### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS ~ STANDARD CONTRACT FORM



This form is jointly issued and published by the Office of the Comptroller (CTR), the Executive Office for Administration and Finance (ANF), and the Operational Services Division (OSD) as the default contract for all Commonwealth Departments when another form is not prescribed by regulation or policy. The Commonwealth deems void any changes made on or by attachment (in the form of addendum, engagement letters, contract forms or invoice terms) to the terms in this published form or to the <u>Standard Contract Form Instructions and Contractor Certifications</u>, the <u>Commonwealth Terms and Conditions for Human and Social Services</u> or the <u>Commonwealth IT Terms and Conditions</u> which are incorporated by reference herein. Additional non-conflicting terms may be added by Attachment. Contractors are required to access published forms at CTR Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms: <a href="https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.">https://www.maccomptroller.org/forms.</a> Forms are also posted at OSD Forms:

https://www.macomptroller.org/forms. Forms are also p	osted at OSD Forms: https://www.	mass.gov/lists/o	sd-forms.		
CONTRACTOR LEGAL NAME: Community Care Cooperative, Inc. (and d/b/a):		COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENT NAME: Executive Office of Health and Human Services MMARS Department Code: EHS			
Legal Address: (W-9, W-4): 75 Federal St., 7th Floor,	, Boston, MA 02110	Business Mailing Address: One Ashburton Place, 11th Fl., Boston, MA 02108			
Contract Manager: Christina Severin	<b>Phone:</b> 617-852-4709	Billing Address (if different):			
E-Mail: cseverin@communitycarecooperative.org	Fax:	Contract Mar	nager: Alejandro Garcia Davalos	Phone: 617-838-3344	
Contractor Vendor Code: VC0000854728		E-Mail: Aleja	ndro.E.GarciaDavalos@mass.gov	Fax:	
Vendor Code Address ID (e.g., "AD001"): AD001.		MMARS Doc	ID(s): N/A		
(Note: The Address ID must be set up for EFT payr	nents.)	RFR/Procure	ment or Other ID Number: BD-17-1039-EH	IS01-EHS01-00000009207	
☐ NEW CONTRAC	СТ		□ CONTRACT AMENDM	<b>MENT</b>	
PROCUREMENT OR EXCEPTION TYPE: (Check o	ne option only)		Contract End Date <u>Prior</u> to Amendment:		
☐ Statewide Contract (OSD or an OSD-designated	' '		ment Amount: \$ no change. (or "no change		
☐ Collective Purchase (Attach OSD approval, scop	. 0 /		TYPE: (Check one option only. Attach d	• ,	
☐ Department Procurement (includes all Grants - Notice or RFR, and Response or other procurem	, ,		ent to Date, Scope or Budget (Attach update		
☐ Emergency Contract (Attach justification for eme	,,		ontract (Attach justification for Interim Contra	,	
☐ Contract Employee (Attach Employment Status I			Employee (Attach any updates to scope or b	• ,	
☐ Other Procurement Exception (Attach authorizing		Scope and	curement Exception (Attach authorizing lar	iguage/justification and updated	
specific exemption or earmark, and exception justi			• /		
The Standard Contract Form Instructions and Correference into this Contract and are legally bindin Social Services  Commonwealth IT Terms and Correct Commonwealth Commonwealth Correct Correct Commonwealth Correct C	ng: (Check ONE option): 🗵 Comn				
COMPENSATION: (Check ONE option): The Departr supported in the state accounting system by sufficien ☑ Rate Contract. (No Maximum Obligation) Attach	t appropriations or other non-appro	opriated funds, s	ubject to intercept for Commonwealth owed	debts under 815 CMR 9.00.	
☐ Maximum Obligation Contract. Enter total maxi	mum obligation for total duration o	f this contract (o	r <b>new</b> total if Contract is being amended). \$	<u>-</u>	
PROMPT PAYMENT DISCOUNTS (PPD): Commo identify a PPD as follows: Payment issued within 10 issued within 30 days% PPD. If PPD percent 23A);   BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT PERFORMA of performance or what is being amended for a Contract This Amendment 2 to the Fourth Amended and Reference of the performance of the Fourth Amended and Reference of the Pourth Amended and Reference of t	0 days% PPD; Payment iss tages are left blank, identify reaso scheduled to support standard EFT ANCE or REASON FOR AMENDM ract Amendment. Attach all suppor	sued within 15 d in: ⊠ agree to s	ays % PPD; Payment issued within standard 45 day cycle □ statutory/legal or int cycle. See Prompt Pay Discounts Policy.) Contract title, purpose, fiscal year(s) and a tion and justifications.)	20 days % PPD; Payment Ready Payments (M.G.L. c. 29, § detailed description of the scope	
ANTICIPATED START DATE: (Complete ONE optic	on only) The Department and Cont	ractor certify for	this Contract or Contract Amendment, that	Contract obligations:	
☐ 1. may be incurred as of the Effective Date (latest	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		contract obligations.	
☐ 2. may be incurred as of, a date	, <u> </u>	•	<del></del>	ective Date.	
		<del></del>	· —		
authorized to be made either as settlement payn	ments or as authorized reimbursem	nent payments, a	and that the details and circumstances of all	obligations under this Contract	
are attached and incorporated into this Contract.	. Acceptance of payments forever	releases the Co	mmonwealth from further claims related to t	hese obligations.	
CONTRACT END DATE: Contract performance shamended, provided that the terms of this Contract at completing any negotiated terms and warranties, to a	nd performance expectations and	obligations shal	I survive its termination for the purpose of r	resolving any claim or dispute, for	
CERTIFICATIONS: Notwithstanding verbal or other representations by the parties, the "Effective Date" of this Contract or Amendment shall be the latest date that this Contract or Amendment has been executed by an authorized signatory of the Contractor, the Department, or a later Contract or Amendment Start Date specified above, subject to any required approvals. The Contractor certifies that they have accessed and reviewed all documents incorporated by reference as electronically published and the Contractor makes all certifications required under the Standard Contract Form Instructions and Contractor Certifications under the pains and penalties of perjury, and further agrees to provide any required documentation upon request to support compliance, and agrees that all terms governing performance of this Contract and doing business in Massachusetts are attached or incorporated by reference herein according to the following hierarchy of document precedence, the applicable Commonwealth Terms and Conditions, this Standard Contract Form, the Standard Contract Form Instructions and Contractor Certifications, the Request for Response (RFR) or other solicitation, the Contractor's Response (excluding any language stricken by a Department as unacceptable, and additional negotiated terms, provided that additional negotiated terms will take precedence over the relevant terms in the RFR and the Contractor's Response only if made using the process outlined in 801 CMR 21.07, incorporated herein, provided that any amended RFR or Response terms result in best value, lower costs, or a more cost effective Contract.					
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE OR THE CONTRACT X:	Date: 10/3/22	AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE FOR THE COMMONWEALTH:  X: AMANGA CASSEL KNAFT  Date: 10/13/2022  (Signature and Date Must Be Captured At Time of Signature)			
(Signature and Date Must Be Captured A	At Time of Signature)			i ime of Signature)	
Print Name: Christina Severin	<del></del>	·-	Ananda Cassel Kraft	<del>.</del>	
Print Title: President and CEO	<u>-</u>	Print little:	Assistant Secretary for MassHealth	<u>.</u>	

