EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the 2019 Annual Meeting, the House of Delegates referred the enclosed Resolution 125, which was sponsored by Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Resolution 125-A-19 directed the American Medical Association (AMA) to advocate for legislation or regulation specifying that codes for outpatient evaluation and management services, including initial and established patient office visits, be exempt from deductible payments. The Board of Trustees assigned this item to the Council on Medical Service for a report back to the House of Delegates at the 2020 Annual Meeting.

While increasing access to health insurance has been beneficial to patients, critical challenges persist regarding health care access. Even when a service is covered by a health plan, patients may incur significant costs in the form of copayments, coinsurance, and/or large medical bills that they must pay before meeting their deductibles. Such costs have been shown to cause people, especially those with low incomes and/or chronic conditions, to forgo necessary care, and these challenges can be exacerbated in the context of high-deductible health plans (HDHPs).

This report examines clinical and financial challenges associated with HDHPs, explores several potential strategies for improvement, and makes recommendations to mitigate the negative effects of HDHPs. Specifically, in addition to reaffirming highly relevant policy, this report recommends that the AMA encourage further research and advocacy to develop and promote innovative health plan designs; that employers be encouraged to provide robust education to help patients make good use of their benefits to obtain the care they need, collaborate with their employees to understand employees’ health insurance preferences and needs, tailor benefit designs to employees’ preferences and needs, and pursue strategies to help enrollees spread the costs associated with high out-of-pocket costs out across the plan year; and that state and national medical specialty societies be encouraged to actively collaborate with payers as they develop innovative plan designs to ensure that the health plans are likely to achieve their goals of enhanced access to affordable care.
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At the 2019 Annual Meeting, the House of Delegates referred the enclosed Resolution 125, which was sponsored by Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Resolution 125-A-19 directed the AMA to advocate for legislation or regulation specifying that codes for outpatient evaluation and management services, including initial and established patient office visits, be exempt from deductible payments. The Board of Trustees assigned this item to the Council on Medical Service (CMS) for a report back to the House of Delegates at the 2020 Annual Meeting. This report examines clinical and financial challenges associated with high-deductible health plans (HDHPs), explores several potential strategies for improvement, and makes recommendations to mitigate the negative effects of HDHPs.

BACKGROUND

HDHPs are insurance plans associated with lower premiums, higher deductibles, and greater cost-sharing requirements as compared with traditional health plans. Both enrollment in HDHPs and the size of deductibles has increased dramatically in recent years. In 2019, approximately 30 percent of enrollees in employer-sponsored health plans were covered by HDHPs, compared to 4 percent in 2006. The imposition of greater consumer cost-sharing is frequently described as a means of ensuring that those receiving health care services “have skin in the game,” and used as a lever to minimize the growth of health insurance premiums.

However, while an HDHP’s lower premium may be enticing, higher patient cost-sharing can lead to significant challenges. Reductions in health care spending achieved through HDHPs have been found to be due to patients simply receiving less medical care. Moreover, HDHPs appear to reduce health care spending by decreasing the use of both appropriate care (such as recommended cancer screenings) and less appropriate care (such as low-severity emergency department visits). Studies have found that families who have members with chronic disease and who are enrolled in HDHPs are more likely to go without care due to cost and/or face substantial financial burdens, such as trouble paying bills, than families enrolled in traditional plans. Another study found that enrollment in an HDHP combined with a savings account led to significant increases in out-of-pocket (OOP) spending, with more than half of the enrollees with lower-incomes and more than one-third of the enrollees with chronic conditions facing “excessive financial burden.”

The challenges of underinsurance and cost-related nonadherence (CRN) which can negatively affect patient care in general can be exacerbated in the context of HDHPs. Rates of underinsurance (e.g. OOP costs that are high relative to income) have risen. Even when a service is covered by a health plan, patients may incur significant costs in the form of copayments, coinsurance, and/or
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large medical bills that they must pay before meeting their deductibles. Such costs have been
shown to cause people, especially those with low incomes and/or chronic conditions, to forgo
necessary care. Similarly, CRN refers to a state in which patients are unable to pursue
recommended medical care due to financial barriers. CRN and sub-optimal patient use of
evidence-based medical services can lead to negative clinical outcomes, increased disparities, and
in some cases, higher aggregate costs. CRN has been identified across the entire continuum of
clinical care, including physician visits, preventive screenings, and prescription drugs, and the
challenges of CRN may be magnified by the COVID-19 pandemic as payers experience financial
pressure and strive to lower medical spending. CRN is especially problematic for vulnerable
populations, such as those with multiple chronic conditions, lower socioeconomic status, and/or
belonging to diverse racial or ethnic groups. For example, a recent study found that HDHPs were
associated with cost-related barriers to care for cancer survivors, and these barriers were
significantly greater for Black patients. Additionally, greater OOP costs for medication to treat
certain chronic conditions has been found to reduce initiation and adherence, lower the likelihood
of achieving desired health outcomes, and sometimes, increase utilization of acute care services.
At the same time, studies have demonstrated that reducing or eliminating cost-sharing leads to
improvements in medication adherence and reductions in health disparities based on
socioeconomic status and race.

