



RADV Audit Preparation & Data Validation

Presented by: Kim Browning, CHC, PMP
Cognisight, LLC Executive Vice President
March 10, 2014

- Part 1 – Kim Browning
 - Knowledge sharing from past/active audits
 - Effective data validation techniques
 - Decoding the RADV extrapolation
- Part 2- Debbie Conboy
 - Strategies to identify inappropriate documentation of codes
 - Designing an effective RADV simulation
 - Determining the best medical record
- Part 3 – Ankur Goel
 - Understanding the FFS adjustor
 - Tying all of this to your compliance activities
- Q&A

Part 1 Objectives

3

- Insights from current RADV audits
- Effective data validation techniques
- Review the extrapolation formula—*in English*
- Correlate to internal controls/internal audit

- For the 2007-2011 National RADVs, our clients struggle with their own submissions:
 - 7 health plans, 10 distinct audits
 - ✦ 20% unable to substantiate with 1 medical record
 - ✦ 25% incorrect submission
 - Themes
 - ✦ Active vs. History of
 - ✦ Incorrect ICD-9
 - ✦ Invalid provider

- The best defense is a good offense:
 - Build controls into your filters and process
- But, when concerned:
 - You're not managing on the front end
 - Have concerns outside of your filters and controls
 - Do not ignore
 - Create sample
 - ✦ Pretend you are CMS and substantiate to their standards

- There are several approaches to get to a meaningful sample
 - Consider a combination of the following:
 - ✦ Members with 7 or more HCCs
 - ✦ Members with ± 1 in RAF score from prior year
 - ✦ Top 1/3 paid stratum
 - ✦ High distribution HCCs
 - ✦ Presumed red flags
 - Active vs. History of
 - Vascular disease
 - Diabetes with complications
 - Major depression

You got this, right?

$$V_{\hat{T}} = \sum_{h=1}^3 \frac{N_h^2}{67} V_h$$

To Simplify & Summarize

8

- Think of RADV extrapolation as a roadmap
 - #1 Know RADV eligibles
 - #2 Know total CMS payment
 - #3 Divide RADV sample into thirds (High/Med/Low stratum)
 - #4 Determine weighting for each stratum
 - #5 Determine estimated weighted payment error (Point Estimate)
 - #6 Determine Standard Error
 - #7 Calculate Confidence Interval
 - #8 Determine upper and lower bound amounts by adding/subtracting the Confidence Interval to the Point Estimate
 - #9 Take lower bound amount and apply FFS adjuster

RADV EXTRAPOLATION EXAMPLE

#	RISK SCORE	STRATA	MA PAYMENT	Hypothetical MA Pymt.	Variance	Weighted Payment error	Deviation	Deviation Squared	Variance (div by 67-1)
1	5.073	TOP 3RD	\$ 3,934.20	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 934.20	\$ 13,943.28	\$ 822.02	\$ 675,710.99	
2	4.975	TOP 3RD	3,957.67	3,957.67	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
3	4.087	TOP 3RD	3,171.02	3,200.00	(28.98)	(432.54)	(141.16)	19,927.16	
4	3.737	TOP 3RD	2,900.11	2,900.11	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
5	3.547	TOP 3RD	2,753.05	2,753.05	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
63	1.277	TOP 3RD	996.02	996.02	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
64	1.251	TOP 3RD	975.90	975.90	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
65	1.246	TOP 3RD	972.03	972.03	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
66	1.242	TOP 3RD	968.93	968.93	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
67	1.240	TOP 3RD	967.39	967.39	-	-	(112.18)	12,585.16	
			\$ 109,128.51	\$ 101,612.21	\$ 7,516.30	\$ 112,183.58	\$ 0.00	\$ 12,710,440.10	192,582.426

1
Nh=3000

Roadmap Summary

- 1 RADV Eligibles
- 2 Total CMS Payment
- 3 Divide sample into 3 stratum
- 4 Weight the stratum
- 5 Point Estimate
- 6 Standard Error
- 7 Confidence Interval
- 8 Upper & Lower bounds
- 9 Lower + FFS adjuster