#### **AMENDMENT #2**

#### TO THE

#### FOURTH AMENDED AND RESTATED

#### PRIMARY CARE ACCOUNTABLE CARE ORGANIZATION CONTRACT

#### FOR THE

#### ACCOUNTABLE CARE ORGANIZATION PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Executive Office of Health and Human Services ("EOHHS") and the Contractor identified in Appendix L ("Contractor") entered into the Contract effective August 25, 2017, and with an Operational Start Date of March 1, 2018, to improve the MassHealth Member experience of care, health of the population, and efficiency of the MassHealth program by substantially shifting towards accountable and integrated models of care and to provide comprehensive health care coverage to MassHealth Members; and

WHEREAS, EOHHS and the Contractor amended and restated the Contract effective January 1, 2022, (the Fourth Amended and Restated Primary Care Accountable Care Organization Contract), and further amended the Contract through Amendment #1;

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 6.13 of the Contract, EOHHS and the Contractor desire to further amend the Contract effective January 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, EOHHS and the Contractor agree that the terms stated herein are subject to all required approvals of the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS);

**NOW, THEREFORE**, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements contained herein, the Contractor and EOHHS agree as follows:

- 1. **Appendix B, EOHHS Accountable Care Organization Quality Appendix**, is hereby deleted and replaced with the attached **Appendix B**.
- 2. **Appendix I, TCOC Benchmarks**, is hereby amended by deleting and replacing **Exhibit 1.1**, attached hereto.