In addition to increases in deductible spending, total patient OOP spending has also risen
significantly in recent years. Total OOP spending, which includes pre-deductible spending,
copayments, and coinsurance, increased by 54 percent between 2006 and 2016. Intensifying this
challenge is the fact that over the past decade, growth in OOP costs has outpaced increases in
workers’ wages. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted critical shortcomings, with many health
plans not providing affordable coverage for services to treat many chronic conditions and COVID-
19-related illness. In fact, 68 percent of adults said that OOP costs would be very or somewhat
important in their decision to get care if they had COVID-19 symptoms.

To help offset the burdens of higher deductibles and greater cost-sharing that patients face when
enrolled in HDHPs, plans and employers can make available one or more of several tax-advantaged
savings accounts including: Health Savings Accounts (HSAs), Health Reimbursement
Arrangements (HRAs), Flexible Spending Arrangements (FSAs), and for certain small employers
or self-employed individuals, Medical Savings Accounts (MSAs). Each of these savings accounts
has unique benefits and drawbacks, and the “best option” is very case specific. However, many
patients do not, or cannot, optimally utilize savings accounts to help them offset OOP costs
associated with HDHPs. In light of these significant financial concerns, more needs to be done to
ensure access to necessary, high-value care.

POTENTIAL STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Resolution 125-A-19 recommended that outpatient evaluation and management services, including
initial and established patient office visits, be exempt from deductible payments in an effort to
improve patient health and decrease total health care costs. The AMA supports innovative benefit
designs that could allow certain physician services and prescription drugs to be provided pre-
deductible. Moreover, in CMS Report 1-I-20, the Council is recommending that health plans be
incentivized to offer pre-deductible coverage including physician services in their bronze plans, to
maximize the value of zero-premium plans to plan enrollees. This is similar to the requirement that
catastrophic plans sold on health insurance exchanges must cover at least three primary care visits
per year pre-deductible. Pre-deductible coverage for certain physician visits in these specific
contexts, however, is a significant departure from pre-deductible coverage for all physician visits in
all contexts.
When health plans become more generous in exempting additional items and services from a deductible, other elements of benefit design become less generous (ie, more costly to the enrollee) to counterbalance the additional cost. In theory, over a long time horizon with a consistent enrollee base, a health plan might find long-term cost savings, such as through decreases in hospital admissions or emergency department visits, to offset short-term cost increases associated with increased generosity in services exempt from deductibles. However, when short-term costs are critical, such as in health insurance exchanges and among plans sponsored by employers in industries that experience high levels of employee turnover, short-term costs heavily influence benefit design. In the health insurance exchanges, increases in plan generosity cause an increase in actuarial value (AV) of a health plan, and the plan must become less generous in other domains to maintain its AV. For example, in a study designed to test how plans could provide more generous coverage for high-value services, the more generous coverage for some services had to be offset by less generous coverage of other services in order to maintain required AV. Similarly, in the private market, health plans might increase premiums or impose greater cost-sharing on some items or services to compensate for decreased cost-sharing for other items and services.

While high deductibles and OOP costs pose a significant challenge to many, this challenge is not universal, so it is important to recognize that blunt instruments that simply cause health care costs to shift among deductibles, cost-sharing, and premiums will be reallocating the burden of health care costs among a general population with very disparate health care utilization. US health care spending is dramatically concentrated, with very few individuals incurring very large shares of spending, while other large portions of the population incur very little spending. In fact, in 2016, half of the population had health spending under $971, accounted for only 2.8 percent of total health spending in the US, and incurred average OOP health care spending of only $73.25 In contrast, 10 percent of the population had health spending of at least $12,024, accounted for 66 percent of total US spending, and incurred average OOP spending of $2,380.26

