AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ORGANIZED MEDICAL STAFF SECTION

Resolution: 3
(A-26)

Introduced by: Joanne Loethen, MD

Subject: Ensuring Accuracy and Physician Protections for Patient Attribution in Health Plan Quality Measurement and Value-Based Programs

Referred to: OMSS Reference Committee
(, MD, Chair)

Whereas, health insurers, including Medicare Advantage organizations and commercial health plans, increasingly attribute patients to physicians and physician practices for purposes of quality measurement, star ratings, and value-based payment programs; and

Whereas, many attribution methodologies rely on administrative enrollment data, patient self-selection, or claims algorithms that may assign patients to physicians with whom they have no active clinical relationship; and

Whereas, physicians and practices are frequently held accountable for quality metrics, preventive care measures, and performance ratings for patients who have never been seen in their practice or who have not received care from the attributed physician during the measurement period; and

Whereas, inaccurate patient attribution may negatively affect physician performance scores, payer star ratings, public reporting metrics, and financial incentives tied to value-based care programs; and

Whereas, physicians often face a significant administrative burden when attempting to correct inaccurate patient attribution, and many health plans lack transparent processes, timely dispute mechanisms, or clear criteria for removing patients who are incorrectly assigned; and

Whereas, inaccurate attribution increases administrative burden and diverts physician resources from patient care; and

Whereas, inaccurate attribution undermines the integrity of quality measurement programs and may misrepresent the quality of care delivered by physicians and physician practices; and

Whereas, accurate attribution should reflect a meaningful clinical relationship between a patient and a physician, such as documented visits or a confirmed patient designation of a primary care physician; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that our American Medical Association adopt as policy the following Universal Standards for Patient Attribution:

1. Clinical Relationship: Attribution must be based on a documented clinical relationship, defined by recent clinical encounter(s) within an appropriate timeframe or a verified patient designation of the physician as their primary care provider (PCP);
2. Prospective Notification: Payers must provide physicians with prospective lists of attributed patients at least 30 days before the start of a measurement period;

3. Transparency: Payers must disclose the attribution algorithms, claims thresholds, and patient designation processes used to assign patients to physicians;
4. Mandatory Exclusion: Patients subject to an active attribution dispute must be excluded from all quality scoring and financial performance calculations until the dispute is resolved;
5. Dispute Resolution: Payers must provide a standardized, timely mechanism for physicians to correct or suppress inaccurate attributions, with a determination required within 30 days of submission;

(New HOD Policy); and be it further

RESOLVED, that our AMA advocate for federal and state legislation and regulation than ensure accurate patient attribution and prevent physicians from being evaluated on patients with whom they have no established care relationship, including enforcement mechanisms for payers who fail to maintain accurate attribution lists (Directive to Take Action); and be it further

RESOLVED, that our AMA develop model state legislation and regulatory policy addressing accurate patient attribution in health plan quality measurement and value-based payment programs, based on the Universal Standards for Patient Attribution, with modular components adaptable to varying state legislative and regulatory environments (Directive to Take Action); and be it further

RESOLVED, that our AMA Board of Trustees report back at the 2026 Interim Meeting with recommendations to align and consolidate existing AMA policies related to patient attribution to ensure a streamlined advocacy strategy (Directive to Take Action).

Fiscal Note: (Assigned by HOD)

Received: 4/21/2026

RELEVANT AMA POLICY

Physician-Focused Alternative Payment Models: Reducing Barriers H-385.908

1. Our AMA encourages physicians to engage in the development of Physician-Focused Payment Models by seeking guidance and refinement assistance from the Physician-Focused Payment Model Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC).

2. Our AMA will continue to urge CMS to limit financial risk requirements to costs that physicians participating in an APM have the ability to influence or control.

3. Our AMA will continue to advocate for innovative ways of defining financial risk, such as including start-up investments and ongoing costs of participation in the risk calculation that would alleviate the financial barrier to physician participation in APMs.

4. Our AMA will work with CMS, the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC), PTAC, interested medical societies, and other organizations to pursue the following to improve the availability and use of health information technology (IT):

a. Continue to expand technical assistance;

b. Develop IT systems that support and streamline clinical participation;

c. Enable health IT to support bi-directional data exchange to provide physicians with useful reports and analyses based on the data provided;

d. Identify methods to reduce the data collection burden; and

e. Begin implementing the 21st Century Cures Act.