# **Appendix B - EOHHS Accountable Care Organization Quality Appendix**

This Appendix details how EOHHS will calculate the Contractor's Quality Score and DSRIP Accountability Score as described in the Contract. EOHHS reserves the right to modify the methodology set forth herein prior to execution of the Contract. EOHHS may modify the methodology set forth herein after the execution of the Contract by written amendment. EOHHS anticipates ongoing evaluation of this methodology, including but not limited to the list of Quality Measures, during the Contract Term. EOHHS anticipates engaging the Contractor and other ACOs as well as other stakeholders in this evaluation process. The following information is included. For the purposes of this document, "Budget Period (BP)" is used interchangeably with "Performance Year (PY)".

- 1 Overview of Quality Score and DSRIP Accountability Score
- 2 Methodology to Calculate Quality Score
  - 2.1 List of Quality Measures
  - 2.2 Member Experience Survey
  - 2.3 Quality Measure Scoring Methodology for All Measures (Budget Periods 2, 4, and 5)
  - 2.4 Domain Scoring Methodology for All Measures (Budget Periods 2, 4, 5)
  - 2.5 Quality Measure Scoring Methodology (Budget Period 3)
  - 2.6 Domain Scoring Methodology for Member Experience Quality Domains (Budget Periods 2 and 3)
  - 2.7 Methodology for Establishing Performance Benchmarks for Quality Measures
  - 2.8 Methodology to Calculate Quality Score
- 3 Methodology to calculate DSRIP Accountability Score
  - 3.1 Overall Approach
  - 3.2 Total Cost of Care Performance
  - 3.3 Quality Performance
  - 3.4 DSRIP Accountability Score

# 1 Overview of Quality Score and DSRIP Accountability Score

The Contractor shall receive, for each Performance Year, a Quality Score and a DSRIP Accountability Score, which may be two different values. The Contractor's Quality Score shall modify the Contractor's risk corridor payments, as described in Section 4 of the Contract. The Contractor's DSRIP Accountability Score shall be used to determine the proportion of the Contractor's withheld DSRIP payments the Contractor receives, as described in Section 5 of the Contract.

The Contractor's Quality Score and DSRIP Accountability Score shall be calculated as described in this Appendix and as further specified by EOHHS. Section 2 of this Appendix describes how the Contractor's Quality Score is calculated. Section 3 of this Appendix describes how the Contractor's DSRIP Accountability Score is calculated.

# 2 Methodology to Calculate Quality Score

The Contractor's Quality Score is based on a weighted average of the Contractor's scores across a set of individual measures that are grouped into domains. This Section of the Appendix describes the individual measures, the methodology EOHHS will use to calculate the Contractor's score for each measure, and the methodology EOHHS will use to calculate and average domain scores to produce the Contractor's Quality Score.

# 2.1 List of Quality Measures

Quality Measures include claims-based measures, Clinical Quality Measures, and member care experience surveys across the following four domains:

- Prevention & Wellness
- Care Integration
- Patient Experience Survey: Overall Rating and Care Delivery
- Patient Experience Survey: Person-centered Integrated Care

In calculating the Contractor's Quality Score, EOHHS will apply a weight to each domain. The Quality Measures Domain Weights are presented in Exhibit 1.

	ACO Quality Do				
	Quality Domain	Domain Weight: PY 1	Domain Weight: PY 2	Domain Weight: PY 3	Domain Weight: PY 4-5
Clin	ical Quality Measures				
1	Prevention & Wellness	100%	85%	65%	45%
2	Care Integration	(P4R only)		20%	40%
Pat	ient Experience Surveys				
3	Overall Rating and Care Delivery		15%	15%	7.5%
4	Person-centered Integrated Care				7.5%

In Performance Year 1, quality is "pay-for-reporting" – i.e., the Contractor will be required to report all Hybrid Quality Measures satisfactorily (i.e., measures requiring submission of record based data) to achieve a full score. Beginning in Performance Year 2, a subset of Quality Measures will be pay-for-performance (P4P) – i.e., the Contractor's score will be based on the Contractor's performance. For Performance Year 3, the State has proposed reweighting as illustrated in the table above to account for the impact of the public health emergency on measurement and accountability in 2020. For Performance Years 4-5, all Quality Measures will be pay-for-performance (P4P).