Benefit Design Initiatives

Rather than applying a blunt instrument that categorically shifts health care costs, health plans could be designed with “clinical nuance,” a principle of value-based insurance design (VBID). “Clinical nuance” recognizes that medical services may differ in the amount of health produced, and that the clinical benefit derived from a specific service depends on the person receiving it, as well as when, where, and by whom the service is provided. The same service could be high-value to one patient and low-value to another, and the ability of patients and their physicians to make this determination on a case-by-case basis is critical and well-supported by AMA policy. Achieving truly nuanced plan design is a laudable goal and one that VBID researchers have been pursuing for over a decade with some progress. For example, the US Department of Treasury recently released Notice 2019-45, allowing HSA-HDHP plans the flexibility to cover specified medications and services used to treat chronic diseases prior to meeting the plan deductible. While the list of specified medications and services is limited, it is a decisive step in the direction of expanding health plan flexibility to improve affordable access to high-value care.

More recently, legislative and regulatory changes have further expanded HSA-HDHPs’ capacity for clinical nuance in the context of COVID-19. Explicitly recognizing the potential administrative and financial barriers to care present for individuals enrolled in HSA-HDHPs, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) issued Notice 2020-15 to remove those barriers in the context of the unprecedented public health emergency. Specifically, Notice 2020-15 makes another limited exception to the general rules governing qualification for HSA-HDHPs to allow health plans the flexibility to cover testing and treatment of COVID-19 pre-deductible and without imposition of patient cost sharing. Many of the nation’s leading insurance companies pursued this opportunity and waived patient
cost-sharing for COVID-19-related testing, but the scope and duration of these waivers vary
across insurers. IRS Notice 2020-29 further clarified that the testing and treatment of COVID-19
that can be provided pre-deductible includes the panel of diagnostic testing for influenza A & B,
norovirus and other coronaviruses, and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV). Additionally, the
Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act created a temporary safe harbor
allowing HDHPs to cover telehealth services and other remote care without cost to participants
before their deductibles are met. The safe harbor is currently in effect until the end of 2021. It is
up to payers, though, to implement plan changes to take advantage of this legal flexibility, and it
remains to be seen how much relief patients will experience. As understanding of the clinical
impacts of COVID-19 continues to evolve and patients begin experiencing long-term impacts from
the infection, patients have reported receiving medical bills totaling tens of thousands of dollars for
treatment for COVID-19 and complications.

A second key consideration is that to effectively enhance patients’ access to high-value care, health
plans must make high-value care across the clinical continuum affordable. Making physician visits
more affordable is therefore a necessary, but insufficient, step toward achieving the improved
access goal of Resolution 125-A-19. If only physician office visits are targeted for deductible
exemption, some patients and physicians may be frustrated to realize that they can identify a
problem but lack the resources to resolve it. For example, consider the scenario where patients can
visit their physician and learn that they are at risk for diabetes without incurring costs under their
health plan, but to pursue necessary testing, pharmaceuticals, and medical devices, they must pay
OOP until reaching their deductibles. In fact, a recent study found that patients enrolled in an
HDHP who received a prescription for a brand name antihyperglycemic medication were less
likely to refill that prescription than were patients enrolled in non-HDHP plans who were
prescribed the same medicine. This study suggests that HDHP enrollment can impact the quality
and delivery of care for patients with type 2 diabetes when branded antihyperglycemic medications
offer optimal disease management. Similarly, another study found that patients with diabetes
experienced minimal changes in outpatient visits and disease monitoring after switching to an
HDHP, but low-income, high-morbidity, and HSA-HDHP subgroups experienced major increases
in emergency department visits or expenditures for preventable acute diabetes complications.

However, VBID can be applied to reduce some of the negative impacts of HSA-HDHPs and reduce
health care disparities. A recent study found that when HSA-HDHPs incorporate a preventive drug
list (PDL) which exempts specific high-value classes of medications from deductibles, patients
experienced substantial decreases in annual OOP costs, increased medication utilization, and lower
barriers to initiating treatment. The study authors emphasized the importance of these findings for
patients with lower incomes and encouraged employers to consider tailoring their benefit designs to
concentrate PDL coverage in lower-income employees who may benefit most from the subsidized
coverage. Additionally, a recent study demonstrated that an “HDHP+,” a hypothetical HSA-HDHP
that would reduce cost-sharing for certain high-value items and services intended to treat chronic
conditions, would likely save the federal government money, and at a minimum, be cost neutral.

