* Ambulatory Services: Non-Hospital Surgery

Ambulatory Surgery Centers & Office-Based Surgery Practices

New York State Department of Health
Public Health and Health Planning Council
Health Planning Committee Meeting
July 17, 2013
Rochester, NY

*Those surgical procedures which need to be performed for safety reasons in an operating room on anesthetized patients requiring a stay of less than 24 hours' duration. (10 NYCRR Section 755.1)

*Ambulatory Surgery Defined

*Fully regulated under Article 28

*May have elements applicable to other modes of ambulatory care.

*Why Discuss Ambulatory Surgery? *Freestanding

- *Hospital-based
 - *On-site
 - *Off-site (extension clinic)

*Ambulatory Surgery Centers (ASCs)

*Not owned or operated by a hospital

*Diagnostic and Treatment Center (D&TC) certified for ambulatory surgery

*Freestanding ASCs

- *116 with Operating Certificates
 - *57 Multi-Specialty
 - *59 Single Specialty

*Most are owned by physicians

*Freestanding ASCs -How Many?

- *CON Review Required
- *Article 28 Operational Oversight Requirements governing operations, physical plant, surveillance, SPARCS reporting, etc.
- *Accreditation Required

*Freestanding ASCs - Regulatory Requirements

*Contribute to HCRA Pools

- *9.63% charge on payments from commercial insurers, Blues, self-insured plans, HMOs
- *7.04% charge on Medicaid payments (State share portion)

*Freestanding ASCs - Regulatory Requirements

*CON Review

Public Need

Financial Feasibility

Character and Competence

*Freestanding ASCs -Regulatory Requirements

- *Demonstrate feasibility based on expected demand and patient referral and use patterns.
- * Expand access to care, including for underserved groups.
- *Not based on population criteria, utilization standards or epidemiological factors.

*ASC CON Need Methodology

*Any surgical or other invasive procedure, requiring general anesthesia, moderate sedation, or deep sedation, and any liposuction procedure, where such surgical or other invasive procedure or liposuction is performed by a licensee in a location other than a hospital, as such term is defined in Article 28, excluding minor procedures and procedures requiring minimal sedation. (PHL 230-d)

*Office-Based Surgery Defined

- *Authority to practice medicine established in Education Law
- *Authority to perform OBS limited by PHL 230-d to accredited medical practices
- *Oversight of professional medical practice carried out by (OPMC), the Office of Professional Medical Conduct

*Office-Based Surgery Authority & Oversight

*PHL Article 230-d:

- *Defined Office-based Surgery (OBS)
- *Identified that the statute applied only to specific licensees (physicians, PAs & SAs)
- *Identified minor procedures performed with local anesthesia or minimal sedation as exempt
- *Identified that practices performing OBS must attain and maintain accreditation
- *Required adverse event reporting

*Office-Based Surgery Statute

- *Made performance of OBS in an unaccredited office unprofessional conduct
- *Made failure to file an OBS adverse event report professional misconduct

*Office-Based Surgery Related Statutes

- *OBS practices do not require CON
- *OBS practices have no operational oversight, commonly referred to as licensure, in the traditional sense
- *OBS practices do not contribute to the HCRA pool.

*Office-Based Surgery

*Non-Hospital Surgery Summary

Ambulatory Surgery* Centers

- * Oversight established in PHL Article 28 and via the Medicare CoP
- * ASC are facilities primarily owned and operated by physicians
- * CON required
- * Operational oversight authorized via Article 28 PHL (generally referred to as licensure)
- * Accreditation required
- * Currently 116 open and operating ASC.

Office-Based Surgery* Practices

- * Oversight established in PHL 230-d & Article 131 Ed. Law
- * OBS practices are private physician office practices in which OBS is performed
- * CON not required
- * DOH has no operational oversight over OBS practices
- * Accreditation required
- * As of June 2013 there were 997 open and accredited OBS practices.

Maintain Current Regulations and Oversight

*Pros:

- *Maintenance of comparable regulatory footing for hospital-based and freestanding ASCs;
- *CON Review prevents undue proliferation of ASCs and possible over-utilization of surgical services;
- *CON Review for character and competence and acceptable ownership and governance.

Maintain Current Regulations and Oversight

- *Pros (cont'd.):
 - *Maintenance of quality through Article 28 monitoring and surveillance;
 - *Through HCRA contribution requirements, compensation for favorable case selection;
 - *Certification for CMS participation (Medicare and Medicaid);
 - *Required utilization of EHRs and SHIN-NY and RHIO participation

Maintain Current Regulations and Oversight

*Cons:

*None identified

Accreditation Only and Medicare CoP

*Pros:

*None identified

Accreditation Only and Medicare CoP

*Cons:

- *Removal of comparable regulatory footing between freestanding and hospital-based ASCs
- *Proliferation of ASCs and possible overutilization of surgery;
- *No review of character and competence or ownership and governance.