If the Contractor has an insufficient number of Enrollees (as determined by EOHHS) for a Measure, then EOHHS will exempt the Contractor from that particular Measure. As such, the weight assigned to the Measure within the Measure's domain will be redistributed equally among all other measures within that domain. Thus, the overall domain weights will not increase or decrease as a result of measure ineligibility.

Please see Exhibit 2 for the list of Quality Measures. EOHHS reserves the right to modify this list as deemed necessary and determined by EOHHS.

# EXHIBIT 2 – ACO Quality Measures

#	Measure Name	Measure Description	Data Source	Measure Steward	NQF No.
1	Childhood Immunization Status	Percentage of members who received all recommended immunizations by their 2nd birthday	Hybrid	NCQA	0038
2	Immunizations for Adolescents	Percentage of members 13 years of age who received all recommended vaccines, including the HPV series	Hybrid	NCQA	1407
3	Timeliness of Prenatal Care	Percentage of deliveries in which the member received a prenatal care visit in the first trimester or within 42 days of enrollment	Hybrid	NCQA	1517
4	Oral Health Evaluation	Percentage of members under age 21 years who received a comprehensive or periodic oral evaluation within the year	Claims	ADA DQA	2517
5	Screening for Depression and Follow Up Plan	Percentage of members 12 to 64 years of age screened for depression on the date of the encounter using an age appropriate standardized depression screening tool AND if positive, a follow-up plan is documented on the date of the positive screen	Hybrid	CMS	0418
6	Asthma Medication Ratio  Percentage of members 5 to 64 years of age who were identified as having persistent asthma and had a ratio of controller medications to total asthma medications of 0.50 or greater		Claims	NCQA	1800
7	Controlling High Blood Pressure  Percentage of members 18 to 64 years of age with hypertension and whose blood pressure was adequately controlled		Hybrid	NCQA	0018
8	Comprehensive Diabetes Care: A1c Poor Control  Percentage of members 18 to 64 years of age with diabetes whose most recent HbA1c level demonstrated poor control (> 9.0%)		Hybrid	NCQA	0059

#	Measure Name	Measure Description	Data Source	Measure Steward	NQF No.
9	Depression Remission or Response	Percentage of members 12 to 64 years of age with a diagnosis of depression and elevated PHQ-9 score, who receive follow-up PHQ-9 and experienced remission or response within 4 to 8 months of the initial elevated score	Hybrid	NCQA	N/A
10	Metabolic Monitoring for Children and Adolescents on Antipsychotics	Percentage of members 1 to 17 years of age who had two or more antipsychotic prescriptions and received metabolic testing	Claims	NCQA	2800
11	Emergency Department Visits for Individuals with Mental Illness, Addiction, or Co-occurring Conditions	Risk adjusted ratio (obs/exp) of ED visits for members 18 to 64 years of age identified with a diagnosis of serious mental illness, substance addiction, or co-occurring conditions	Claims	EOHHS	N/A
12	Follow-Up After Emergency Department Visit for Mental Illness (7 days)	Percentage of ED visits for members 6 to 64 years of age with a principal diagnosis of mental illness, where the member received follow-up care within 7 days of ED discharge	Claims	NCQA	2605
13	Follow-Up After Hospitalization for Mental Illness (7 days)	Hospitalization for Mental age, nospitalized for mental liness, where the member		NCQA	0576
14	Hospital Readmissions (Adult)	Case-mix adjusted rate of acute unplanned hospital readmissions within 30 days of discharge for members 18 to 64 years of age	Claims	NCQA	1768
15	Health-Related Social Needs Screening	Percentage of members 0 to 64 years of age who were screened for health-related social needs in the measurement year	Hybrid	EOHHS	N/A
16	Behavioral Health Community Partner Engagement	Percentage of members 18 to 64 years of age who engaged with a BH Community Partner and received a treatment plan within 4 months (122 days) of Community Partner assignment	Claims	EOHHS	N/A

Fourth Amended and Restated Primary Care ACO Contract, Appendix B EOHHS ACO Quality Appendix Updated as of Amendment 2

