

Medicare Comprehensive End Stage Renal Disease Care Model Performance Year 1 (Oct 2015 - Dec 2016) Results

ESCO Name	Music City Kidney Care Alliance	Palmetto Kidney Care Alliance	Metropolitan Kidney Care Alliance	Fresenius Seamless Care of Philadelphia	Fresenius Seamless Care of San Diego	Fresenius Seamless Care of Chicago	Fresenius Seamless Care of Columbia	Fresenius Seamless Care of Dallas	Fresenius Seamless Care of Charlotte	Phoenix- Tucson Integrated Kidney Care	South Florida Integrated Kidney Care	Philadelphia- Camden Integrated Kidney Care	Rogosin Kidney Care Alliance	Total for all ESCOs
ESCO Dialysis Company	DCI	DCI	DCI	Fresenius	Fresenius	Fresenius	Fresenius	Fresenius	Fresenius	DaVita	DaVita	DaVita	Rogosin	N/A
ESCO Location	Nashville, TN	Spartanburg, SC	Newark, NJ	Philadelphia, PA	San Diego, CA	Chicago, IL	Columbia, SC	Dallas, TX	Charlotte, NC	Phoenix, AZ	Miami, FL	Philadelphia, PA	New York, NY	N/A
Total Aligned Beneficiary-Years¹	575.42	431.50	478.08	1,196.08	892.33	2,249.25	936.25	2,632.17	1,266.08	1,053.75	1,445.83	2,526.42	402.00	16,085.17
Total Benchmark Expenditures^{2,3}	\$48,295,980	\$34,641,071	\$45,460,690	\$109,713,810	\$82,538,064	\$204,070,377	\$77,977,736	\$223,642,115	\$93,343,314	\$89,368,136	\$131,483,963	\$239,645,108	\$35,336,919	\$1,415,517,283
Total Actual Expenditures for Aligned Beneficiaries	\$46,839,332	\$30,747,968	\$43,971,321	\$102,846,756	\$72,268,207	\$192,893,194	\$73,598,970	\$215,478,399	\$90,941,119	\$86,685,460	\$127,698,247	\$221,646,807	\$34,780,665	\$1,340,396,446
Total Benchmark Expenditures Minus Total Aligned Beneficiary Expenditures⁴	\$1,456,648	\$3,893,103	\$1,489,369	\$6,867,054	\$10,269,857	\$11,177,183	\$4,378,765	\$8,163,716	\$2,402,195	\$2,682,677	\$3,785,716	\$17,998,301	\$556,254	\$75,120,837
Total Benchmark Minus Aligned Beneficiary Expenditures as % of Total Benchmark⁵	3.02%	11.24%	3.28%	6.26%	12.44%	5.48%	5.62%	3.65%	2.57%	3.00%	2.88%	7.51%	1.57%	5.31%
Earned Shared Savings Payments/Owe Losses⁶	\$999,260	\$2,670,669	\$1,021,707	\$4,710,799	\$7,045,122	\$7,667,547	\$3,003,833	\$5,600,309	\$1,647,906	\$1,840,316	\$2,597,001	\$12,346,834	\$0.00	\$51,151,304
Successfully Reported Quality⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Quality Score^{8,9}	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Diabetes Care: Eye Exam	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.028	0.070	0.056	0.016	0.024	0.078	0.016	0.017	0.005	0.204	N/A
Diabetes Care: Foot Exam	0.942	0.972	0.869	0.746	0.790	0.672	0.802	0.689	0.781	0.020	0.017	0.005	0.538	N/A
Influenza Immunization in the ESRD Population	0.770	0.805	0.861	0.676	0.735	0.608	0.696	0.715	0.650	0.752	0.628	0.689	0.689	N/A
Pneumococcal Vaccination Status	0.747	0.808	0.836	0.229	0.258	0.156	0.085	0.161	0.231	0.499	0.370	0.440	0.856	N/A
Screening for Clinical Depression and Follow-Up Plan	0.934	0.729	0.679	0.740	0.746	0.764	0.830	0.776	0.766	0.603	0.664	0.625	0.609	N/A
Tobacco Use: Screening and Cessation Intervention	0.787	0.805	0.836	0.745	0.747	0.659	0.757	0.728	0.711	0.681	0.713	0.752	0.798	N/A
Falls: Screening, Risk Assessment, and Plan of Care¹⁰	0.958 1.000 0.103	0.956 1.000 0.177	0.865 1.000 0.339	0.900 1.000 0.083	0.934 1.000 0.000	0.859 1.000 0.000	0.947 1.000 0.000	0.869 1.000 0.000	0.842 1.000 0.077	0.684 0.960 0.000	0.788 1.000 0.000	0.849 1.000 0.000	0.681 1.000 0.154	N/A
Advance Care Plan	0.952	0.956	0.874	0.910	0.915	0.912	0.944	0.920	0.891	0.589	0.608	0.706	0.763	N/A