Moreover, plans that apply VBID principles to HDHPs could improve health equity by ensuring
that all enrollees can afford high-value services, even during the deductible phase of their
coverage. At the same time, especially with such complex benefit designs, active counseling to
help enrollees understand the value of their benefits may be critical to the success of these
programs. Collectively, these studies reinforce the principle that mitigating the deleterious effects
of HDHPs will require efforts from stakeholders from across the health care continuum.
Payer-Driven Initiatives

In addition to considering alternative benefit design strategies that incentivize use of high-value care, payers can adopt strategies to minimize the deleterious effects of high deductibles. Given the trend of increasing patient OOP spending, payers could nevertheless soften the burden of these increasing OOP costs on patients and their physicians. Two key variables add to the stress of increasing OOP patient spending – first, the extent to which health care expenditures may need to be paid in large lump sums, and second, the extent to which patients and their physicians are unable to anticipate how much a given item or service will cost a patient OOP. When deductibles reset every year on January 1, many patients, including the 60 percent of Americans living with at least one chronic condition, may face significant OOP costs. Patients may delay or forgo necessary care early in the year when they are facing the full OOP burden of their deductibles and have not accumulated funds in health savings accounts. In fact, it has been shown that nearly all incremental reductions in high-deductible health care spending occur while patients are subject to their deductibles. Moreover, for patients enrolled in plans with coinsurance, the cost of health care items and services often cannot be known in advance, even after they have met their deductibles. In contrast, plans designed with copayments allow patients and their physicians to anticipate patient OOP costs.

Copayments are the most common form of patient cost-sharing associated with physician visits, but with the increasing use of HDHPs, increasing numbers of patients and physicians are facing high deductibles and unpredictable bills for coinsurance. From 2007 to 2017, among patients with large employer coverage, coinsurance, deductible, and patient OOP spending increased, and copayment spending decreased. In 2019, approximately 15 percent of patients enrolled in an HDHP paired with a savings account were subject to copayments for a physician office visit, with 68 percent subject to coinsurance. The opposite pattern is present for patients enrolled in non-HDHP plans – between 86 and 95 percent of patients in non-HDHP plans paid copayments for physician office visits, with only 4 to 11 percent paying coinsurance. With patients bearing increasing OOP health care costs, health plans that allow patients to predict their OOP costs in advance and also spread their OOP expenses over time may present a more patient-friendly and physician practice-friendly benefit design.

Employers, in specific, play a unique role as designers of employee health care benefits, and employers can choose to deploy a variety of strategies to encourage patients to pursue the care they need. Benefit packages are increasingly important to employees, with employees seeking choice and personalization, and looking to their employers to provide the tools they need to make good decisions. Employers can take a variety of actions to make the health insurance benefits they offer valuable and accessible to their employees. For example, in 2019, JPMorgan Chase provided employees with health plans that applied lower deductible and coinsurance maximum amounts to lower-income employees. For 2020, some JPMorgan Chase and Amazon employees have even more innovative plan options via the Haven Healthcare program, the venture among JPMorgan Chase, Amazon, and Berkshire Hathaway. Few details are available, but reporting indicates that the JPMorgan Chase plans remove patient deductibles, and copayments for most services range from $15 to $110. Employers have a variety of more incremental options for tailoring the health plans they offer to their employees’ needs. Some potential options for employers to consider include:

- Seed and/or match employee contributions to one or more types of savings accounts that can be used for health care expenses to encourage savings and use of these savings accounts. Employers contributing to employees’ HSAs can improve employee awareness, consideration, and ultimately adoption and self-funding of HSAs. Research indicates that on average, employees contribute 10 percent more to their HSAs each year when their
When possible, grant employees access to the full annual employer and/or employee contribution to a savings account at the beginning of a plan year so that patients can pursue care as they need it, rather than delaying care until savings have accumulated.

- Provide, and perhaps incentivize employees to participate in, robust health insurance and financial literacy campaigns that give them tools to choose the plan that best meets their needs and identify affordable care options throughout the plan year. When making decisions about health care savings, patients must navigate a complex set of choices, and even those with high financial literacy have trouble deciding where to save and how to spend. For example, a 2018 study found that 69 percent of employees who did not enroll in an HSA say they chose not to enroll because they did not see any benefits to an HSA, did not understand what HSAs do, or simply did not take the time to understand the HSA. Moreover, only 15 percent of employees with high financial literacy choose to save their HSA money for the future. Educational campaigns could include practical information regarding which items and services are available without patient cost-sharing pre-deductible and information about how funds placed in an HSA, HRA, FSA, MSA, or other savings account can be used to pay for health expenses. Via online and in-person education, employers can provide decision support and care navigation tools to help their employees at the time of health insurance enrollment and throughout the year.

