funding Non-Risk Communities</td>
<td>$905,263</td>
<td>$1,131,900</td>
<td>$226,637</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP Payments Risk Communities</td>
<td>$1,255,720</td>
<td>$875,328</td>
<td>($380,392)</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP Payments Non-Risk Communities</td>
<td>$717,929</td>
<td>$954,936</td>
<td>$237,007</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,291,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,508,227</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,782,829)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact to Budget Orders

- **Order H: OneCare must fund PHM at no less than 3.1% of its overall budget**
  - Based on the revised data, we do not anticipate any core budget-model concerns. However, some of the spending will vary based on network engagement and program ramp-up. We will monitor this ratio throughout the year.

- **Order K: OneCare must ensure that its administrative expenses are appropriately allocated by state (i.e., between VT and NY)**
  - There are no current concerns with our ability to comply with this order as a result of the changes to attribution and total cost of care estimates.

- **Order L: OneCare’s administrative expense ratio must be consistent with its proposed budget**
  - Because the total cost of care is a moving number (both between budget approval and go-live and also throughout the plan year), maintaining a consistent administrative expense ratio is not possible even if OneCare administrative expenses end up exactly on budget. Attribution and TCOC changes of this magnitude do not result in administrative efficiencies.

- **Order M: OneCare’s administrative expenses should be less than the health care savings generated through the All-Payer Accountable Care Organization Model**
  - Because gross savings potential is linked to attribution and total cost of care, the health care savings potential is affected. However, based on the magnitude of these changes there are no present concerns.
Highlights: Population Health & Quality Initiatives

- **Diabetes Prevention & Management Learning Collaborative**
  - OneCare partnering with Blueprint, VDH, SASH, QIN/QIO
  - 16 teams across eight health service areas
  - Monthly technical assistance + four in-person sessions:
    - 4/20: Standards of Care & Patient Panels
    - 6/1: Self-management and Motivational Interviewing
    - 9/14: Pharmacology and Medication Management
    - 1/11/19: Screening and Referrals for Mental Health and Social Determinants of Health
  - Assess: vital signs, diabetes poor control, self-management care plans, referrals, dilated eye exams, primary care visits, depression screening

- **Clinical Education and Training Series**
  - Interdisciplinary Grand Rounds
  - Interdisciplinary Chronic Condition Symposia
  - Enduring Materials

**Grand Rounds Topic Areas:**
- Medicare Annual Wellness Visits (2017)
- Palliative Care (2017)
- Suicide Screening & Intervention (2017)
- Dementia Care in Vermont (2018)
- End Stage Renal Disease (2018)
- Pediatric Topic TBD (2018)
- Patient/Family-Centered Care (2018)

**Symposia Topic Areas:**
- Diabetes & Pre-Diabetes (2017)
- Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (2018)
Highlights: Population Health & Quality Initiatives

• Data Collection & Reporting
  o New partnership with Blueprint & Capital Health Associates to improve quality of clinical data from VITL
  o BCBS to begin sending quarterly aggregate data on substance use claims-based quality measures
  o Manually collected data on >5,000 patient records for 2017 performance year quality measurement reporting
  o Redesigned annual quality measure reporting to display HSA-level comparisons and historical performance
  o Negotiations with GMCB, HCA, CMMI regarding alignment of Medicare quality measures for 2019 under All Payer Model agreement

• Care Coordination
  o Risk stratified all attributed patients; identified individuals that may benefit from complex care coordination
  o Expanded model into five additional HSAs
  o Formed a Care Coordination Core Team in the southern region of Vermont
  o Facilitated community workflow development/refinement
  o Trained >200 individuals since January on core skills, advanced topics, and/or sr. leader engagement
Highlights: Population Health & Quality Initiatives

• Partnership with RiseVT
  o RiseVT is a unique public health movement that integrates wellness and prevention into the healthcare delivery system.
  o An initiative in northwest VT that was recently formalized into a new state level organization to make the program available statewide.
  o Partnering on an integrated approach to primary prevention, and OneCare also functions as the administrative partner for the RiseVT organization offering employment, support, and space for the new organization and its leaders.

• SASH/Howard Mental Health Pilot
  o Major investment in an innovative pilot program to improve the quality of mental health and substance use treatment services for residents of two Burlington area housing communities specializing in the coordination of care and services for older adults and those with special needs.
  o Unique focus on prompting a culture of mental wellness through resident group education and staff support.

• Community Network Success Stories
  o Controlling Hypertension (spotlight on PCHP-St. Albans)
  o Improving Hospice Utilization (Brattleboro)
  o Diabetes Prevention Program (Springfield Medical Care System)
  o Reduction in SNF Utilization after Total Joint Surgery (Berlin)
  o Integration of Behavioral Health Care (St. Albans)
OneCare 2019 Network Development

Current Provider Types

• Hospitals
  o Existing hospital participants will be expected to move to all programs offered, with approval to defer that requirement by management on an exception basis
  o If a hospital is new to risk, OneCare will offer participation in either all programs or start with VMNG only for one year (and expectation to move to all programs in 2020)

• Independent Primary and Specialty Care, FQHC, Home Health, Designated Agencies, Skilled Nursing Facilities:
  o Provider types only have the option to participate in the same program selections as their Health Service Area hospitals
  o If a provider is new or was only in one program in the past, expectation is to participate in all programs that their hospital is participating in for the year, with approval to defer that requirement by management on an exception basis
OneCare 2019 Network Development

• **Continue to Seek Willing Providers:**
  - To meet All Payer Model scale targets, OneCare seeks to increase the number of people in population health management programs under value-based payment arrangements

• **Key Elements of the 2019 Network Development Plan:**
  - Welcome new entrants with patient attribution
  - Develop clear program value proposition and expectations
  - Enhance or expand existing programs and fixed payment arrangements
  - Begin to engage with new provider types in late 2018-early 2019 to develop specific value-add programs in 2020 (PT, OT, ST, Chiropractic, Home Infusion Vendors etc.)
  - Border Hospitals will be deferred until 2020 to assess if there are alternate risk platforms that they can enter into with OneCare

• **New Program Offerings**
  - Any new programs to include additional financing and population health support will be vetted and recommended by the Population Health Committee and Finance Committee, with approval by the Board of Managers
## 2019 Network Development Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Milestones in Preparation for 2019</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Determine Program Offerings and Strategy for Network Development</td>
<td>February-March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | Define Budget Assumptions  
Send Solicitation of Interest to Hospital, PCP’s and FQHC’s | March-April             |                         |                         |                         |
| 3 | Receive Response on 2019 Interest by Hospitals, PCPs and FQHCs | April                   |                         |                         |                         |
| 4 | Financial Modeling Based on Attributing Providers Interested Network | May-June                |                         |                         |                         |
| 5 | Send LOI to all other Continuum or Care Providers in HSA’s where Hospitals have expressed interest | May                     |                         |                         |                         |
| 6 | Preliminary Full Budget Models and Initial Approval by BOM   | June                    |                         |                         |                         |
| 7 | Provider Outreach on 2019 Programs/Contracts/Payments/Budget |                         |                         |                         | July-August             |
| 8 | Contract and Program Riders Returned (Provider Commitment)   | August                  |                         |                         |                         |
| 9 | Approval by BOM of Final Network and GMCB Budget Submission  |                         |                         |                         | September-October       |
| 10| Provide Final Rosters to Payers  
Confirm 2019 Program Participation  
Refine Budget as Necessary |                         |                         |                         | September-October       |