5. Our AMA will work with CMS, PTAC, interested medical societies, and other organizations to design risk adjustment systems that:

a. Identify new data sources to enable adequate analyses of clinical and non-clinical factors that contribute to a patient’s health and success of treatment, such as disease stage and socio-demographic factors;

b. Account for differences in patient needs, such as functional limitations, changes in medical conditions compared to historical data, and ability to access health care services; and

c. Explore an approach in which the physician managing a patient’s care can contribute additional information, such as disease severity, that may not be available in existing risk adjustment methods to more accurately determine the appropriate risk stratification.

6. Our AMA will work with CMS, PTAC, interested medical societies, and other organizations to improve attribution methods through the following actions:

a. Develop methods to assign the costs of care among physicians in proportion to the amount of care they provided and/or controlled within the episode;

b. Distinguish between services ordered by a physician and those delivered by a physician;

c. Develop methods to ensure a physician is not attributed costs they cannot control or costs for patients no longer in their care;

d. Explore implementing a voluntary approach wherein the physician and patient agree that the physician will be responsible for managing the care of a particular condition, potentially even having a contract that articulates the patient's and physician's responsibility for managing the condition; and

e. Provide physicians with lists of attributed patients to improve care coordination.

7. Our AMA will work with CMS, PTAC, interested medical societies, and other organizations to improve performance target setting through the following actions:

a. Analyze and disseminate data on how much is currently being spent on a given condition, how much of that spending is potentially avoidable through an APM, and the potential impact of an APM on costs and spending;

b. Account for costs that are not currently billable but that cost the practice to provide; and

c. Account for lost revenue for providing fewer or less expensive services.

Citation: CMS Rep. 10, A-17; Reaffirmed: CMS Rep. 03, I-18; Reaffirmed: CMS Rep. 10, A-19; Reaffirmed: CMS Rep. 3, I-19; Reaffirmed: BOT Rep. 13, I-20

Physician Payment Reform H-390.849

1. Our American Medical Association will advocate for the development and adoption of physician payment reforms that adhere to the following principles:
    a. Promote improved patient access to high-quality, cost-effective care.
    b. Be designed with input from the physician community.
    c. Ensure that physicians have an appropriate level of decision-making authority over bonus or shared-savings distributions.
    d. Not require budget neutrality within Medicare Part B.
    e. Be based on payment rates that are sufficient to cover the full cost of sustainable medical practice.
    f. Ensure reasonable implementation timeframes, with adequate support available to assist physicians with the implementation process.
    g. Make participation options available for varying practice sizes, patient mixes, specialties, and locales.
    h. Use adequate risk adjustment methodologies.
    i. Incorporate incentives large enough to merit additional investments by physicians.
    j. Provide patients with information and incentives to encourage appropriate utilization of medical care, including the use of preventive services and self-management protocols.
    k. Provide a mechanism to ensure that budget baselines are reevaluated at regular intervals and are reflective of trends in service utilization.

   l. Attribution processes should emphasize voluntary agreements between patients and physicians, minimize the use of algorithms or formulas, provide attribution information to physicians in a timely manner, and include formal mechanisms to allow physicians to verify and correct attribution data as necessary.
   m. Include ongoing evaluation processes to monitor the success of the reforms in achieving the goals of improving patient care and increasing the value of health care services.
2. Our AMA opposes bundling of payments in ways that limit medically necessary care, including institutional post-acute care, or otherwise interfere with a physician's ability to provide high quality care to patients.
3. Our AMA supports payment methodologies that redistribute Medicare payments among providers based on outcomes (including functional improvements, if appropriate), quality and risk-adjustment measures only if measures are scientifically valid, reliable, and consistent with national medical specialty society- developed clinical guidelines/standards.
4. Our AMA will continue to monitor health care delivery and physician payment reform activities and provide resources to help physicians understand and participate in these initiatives.
5. Our AMA supports the development of a public-private partnership for the purpose of validating statistical models used for risk adjustment.

