SURPRISE BILLING PRINCIPLES

America’s hospitals and health systems are committed to protecting patients from “surprise bills” and support a federal legislative solution to do so. These types of bills may occur when a patient receives care from an out-of-network provider or when their health plan fails to pay for covered services. The three most typical scenarios are when: (1) a patient accesses emergency services outside of their insurance network, including from providers while they are away from home; (2) a patient has acted in good faith to obtain care within their network but unintentionally receives care from an out-of-network physician providing services in an in-network hospital; or (3) a health plan denies coverage for emergency services saying they were unnecessary. In these situations, we believe it is critical to protect patients from surprise bills.

We have developed the following principles to help inform the debate regarding surprise billing in the scenarios outlined above. In the event a patient chooses to go out-of-network for care, these principles should not apply.

- **PROTECT THE PATIENT.** Any public policy solution should protect patients and remove them from payment negotiations between insurers and providers.

  Patients, regardless of the type of health care coverage they have, should be protected from gaps in insurance coverage that result in surprise bills. Patients should have certainty regarding their cost-sharing obligations, which should be based on an in-network amount. Patients should not be “balance billed,” meaning they should not receive a bill from the provider beyond their cost-sharing obligations. Patients should not have to bear the burden of serving as an intermediary between health plans and providers, rather health plans should be responsible for paying providers directly.

- **ENSURE PATIENTS HAVE ACCESS TO EMERGENCY CARE.** Any public policy solution should ensure that patients have access to and coverage of emergency care.

  This requires that health plans adhere to the “prudent layperson standard” and not deny payment for emergency care that, in retrospect, the health plan determined was not an emergency. Recent actions by some health plans to deny coverage of emergency services puts patients’ physical, mental and financial health at risk.

- **PRESERVE THE ROLE OF PRIVATE NEGOTIATION.** Any public policy solution should ensure providers are able to negotiate appropriate payment rates with health plans.

  The government should not establish a fixed payment amount for out-of-network services. Health plans and providers take into account a number of factors when negotiating rates. Any rate or methodology sufficiently simple for national use would not be able to capture these factors. In addition, a fixed payment rate could undermine patients’ ability to access in-network clinicians by giving health plans less of an incentive to enlist physicians and facilities to join their networks because they can rely on a default out-of-network payment rate. Providers and health plans should be able to develop networks that meet consumers’ needs, and not be compelled to enter into contracts that
could thwart the development of more affordable coverage options that support coordinated care.

- **Educate Patients.** Any public policy solution should include an educational component to help patients understand the scope of their health care coverage and how to access their benefits.

  All stakeholders – health plans, employers, providers and others – should undertake efforts to improve patients’ health care literacy and support them in navigating their health coverage and the health care system.

- **Ensure Adequate Provider Networks and Greater Health Plan Transparency.** Any public policy solution should include greater oversight of health plan provider networks and the role health plans play in helping patients access in-network care.

  Patients should have access to easily-understandable provider network information to ensure they can make informed health care decisions, including accurate listings for hospital-based physicians in health plan directories and websites. Patients also should have adequate access to in-network providers, including hospital-based specialists at in-network facilities, rather than simply a minimum number of physicians and hospitals. Federal and state regulators should ensure both the adequacy of health plan provider networks and the accuracy of provider directories. Health plans should be responsible for an efficient and timely credentialing process to minimize the amount of time a physician is “out-of-network.”

- **Support State Laws that Work.** Any public policy solution should take into account the interaction between federal and state laws.

  Many states have undertaken efforts to protect patients from surprise billing, but federal action is necessary to protect patients in self-insured employer-sponsored plans regulated under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which cover the majority of privately insured individuals. Any federal solution should provide a default to state laws that meet the federal minimum for consumer protections.