- Consider how predictable copayments vs. variable coinsurance can influence patient tendencies to pursue necessary health care and provide patients with a variety of health plan design options whenever possible.

- Collaborate with organized medicine to ensure that their innovations in plan design are likely to achieve intended clinical goals, as well as enhanced access to affordable care.

Physician Practice Initiatives

Physician practice initiatives focused on helping patients with high deductibles can serve physicians and the patients in their care. High deductibles burden patients and their physicians when patient fears about cost of care impair joint patient-physician decision-making and care planning. High deductibles also pose billing and collection challenges for physician practices. Fortunately, there are tools available that can help physicians and their practices. The administrative simplification provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) related to standard electronic transactions and associated operating rules empower health care providers to obtain real-time information regarding patients’ health plan coverage and financial obligations. Specifically, the operating rules for the electronic eligibility standard transaction require health plans to respond in real-time (within 20 seconds) to health care providers’ electronic requests for information about patients’ health plan benefits. Implementation of this legal requirement has been imperfect — challenges persist — but the eligibility operating rules provide physicians with an avenue to obtain necessary data to inform their practice and their physician-patient joint decision-making. Specifically, physician practices can ascertain the patient’s portion of the financial responsibility, including copayment, coinsurance and patient-specific remaining deductible. This information can help practices estimate patient costs before treatment decisions are made, and in some cases, collect patient deductibles and/or coinsurance before patients leave the office. To empower physicians to implement and exercise their rights under the HIPAA administrative simplification provisions and to streamline their practices’ billing processes, the AMA has published several toolkits and educational resources,
including those entitled, “What you need to know about electronic eligibility verification,”
“Managing patient payments,” and “Electronic transaction toolkits for administrative
simplification, which includes a resource on Compliance in standard electronic transactions:
Responsibilities of health plans and physicians.”

RELEVANT AMA POLICY

AMA policy strongly supports value-based care, VBID, and innovative insurance design. Policy
H-185.939 broadly supports flexibility in the design and implementation of VBID programs and
outlines a series of guiding principles including that VBID explicitly consider the clinical benefit of
a given service or treatment when determining cost-sharing or other benefit design elements. Policy
D-185.979 also supports clinical nuance in VBID to respect individual patient needs and supports
legislative and regulatory flexibility to accommodate VBID, including innovations that expand
access to affordable care, such as changes needed to allow HSA-HDHPs to provide pre-deductible
coverage for preventive and chronic care management services. Policy D-185.979 also encourages
national medical specialty societies to identify services that they consider to be high-value and
collaborate with payers to experiment with benefit plan designs that align patient financial
incentives with utilization of high-value services. Consistent with calls to remove legislative and
regulatory barriers to innovative plan design, Policy H-165.856 states that the regulatory
environment should enable rather than impede private market innovation in product development
and purchasing arrangements and further states that benefit mandates should be minimized to allow
markets to determine benefit packages and permit a wide choice of coverage options. Policy
H-450.938 provides principles to guide physician value-based decision-making, and Policy
H-155.960 supports value-based decision-making among other broad strategies for addressing
rising health care costs. Moreover, this policy recognizes the role of physician leadership and
collaboration among physicians, patients, insurers, employers, unions, and government in
successful cost-containment and quality-improvement initiatives. The policy encourages third-party
payers to use targeted benefit design, whereby patient cost-sharing is determined based on the
clinical value of a health care service or treatment, with consideration given to further tailoring
cost-sharing to patient income and other factors known to impact compliance. AMA policy also
supports value-based pricing for pharmaceuticals (Policy H-110.986) and providing patients with
information and incentives to encourage appropriate utilization of preventive services (Policy
H-390.849).

Policy H-165.846 states that provisions must be made to assist individuals with low-incomes or
unusually high medical costs in obtaining health insurance coverage and meeting cost-sharing
obligations. Policy H-165.828 encourages the development of demonstration projects to allow
individuals eligible for cost-sharing subsidies, who forego these subsidies by enrolling in a bronze
plan, to have access to an HSA partially funded by an amount determined to be equivalent to the
cost-sharing subsidy. That policy also supports education regarding deductibles, cost-sharing, and
HSAs. Policy H-165.852 supports, as an integral component of AMA efforts to achieve universal
access and coverage and freedom of choice in health insurance, legislation promoting the
establishment and use of HSAs and allowing the tax-free use of such accounts for health care
expenses. That policy also supports the enhancement of activities to educate patients about the
advantages and opportunities of HSAs. In addition, Policy H-165.854 supports HRAs as a
mechanism for empowering patients to have greater control over their health care decision-making.