Citation: CMS Rep. 6, A-09; Reaffirmed: A-10; Appended: Res. 829, I-10; Appended: CMS Rep. 1, A-11; Appended: CMS Rep. 4, A-11; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 119, A-12; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 122, A-12; Modified: CMS Rep. 6, A-13; Reaffirmed: I-15; Reaffirmed: A-16; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 712, A-17; Reaffirmed: BOT Action in response to referred for decision: Res. 237, I-17; Reaffirmed: A-19; Reaffirmed: BOT Action in response to referred for decision: Res. 111, A-19; Reaffirmed: BOT Action in response to referred for decision: Res. 132, A-19; Reaffirmed: Res. 212, I-21; Reaffirmed: Res. 240, A-22; Reaffirmed: A-22; Modified: CMS Rep. 04, A-23; Reaffirmed: Res. 214; A-23; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 225, A-25; Reaffirmed: Res. 226, A-25

Medical Information and Its Uses H-406.987

DATA TRANSPARENCY PRINCIPLES TO PROMOTE IMPROVEMENTS IN QUALITY AND CARE DELIVERY

Our AMA seeks to help physicians improve the quality reporting of patient care data and adapt to new payment and delivery models to transform our health care system. One means of accomplishing this goal is to increase the transparency of health care data. The principles outlined below ensure that physicians, practices, care systems, physician-led organizations, patients and other relevant stakeholders can access and proactively use meaningful, actionable health care information to achieve care improvements and innovations. These principles do not replace but build upon existing AMA policies H-406.990, H-406.989, H-406.991, and H-406.996 that address safeguards for the release of physician data and physician profiles, expanding these guidelines to reflect the new opportunities and potential uses of this information.

Transparency Objectives and Goals

Engaging Physicians - Our AMA encourages greater physician engagement in transparency efforts, including the development of physician-led quality measures to ensure that gaps in measures are minimized and that analyses reflect the knowledge and expertise of physicians.

Promoting New Payment and Delivery Models - Our AMA supports appropriate funding and other support to ensure that the data that are used to inform new payment and delivery models are readily available and do not impose a new cost or additional burden on model participants.

Improving Care Choices and Decisions - Our AMA promotes efforts to present data appropriately depending on the objective and the relevant end-user, including transparently identifying what information is being provided, for what purpose, and how the information can or cannot be used to influence care choices.

Informing Physicians - Our AMA encourages the development of user interfaces that allow physicians or their staff to structure simple queries to obtain and track actionable reports related to specific patients, peer comparisons, provider-level resource use, practice patterns, and other relevant information.

Informing Patients - Our AMA encourages patients to consult with physicians to understand and navigate health care transparency and data efforts.

Informing Other Consumers - Our AMA seeks opportunities to engage with other stakeholders to facilitate physician involvement and more proactive use of health care data.

Data Transparency Resources

Data Availability - Our AMA supports removing barriers to accessing additional information from other payers and care settings, focusing on data that is valid, reliable, and complete.

Access to Timely Data - While some datasets will require more frequent updates than others, our AMA encourages use of the most current information and that governmental reports are made available, at a minimum, from the previous quarter.

Accurate Data - Our AMA supports proper oversight of entities accessing and using health care data, and more stringent safeguards for public reporting, so that information is accurate, transparent, and appropriately used.

Use of Quality Data - Our AMA supports definitions of quality based on evidence-based guidelines, measures developed and supported by specialty societies, and physician-developed metrics that focus on patient outcomes and engagement.

Increasing Data Utility - Our AMA promotes efforts by clinical data registries, regional collaborations, Qualified Entities, and specialty societies to develop reliable and valid performance measures, increase data utility and reduce barriers that currently limit access to and use of the health care data.

Challenges to Transparency

Standardization - Our AMA supports improvements in electronic health records (EHRs) and other technology to capture and access data in uniform formats.

Mitigating Administrative Burden - To reduce burdens, data reporting requirements imposed on physicians should be limited to the information proven to improve clinical practice. Collection, reporting, and review of all other data and information should be voluntary.

Data Attribution - Our AMA seeks to ensure that those compiling and using the data avoid attribution errors by working to correctly assign services and patients to the appropriate provider(s) as well as allowing entities to verify who or where procedures, services, and items were performed, ordered, or otherwise provided. Until problems with the current state of episode of care and attribution methodologies are resolved, our AMA encourages public data and analyses primarily focused at the system-level instead of on individual physicians or providers.

Citation: BOT Rep. 6, A-15; Reaffirmed: I-18; Reaffirmed: CSAPH Rep. 2, I-19

Work of the Task Force on the Release of Physician Data H-406.990

Release of Claims and Payment Data from Governmental Programs

The AMA encourages the use of physician data to benefit both patients and physicians and to improve the quality of patient care and the efficient use of resources in the delivery of health care services. The AMA supports this use of physician data only when it preserves access to health care and is used to provide accurate physician performance assessments.