Error % **6.89%**
 Enrollee Weight **4 14.925**
 Weighted Enrollee Payment Error **\$ 112,183.58**

68	1.224	MIDDLE 3RD	\$ 955.00	\$ 940.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 223.88	\$ (21.11)	\$ 445.68	
69	1.219	MIDDLE 3RD	951.13	-	951.13	14,195.97	915.02	837,259.42	
70	1.207	MIDDLE 3RD	941.84	941.84	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
71	1.204	MIDDLE 3RD	939.52	939.52	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
72	1.168	MIDDLE 3RD	911.65	911.65	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
130	0.685	MIDDLE 3RD	542.04	542.04	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
131	0.685	MIDDLE 3RD	537.81	537.81	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
132	0.683	MIDDLE 3RD	536.25	536.25	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
133	0.679	MIDDLE 3RD	533.16	533.16	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
134	0.679	MIDDLE 3RD	533.16	533.16	-	-	(36.11)	1,304.02	
			\$ 48,392.30	\$ 45,972.85	\$ 2,419.45	\$ 36,111.19	\$ (0.00)	\$ 2,112,386.58	32,005.857

Error % **5.00%**
 Enrollee Weight **4 14.925**
 Weighted Enrollee Payment Error **\$ 36,111.19**

135	0.649	BOTTOM 3RD	\$ 509.94	\$ 515.00	\$ (5.06)	\$ (75.52)	\$ (16.05)	\$ 257.74	
136	0.649	BOTTOM 3RD	516.19	516.19	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
137	0.645	BOTTOM 3RD	506.84	506.84	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
138	0.635	BOTTOM 3RD	499.11	499.11	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
139	0.617	BOTTOM 3RD	485.17	485.17	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
197	0.177	BOTTOM 3RD	147.91	145.00	2.91	43.43	(8.08)	65.35	
198	0.177	BOTTOM 3RD	144.60	144.60	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
199	0.177	BOTTOM 3RD	144.60	144.60	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
200	0.177	BOTTOM 3RD	144.60	144.60	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
201	0.177	BOTTOM 3RD	144.60	144.60	-	-	(10.99)	120.87	
			\$ 20,348.32	\$ 19,611.71	\$ 736.61	\$ 10,994.18	\$ 0.00	\$ 264,963.28	4,014.595

Error % **3.62%**
 Enrollee Weight **4 14.925**
 Weighted Enrollee Payment Error **\$ 10,994.18**

Strata Total \$ 177,869.13 \$ 167,196.77 \$ 10,672.36 \$ 159,288.96
2 Total CMS Pymt \$ 3,900,000

Standard Error (SE) (Sq of PE) 58,412.18 **6**

Average Error % **POINT ESTIMATE (PE) \$ 159,288.96**
 Sample 6% Population (Extrapolated) 4%

Confidence Interval CI (2.575*SE) \$ 150,411.37 **7**

8 PE + Confidence Interval \$ 309,700.33
PE - Confidence Interval \$ 8,877.58

Lower Bound CI 8,877.58 Payment Recovery Amount subject to FFS **9**

- Give consideration to refining internal controls and audit strategies to accommodate RADV
- If nothing else, concentrate focus on top 1/3 paid

Small MA Plan, 3K Members, \$32M Annual Plan Revenue

	10% Error Rate	20% Error Rate
Payment Recovery	\$1.22M	\$3.47M
<u>Post 100% Review of Top Third Stratum</u>		
Payment Recovery	\$0.33M	\$1.23M
Error Rate reduced	4%	8%

Disclaimer: This example assumes equal distribution of error in each of the sample stratum.

Large MA Plan, 21K Members, \$200M Annual Plan Revenue

	10% Error Rate	20% Error Rate
Payment Recovery	\$5.54M	\$21.50M
<u>Post 100% Review of Top Third Stratum</u>		
Payment Recovery	\$2.34M	\$8.73M
Error Rate reduced	4%	8%

Disclaimer: This example assumes equal distribution of error in each of the sample stratum.

- For more information, please contact:

Kim Browning



kbrowning@cognisight.com



585.662.4215



www.linkedin.com/in/kimbrowning1