Accreditation Only and Medicare CoP

- *Cons (cont'd.):
 - *Loss of Article 28 monitoring and oversight
 - *Loss of SPARCS reporting
 - *Loss of contributions to HCRA pools
 - *Need for separate process for Medicare and Medicaid participation
 - *Loss of EHR and clinical data-sharing through RHIOs and SHIN-NY.

Broaden premise of the law to include any medical procedure requiring greater than minimal sedation and/or local/topical anesthesia to perform the procedure and/or attain/maintain adequate patient comfort performed in a private office practice.

- *Maintain current requirements for accreditation and adverse event reporting;
- *AKA Office-Based Anesthesia (OBA)

Pros:

- Clarifies intent to include neuraxial and upper and lower extremity major conduction blocks;
- * Assures one standard of care for patients undergoing procedures (invasive and non-invasive) in private medical offices with greater than minimal sedation via requirements for accreditation and adverse event reporting;
- * Responsive to continuing evolution of health care toward non and minimally invasive procedures
- * Consistent with other states that do not limit procedures to invasive but rather oversee based on levels of sedation/ anesthesia provided.

Cons:

- * Potential opposition from currently unaffected practitioners;
- * Cost of accreditation for currently unaccredited office practices;
- * Maintains payment inequities between regulated ASCs and accredited practices.

Require OBS/OBA practices to register with DOH and submit specific information, e.g. services provided, service specific quality and safety indicators, payer mix.

- *With or with out expansion of law as described in number 1;
- *Maintain current requirements for accreditation and adverse event reporting.

Pros:

- * Same as in Option 1;
- * Gives DOH the authority to collect data and require participation in RHIOs, etc.;
- * Maintains compliance with Statewide Policy Guidance for sharing of electronic health information;
- Provides information to the DOH that is currently not available that could be made available to the public, be used in planning, identify collaborative quality improvement opportunities, etc.

Cons:

- * Same as in Option 1
- * Increased demands on practices to register and collect and submit data.

Require operational oversight, similar to that of Article 28 (commonly referred to as licensure), of OBS/OBA practices who provide services such that 4 or more patients are rendered incapable of self preservation at one time.

Pros:

- * Operational oversight gives DOH the authority to:
 - *Require compliance with regulation, e.g. physical plant, patient selection by ASA class and/or anesthesia type, procedural and post-procedure recovery, etc.;

Pros, cont.:

- * Operational oversight gives DOH the authority to:
 - *Require submission of data, e.g. services provided, safety and quality indicators, payer mix, etc.;
 - *Require participation in the Medicaid Program;
 - *Require payment into the HCRA fund;
 - *Require utilization of certified EHR connected to the Statewide Health Information Network (SHIN-NY) and Regional Health Information Networks (RHIOs);
 - *Survey and inspect

Pros, cont'd:

- * Playing field is more even between ASCs and OBS/OBA practices;
- * Goal of OBS/OBA practices of receiving a facility fee would be accomplished.

Cons:

- * May exceed DOH authority by "regulating the practice of medicine" --unless the operational oversight model chosen is that of existing ASC model;
- * May increase the cost of health care if practices begin to routinely receive a facility fee for services.
- * Would increase the work and the likely cost of practices required to attain this more regulated model of oversight.

Require operational oversight similar to Article 28 (commonly referred to as licensure) of OBS practices performing level 2 and level 3 plastic and cosmetic procedures.

Pros:

* There are higher risks of complications associated with longer surgical and anesthesia times and use of general anesthesia (GA); some of the plastic/cosmetic surgery procedures performed in OBS are quite long using GA—longer than other procedure times associated with other specialties reported via adverse event reports.

Pros, cont'd:

- * Complications associated with plastics/cosmetic cases performed in offices often make the news and provoke questions about quality of care and raise questions about lack of DOH oversight.
- * Operational oversight is viewed by the public as an assurance of quality and safety.
- * Require compliance with regulation, e.g. physical plant, patient selection by ASA class and/or anesthesia type, procedural and post-procedure recovery, etc.;
- Same as those identified above in Option 3 related to authority granted to DOH

Cons:

- * All plastic/cosmetic surgeons may not welcome increased oversight of their practices
- * Cost of care may increase due to eligibility for receipt of facility.
- * Disparate requirements for plastic/cosmetic surgeons/procedures.

Standardize/differentiate name/terminology used in describing non-inpatient surgical services in all sites, e.g. ASCs, OBS, Hospital OPDs, other venues.

Pros:

- * Standardizing naming convention would decrease confusion among public and health care providers;
- * Promote differentiation between provider types and clarify distribution of services across the state;
- * Assist in establishing a baseline with which to assist in evaluation of data and provider types across jurisdictions.

Cons:

- * Would require inter-agency, and potentially state and federal, collaboration;
- * Some practices may need to change their names which would legal and other costs;
- * Maybe seen as an added unnecessary bureaucratic intervention with minimal added benefit for providers or the public.