Raw claims data used in isolation have significant limitations. The release of such data from government programs must be subject to safeguards to ensure that neither false nor misleading conclusions are derived that could undermine the delivery of appropriate and quality care. If not addressed, the limitations of such data are significant. The foregoing limitations may include, but are not limited to, failure to consider factors that impact care such as specialty, geographic location, patient mix and demographics, plan design, patient compliance, drug and supply costs, hospital and service costs, professional liability coverage, support staff and other practice costs as well as the potential for mistakes and errors in the data or its attribution.

Raw claims and payment data resulting from government health care programs, including, but not limited to, the Medicare and Medicaid programs should only be released:

1. when appropriate patient privacy is preserved via de-identified data aggregation or if written authorization for release of individually identifiable patient data has been obtained from such patient in accordance with the requirements of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and applicable regulations;
2. upon request of physicians [or their practice entities] to the extent the data involve services that they have provided;
3. to law enforcement and other regulatory agencies when there is reasonable and credible reason to believe that a specific physician [or practice entity] may have violated a law or regulation, and the data is relevant to the agency's investigation or prosecution of a possible violation;
4. to researchers/policy analysts for bona fide research/policy analysis purposes, provided the data do not identify specific physicians [or their practice entities] unless the researcher or policy analyst has (a) made a specific showing as to why the disclosure of specific identities is essential; and, (b) executed a written agreement to

maintain the confidentiality of any data identifying specific physicians [or their practice entities];
5. to other entities only if the data do not identify specific physicians [or their practice entities]; or
6. if a law is enacted that permits the government to release raw physician-specific Medicare and/or Medicaid claims data, or allows the use of such data to construct profiles of identified physicians or physician practices. Such disclosures must meet the following criteria:
(a) the publication or release of this information is deemed imperative to safeguard the public welfare;
(b) the raw data regarding physician claims from governmental healthcare programs is:
(i) published in conjunction with appropriate disclosures and/or explanatory statements as to the limitations of the data that raise the potential for specific misinterpretation of such data. These statements should include disclosure or explanation of factors that influence the provision of care including geographic location, specialty, patient mix and demographics, health plan design, patient compliance, drug and supply costs, hospital and service costs, professional liability coverage, support staff and other practice costs as well as the potential for mistakes and errors in the data or its attribution, in addition to other relevant factors.
(ii) safeguarded to protect against the dissemination of inconsistent, incomplete, invalid or inaccurate physician-specific medical practice data.
(c) any physician profiling which draws upon this raw data acknowledges that the data set is not representative of the physicians' entire patient population and uses a methodology that ensures the following:
(i) the data are used to profile physicians based on quality of care provided - never on utilization of resources alone - and the degree to which profiling is based on utilization of resources is clearly identified.
(ii) data are measured against evidence-based quality of care measures, created by physicians across appropriate specialties.
(iii) the data and methodologies used in profiling physicians, including the use of representative and statistically valid sample sizes, statistically valid risk-adjustment methodologies and statistically valid attribution rules produce verifiably accurate results that reflect the quality and cost of care provided by the physicians.
(d) any governmental healthcare data shall be protected and shared with physicians before it is released or used, to ensure that physicians are provided with an adequate and timely opportunity to review, respond and appeal the accuracy of the raw data (and its attribution to individual physicians) and any physician profiling results derived from the analysis of physician-specific medical practice data to ensure accuracy prior to their use, publication or release.

Citation: BOT Rep. 18, A-09; Reaffirmed: BOT Rep. 09, A-19; Modified: Speakers Rep., A-19

Work of the Task Force on the Release of Physician Data H-406.991

Principles for the Public Release and Accurate Use of Physician Data

The AMA encourages the use of physician data to benefit both patients and physicians and to improve the quality of patient care and the efficient use of resources in the delivery of health care services. The AMA supports this use of physician data when it is used in conjunction with program(s) designed to improve or maintain the quality of, and access to, medical care for all patients and is used to provide accurate physician performance assessments in concert with the following Principles:

1. Patient Privacy Safeguards
- All entities involved in the collection, use and release of claims data comply with the HIPAA Privacy and Security Rules (H-315.972, H-315.973, H-315.983, H-315.984, H-315.989, H-450.947).
- Disclosures made without patient authorization are generally limited to claims data, as that is generally the only information necessary to accomplish the intended purpose of the task (H-315.973, H-315.975, H-315.983).

