

SUBJECT TO RESOLUTION COMMITTEE REVIEW

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Resolution: 105
(JUN-21)

Introduced by: Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Virginia, Alabama

Subject: Effects of Telehealth Coverage and Payment Parity on Health Insurance Premiums

Referred to: Reference Committee A

1 Whereas, The coverage and utilization of telehealth expanded rapidly during the COVID-19
2 pandemic; and¹

3
4 Whereas, Many commercial health insurance companies have voluntarily expanded telehealth
5 coverage during the pandemic, albeit in some cases on a more restrictive or less generous
6 basis than the Medicare program; and

7
8 Whereas, Our AMA has drafted model legislation that requires health insurance companies to
9 offer telehealth coverage and to reimburse for those services “on the same basis and to the
10 same extent” that the insurer would have if the same service were rendered in-person; and²

11
12 Whereas, There are ongoing discussions across the nation regarding whether to require health
13 insurance companies to offer telehealth coverage and whether to require health insurance
14 companies to provide payment parity for telehealth services; and³

15
16 Whereas, Physicians have recognized that telehealth can improve clinical outcomes, patient
17 experience, costs, and professional satisfaction; and⁴

18
19 Whereas, Insurance companies in Florida and elsewhere have argued that enacting legislation
20 that would require them to offer telehealth coverage and to adhere to payment parity
21 requirements will definitively, significantly increase insurance premiums; and

22
23 Whereas, Physician advocates urgently need additional data concerning the effects of
24 telehealth coverage requirements and payment parity requirements on health insurance
25 premiums to respond to the cost-related concerns being propagated by insurers; and

26
27 Whereas, Physician advocates may struggle to successfully enact telehealth coverage and
28 payment parity legislation in the absence of research that can be used to respond to the
29 assertion that such legislation will definitively and significantly increase health insurance
30 premiums; and

31
32 Whereas, Our AMA is equipped to perform or commission research concerning the effects of
33 telehealth coverage and payment parity requirements, including the effect that such policies
34 may have on health insurance premiums; therefore be it

- 1 RESOLVED, That our American Medical Association conduct or commission a study on the
2 effect that telemedicine services have had on health insurance premiums, focusing on the
3 differences between states that had telehealth payment parity provisions in effect prior to the
4 pandemic versus those that did not, and report back at the 2021 Interim Meeting of the AMA
5 House of Delegates. (Directive to Take Action)

Fiscal Note: Not yet determined

Received: 05/03/21

AUTHORS STATEMENT OF PRIORITY

The practice of medicine would benefit from a study that examined the effects of telehealth coverage requirements, including payment parity requirements, on health insurance premiums.

In the wake of COVID-19, physicians and patients across the nation realized the numerous, substantial benefits of greater access to telehealth. Consequently, state medical societies have become increasingly interested in permanently requiring health insurers to cover telehealth services and to pay for telehealth services at parity with in-person services. The access and patient care benefits of enacting such legislation would be considerable, as the AMA has formally recognized through its public policy positions and ongoing work initiatives.

However, health insurers have expressed opposition to such mandates, arguing that such mandates will significantly increase premiums. Currently, there is a paucity of research examining the effects of telehealth coverage requirements on insurance premiums. This makes it difficult to assess and respond to such claims. Additionally, many state lawmakers are unconcerned about record-high insurance company profits, but care deeply about avoiding legislation that will increase premiums.

Ultimately, even if the scope of the research was limited due to methodological constraints, physician advocates urgently need whatever data can be made available to them. Additionally, even a finding that the effects of such policies on premiums are “inconclusive” would still help physicians respond to claims that increasing access to telehealth will “definitively” and “significantly” raise premiums. In short, this research would help medical societies enact laws that are consistent with AMA policy by supplying advocates with much-needed data.

References:

1. FAIR Health Monthly Telehealth Regional Tracker, <https://www.fairhealth.org/article/fair-health-tracker-shows-continuing-growth-in-telehealth>
2. AMA Telemedicine Model Bill, 2017
3. Kaiser Family Foundation: Opportunities and Barriers for Telemedicine in the U.S. During the COVID-19 Emergency and Beyond, <https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/issue-brief/opportunities-and-barriers-for-telemedicine-in-the-u-s-during-the-covid-19-emergency-and-beyond/>
4. American Medical Association Telehealth Research & Key Resources: Research Findings, <https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/digital/telehealth-research-key-resources-research-findings>

RELEVANT AMA POLICY

Insurance Coverage Parity for Telemedicine Service D-480.969

1. Our AMA will advocate for telemedicine parity laws that require private insurers to cover telemedicine-provided services comparable to that of in-person services, and not limit coverage only to services provided by select corporate telemedicine providers.
 2. Our AMA will develop model legislation to support states' efforts to achieve parity in telemedicine coverage policies.
 3. Our AMA will work with the Federation of State Medical Boards to draft model state legislation to ensure telemedicine is appropriately defined in each state's medical practice statutes and its regulation falls under the jurisdiction of the state medical board.
- Res. 233, A-16; Reaffirmed: CMS Rep. 1, I-19