DISCUSSION

The Council lauds the sponsors of Resolution 125-A-19 for highlighting key challenges that
HDHPs present to both patients and physicians, and it shares the goal of reducing barriers to
necessary health care. The Council is committed to developing AMA policy to mitigate the negative impacts of HDHPs that is consistent with the broader context of AMA policy on health reform and value-based decision-making. To accomplish this goal, the Council believes that the AMA should encourage further research and advocacy to develop and promote innovative health plan designs, including designs that can recognize that medical services may differ in the amount of health produced and that the clinical benefit derived from a specific service can vary among patients. Such policy would be consistent with AMA policy regarding “clinical nuance” in VBID (Policy D-185.979) and policy encouraging private market innovation in product development and purchasing arrangements (Policy H-165.856). Recognizing that more than half of Americans under age 65 get their health insurance through an employer, employers have a powerful role to play in designing health plans to meet their employees’ needs and educating their employees about the benefits provided by the health plans. Accordingly, the Council recommends that employers should be encouraged to collaborate with their employees in ways that help them to better understand their employees’ health insurance preferences and needs, tailor the benefits they offer to meet the preferences and needs of employees and their dependents, and provide robust education to help patients make good use of their benefits to obtain the care they need. Moreover, to ease the financial burden of large lump sum expenditures, the Council recommends that employers pursue strategies to help enrollees spread the costs associated with high OOP costs across the plan year. Additionally, consistent with Policy H-155.960, which highlights the importance of collaboration among physicians and employers in successful cost-containment and quality-improvement initiatives, the Council encourages state medical associations and state and national medical specialty societies to actively collaborate with payers as they develop innovative plan designs to ensure that the health plans are likely to achieve their goals of enhanced access to affordable care. In addition, to emphasize the importance of health plans designed with “clinical nuance,” the need for legislative and regulatory flexibility to accommodate innovations in health plan design that expand access to affordable care, and the critical role of collaboration among national medical specialty societies and payers in designing innovative health plans, the Council recommends reaffirming Policy D-185.979. Similarly, to highlight the importance of robust education regarding deductibles, cost-sharing, and health care savings accounts, and to amplify the AMA’s support for funding health savings accounts, the Council recommends reaffirming Policy H-165.828. Moreover, the Council notes that in CMS Report 1-I-20, it recommends incentivizing health plans to offer pre-deductible coverage, including physician services in bronze plans, to maximize the value of zero-premium plans to plan enrollees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council on Medical Service recommends that the following be adopted in lieu of Resolution 125-A-19 and that the remainder of the report be filed:

1. That our American Medical Association (AMA) encourage ongoing research and advocacy to develop and promote innovative health plan designs, including designs that can recognize that medical services may differ in the amount of health produced and that the clinical benefit derived from a specific service can vary among patients. (New HOD Policy)

2. That our AMA encourage employers to: (a) provide robust education to help patients make good use of their benefits to obtain the care they need, (b) take steps to collaborate with their employees to understand employees’ health insurance preferences and needs, (c) tailor their benefit designs to the health insurance preferences and needs of their employees and their dependents, and (d) pursue strategies to help enrollees spread the costs associated with high out-of-pocket costs across the plan year. (New HOD Policy)
3. That our AMA encourage state medical associations and state and national medical specialty societies to actively collaborate with payers as they develop innovative plan designs to ensure that the health plans are likely to achieve their goals of enhanced access to affordable care. (New HOD Policy)

4. That our AMA reaffirm Policy D-185.979, which supports health plans designed to respect individual patient needs and legislative and regulatory flexibility to accommodate innovations in health plan design that expand access to affordable care, and which encourages national medical specialty societies to identify services that they consider to be high-value and collaborate with payers to experiment with benefit plan designs that align patient financial incentives with utilization of high-value services. (Reaffirm HOD Policy)

5. That our AMA reaffirm Policy H-165.828, which supports education regarding deductibles, cost-sharing, and health savings accounts (HSAs), and encourages the development of demonstration projects to allow individuals eligible for cost-sharing subsidies, who forego these subsidies by enrolling in a bronze plan, to have access to an HSA partially funded by an amount determined to be equivalent to the cost-sharing subsidy. (Reaffirm HOD Policy)

Fiscal Note: Less than $500.
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