2. Data Accuracy and Security Safeguards
- Effective safeguards are established to protect against the dissemination of inconsistent, incomplete, invalid or inaccurate physician-specific medical practice data (H-406.996, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- Reliable administrative, technical, and physical safeguards provide security to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure of patient or physician-specific health care data and physician profiles (H-406.996, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- Physician-specific medical practice data, and all analyses, proceedings, records and minutes from quality review activities are not subject to discovery or admittance into evidence in any judicial or administrative proceeding without the physician's consent (H-406.996, H-450.947, H-450.961).

3. Transparency Requirements
- When data are collected and analyzed for the purpose of creating physician profiles, the methodologies used to create the profiles and report the results are developed in conjunction with relevant physician organizations and practicing physicians and are disclosed in sufficient detail to allow each physician or medical group to re-analyze the validity of the reported results prior to more general disclosure (H-315.973, H-406.993, H-406.994, H-406.998, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- The limitations of the data sources used to create physician profiles are clearly identified and acknowledged in terms understandable to consumers (H-406.994, H-450.947).
- The capabilities and limitations of the methodologies and reporting systems applied to the data to profile and rank physicians are publicly revealed in understandable terms to consumers (H-315.973, H-406.994, H-406.997, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- Case-matched, risk-adjusted resource use data are provided to physicians to assist them in determining their relative utilization of resources in providing care to their patients (H-285.931).

4. Review and Appeal Requirements
- Physicians are provided with an adequate and timely opportunity to review, respond and appeal the results derived from the analysis of physician-specific medical practice data to ensure accuracy prior to their use, publication or release (H-315.973, H-406.996, H-406.998, H-450.941, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- When the physician and the rater cannot reach agreement, physician comments are appended to the report at the physician's request (H-450.947).

5. Physician Profiling Requirements
- The data and methodologies used in profiling physicians, including the use of representative and statistically valid sample sizes, statistically valid risk-adjustment methodologies and statistically valid attribution rules produce verifiably accurate results that reflect the quality and cost of care provided by the physicians (H-406.994, H-406.997, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- Data reporting programs only use accurate and balanced data sources to create physician profiles and do not use these profiles to create tiered or narrow network programs that are used to steer patients towards certain physicians primarily on cost of care factors (H-450.951).

- When a single set of claims data includes a sample of patients that are skewed or not representative of the physicians' entire patient population, multiple sources of claims data are used.
- Physician efficiency of care ratings use physician data for services, procedures, tests and prescriptions that are based on physicians' patient utilization of resources so that the focus is on comparative physicians' patient utilization and not on the actual charges for services.
- Physician-profiling programs may rank individual physician members of a medical group but do not use those individual rankings for placement in a network or for reimbursement purposes.

6. Quality Measurement Requirements
- The data are used to profile physicians based on quality of care provided - never on utilization of resources alone -- and the degree to which profiling is based on utilization of resources is clearly identified (H-450.947).
- Data are measured against evidence-based quality of care measures, created by physicians across appropriate specialties, such as the Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement. (H-406.994, H-406.998, H-450.947, H-450.961).
- These evidence-based measures are endorsed by the National Quality Forum (NQF) and/or the AQA and HQA, when available. When unavailable, scientifically valid measures developed in conjunction with appropriate medical specialty societies and practicing physicians are used to evaluate the data.

7. Patient Satisfaction Measurement Requirements
- Until the relationship between patient satisfaction and other outcomes is better understood, data collected on patient satisfaction is best used by physicians to better meet patient needs particularly as they relate to favorable patient outcomes and other criteria of high quality care (H-450.982).
- Because of the difficulty in determining whether responses to patient satisfaction surveys are a result of the performance of a physician or physician office, or the result of the demands or restrictions of health insurers or other factors
out of the control of the physician, the use of patient satisfaction data is not appropriate for incentive or tiering mechanisms.
- As in physician profiling programs, it is important that programs that publicly rate physicians on patient satisfaction notify physicians of their rating and provide a chance for the physician to appeal that rating prior to its publication.

Citation: BOT Rep. 19, A-09; Reaffirmed: A-10; Reaffirmed: BOT action in response to referred for decision: Res. 709, A-10, Res. 711, A-10 and BOT Rep. 17, A-10; Reaffirmed: I-10; Reaffirmed in lieu of Res. 808, I-10; Reaffirmed in lieu of res. 824, I-10; Reaffirmed: A-11; Reaffirmed: BOT Rep. 17, A-13; Reaffirmed: Res. 806, I-13; Reaffirmed: A-19