#	Measure Name	Measure Description	Data Source	Measure Steward	NQF No.
17	Long-Term Services and Supports Community Partner Engagement	Percentage of members 3 to 64 years of age who engaged with an LTSS Community Partner and received a care plan within 4 months (122 days) of Community Partner assignment	Claims	EOHHS	N/A
18	The percentage of eligible days that ACO members 18-64 with bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, or psychosis (BSP) diagnoses, and separately, for other members 18-64 who have at least 3 consecutive months of LTSS utilization reside in their home or in a community setting without utilizing acute, chronic, or post-acute institutional health care services during the measurement year		Claims	EOHHS	N/A
19	Initiation and Engagement of Alcohol, or Other Drug Abuse or Dependence Treatment  Percentage of members 13 to 64 years of age who are diagnosed with a new episode of alcohol, opioid, or other drug abuse or dependency who initiate treatment within 14 days of diagnosis and who receive at ≥2 additional services within 30 days of the initiation visit		Claims	NCQA	0004
20	Overall Rating and Care Composites related to communications and willingness to recommend		Survey	AHRQ	0005
21	Person-Centered Integrated Care	Composites related to care planning, self-management, and integration of care	Survey	TBD	N/A

# 2.2 Member Experience Survey

EOHHS will use survey instruments to evaluate the Enrollee experience for its ACO program. Where available, EOHHS will use nationally validated surveys, such as the CAHPS Clinician and Group Survey. EOHHS will include survey questions related to EOHHS' delivery system reform priorities, such as a Patient-Centered Medical Home supplement and specific questions related to the integration of physical health, Behavioral Health, Long Term Services and Supports, and health-related social needs. EOHHS intends to phase in new approaches to evaluating Enrollee experience over time, including survey instruments that evaluate Enrollee experience with the services provided by Behavioral Health and Long Term Services and Support providers.

# **2.3** Quality Measure Scoring Methodology for All Measures (Budget Periods 2, 4, and 5)

The Contractor may receive "achievement points" and "improvement points" for each Quality Measure.

#### 2.3.1 Achievement Points

The Contractor may receive up to a maximum of ten (10) achievement points for each Quality Measure, as follows:

- EOHHS will establish an "attainment threshold" and a "goal benchmark" for each Quality Measure
  - a. "Attainment threshold" sets the minimum level of performance at which the contractor can earn achievement points
  - b. "Goal benchmark" is a high performance standard above which the Contractor earns the maximum number of achievement points (i.e., 10 points)
- 2. EOHHS will calculate the Contractor's performance score on the Quality Measure based on the measure specifications
- 3. EOHHS will award the Contractor between zero (0) and ten (10) achievement points as follows:
  - a. If the Contractor's performance score is less than the attainment threshold: 0 achievement points
  - b. If the Contractor's performance score is greater than or equal to the goal benchmark: 10 achievement points
  - c. If the performance score is between the attainment threshold and goal benchmark: achievement points earned are determined by the formula:
    - i. 10\*((Performance Score Attainment Threshold) / (Goal Benchmark Attainment Threshold))

#### EXHIBIT 3 – Example Calculation of Achievement Points for Measure A

Measure A attainment threshold = 45% (e.g., corresponding to 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of HEDIS benchmarks)

Measure A goal benchmark = 80% (e.g., corresponding to 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of HEDIS benchmarks)

#### Scenario 1:

- Measure A performance score = 25%
- Achievement points earned = 0 points

#### Scenario 2:

- Measure A performance score = 90%
- Achievement points earned = 10 points

#### Scenario 3:

- Measure A performance score = 60%
- Achievement points earned = 10\*((60% 45%) / (80% 45%)) = 4.29 points

#### 2.3.2 Improvement Points

In addition to receiving achievement points based on performance (on a 0 to 10 scale), the Contractor may earn improvement points for reaching established improvement targets for each Quality Measure. Improvement points will be calculated as follows:

- EOHHS will calculate the Contractor's performance score on each Quality Measure based on the measure specifications. Each Quality Measure's specifications will describe the detailed methodology by which this performance score is calculated.
- 2. EOHHS will compare the Contractor's performance score on each Quality Measure to the Contractor's performance score on that same Quality Measure from the highest scoring previous Performance Year (excluding BP3 due to a state of emergency declared by the federal or state government).
- 3. EOHHS will calculate an Improvement Target for each Quality Measure using the following formula (unless otherwise communicated by EOHHS). The Improvement Target is based on at least a 20% improvement each year in the gap between Goal Benchmark and the Attainment Threshold of each ACO measure.
  - a. Improvement Target formula = [(Goal Benchmark Attainment Threshold) /5]

For example, for Measure A, if the Attainment Threshold is 50% and the Goal Benchmark is 60%, the Improvement Target is 2% [(60-50)/5)]

b. For the purposes of calculating the Improvement Target, the result is rounded to the nearest tenth (i.e., one decimal point).