Medicare Comprehensive End Stage Renal Disease Care Model Performance Year 1 (Oct 2015 - Dec 2016) Results

ESCO Name	Music City Kidney Care Alliance	Palmetto Kidney Care Alliance	Metropolitan Kidney Care Alliance	Fresenius Seamless Care of Philadelphia	Fresenius Seamless Care of San Diego	Fresenius Seamless Care of Chicago	Fresenius Seamless Care of Columbia	Fresenius Seamless Care of Dallas	Fresenius Seamless Care of Charlotte	Phoenix-Tucson Integrated Kidney Care	South Florida Integrated Kidney Care	Philadelphia-Camden Integrated Kidney Care	Rogosin Kidney Care Alliance	Total for all ESCOs
Medication Reconciliation Post Discharge	0.838	0.911	0.776	0.411	0.322	0.061	0.292	0.078	0.197	0.487	0.630	0.659	0.436	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Nephrologists' Communication and Caring	0.690	0.740	0.740	0.649	0.644	0.657	0.653	0.676	0.672	0.654	0.701	0.666	0.676	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Providing Information to Patients	0.844	0.804	0.842	0.793	0.772	0.750	0.751	0.757	0.760	0.817	0.792	0.799	0.755	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Dialysis Center Care and Operations	0.674	0.671	0.636	0.605	0.597	0.614	0.538	0.568	0.548	0.630	0.621	0.618	0.598	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Rating of Kidney Doctors	0.636	0.723	0.676	0.534	0.569	0.535	0.584	0.565	0.561	0.568	0.656	0.546	0.601	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Rating of Dialysis Center Staff	0.682	0.660	0.609	0.591	0.609	0.570	0.479	0.546	0.491	0.659	0.615	0.617	0.603	N/A
ICH CAHPS: Rating of Dialysis Center	0.743	0.742	0.624	0.650	0.663	0.645	0.508	0.617	0.546	0.730	0.652	0.642	0.649	N/A
Standardized Mortality Ratio ¹¹	0.941	0.830	0.817	0.797	0.849	0.914	1.095	0.990	0.944	1.079	1.027	0.955	0.763	N/A

¹ Total number of Medicare fee-for-service beneficiary-years were included in final reconciliation.

² Expenditure target against which actual expenditures are compared to determine savings/losses generation by an ESCO.

³ In calculating the benchmark, actual expenditures and savings/loss performance, annualized expenditures for individual beneficiaries (for both the ESCO's population and the reference population) are capped at the truncation threshold.

⁴ This may be called the "Gross Savings/Losses amount." It shows the total savings or losses (first to last dollar) dollar amount. This represents total savings/loss generation to be split between the ESCO and CMS.

⁵ This may be called the "Gross Savings/Losses percentage." It shows the total savings or losses (first to last dollar) as a percentage of the ESCO's benchmark.

⁶ The ESCO's shares of savings or losses (positive value indicates amount to be paid by CMS to the ESCO, negative value indicates amounts to be paid by ESCO to CMS). This amount accounts for several factors: the nature of the ESCO's risk arrangement (the shared savings percentage and shared savings cap) and the reduction of shared savings payments by 2% due to sequestration.

⁷ ESCOs are considered to have successfully reported quality if they completely reported in a given performance year and reported to the ESRD Quality Incentive Program (QIP).

⁸ For Performance Year 1, all quality measures were in pay-for-reporting status. As all ESCOs completed quality reporting, all ESCOs received full quality points.

⁹ For more information on Quality Measures and how the overall Quality Score was determined, please refer to the CEC Model Website.

¹⁰ This measure is a composite of three separate measures. Performance for each component is included here.

¹¹ This measure is a ratio of observed-to-expected results. Scores less than one represent better-than-expected performance, scores greater than one represent worse-than-expected performance.