For example, for Measure B, if the Attainment Threshold is 80% and the Goal Benchmark is 90.2%, the Improvement Target is calculated to 2.04% [(90.2 – 80)/5)] which rounds to 2.0%.

c. Starting in PY2, the Contractor may earn up to five (5) improvement points per measure per year for increases in measure score which <u>meet or exceed</u> the improvement target.

For example, for Measure B, the Improvement Target is 2.0%. If Contractor performance in PY4 is 54.0% and if Contractor performance in PY5 is 60.0%, the Contractor improvement from PY4 to PY5 is 6.0% [(60.0-54.0)] and the Contractor is awarded 5 improvement points. No points above 5 are awarded for increases in excess of the improvement target.

d. For the purposes of calculating the difference in Contractor quality performance over a previous year, the results are rounded to the nearest tenth (i.e., one decimal point). Rounding takes place after the calculation.

For example, for Measure B, if Contractor performance in PY4 is 54.54% and if Contractor performance in PY5 is 60.17%, the Contractor improvement from PY4 to PY5 is 5.63% [(60.17-54.54)], and the Contractor improvement will be rounded to the nearest tenth (i.e., one decimal point) to 5.6%.

e. The Improvement Target is based on the <u>higher</u> of the original baseline (PY1) or any year's performance prior to the current PY. This is intended to avoid rewarding regression in performance.

For example, for Measure B, assume Contractor performance in PY1 is 90.0% and the Improvement Target is 2.0%. If in PY4 the performance for the Contractor decreases to 89.0%, in PY5 the Contractor would need to reach 92.0% to reach the Improvement Target.

- f. There are several special circumstances:
  - i. At or Above Goal: If the Contractor has prior PY performance scores equal to or greater than the Goal Benchmark then the Contractor may still earn up to five (5) improvement points in each PY if improvement from the highest prior PY (excluding PY3 due to a state of emergency declared by the federal or state government) is greater than or equal to the Improvement Target.
  - ii. At or Below Attainment: If the Contractor has prior PY performance scores less than the Attainment Threshold then the Contractor may still earn up to five (5) improvement points each PY if improvement from the highest prior PY (excluding PY3 due to a state of emergency declared by the federal or state government) is greater than or equal to the Improvement Target, and performance in the current PY does not equal or exceed the Attainment Threshold. Additionally, if the Contractor has prior PY performance scores less than the Attainment Threshold and current PY performance scores equal to or above the Attainment Threshold then the Contractor may still earn up to five (5) improvement points if the improvement is greater than or equal to the Improvement Target.

EXHIBIT 4 – Example Calculation of Improvement Points for Measure B

Measure B Attainment = 48.9% | Goal = 59.4% | Improvement Target = 2.1%

	PY4 Score	PY5 Score	Improvement	Improvement Target Met	Improvement Points Earned
Scenario 1:	50.0%	52.1%	2.1%	Yes	5
Scenario 2:	50.0%	56.7%	6.7%	Yes	5
Scenario 3:	59.5%	63.0%	3.5%	Yes; above Goal Benchmark	5
Scenario 4	45.0%	48.0%	3.0%	Yes; below Attainment Threshold	5
Scenario 5:	46.0%	49.0%	3.0 %	Yes; crossing Attainment	5
Scenario 6:	45.0%	46.0%	1.0%	No	0

# 2.4 Domain Scoring Methodology for All Measures (Budget Periods 2, 4, 5)

Domain-based scoring does not apply in PY 1, as only P4R results factor into Quality Score calculation. In PY2, PY4 and PY5, EOHHS will sum the Contractor's achievement and improvement points for all Quality Measures within each Quality Domain. Improvement points earned in one Quality Domain may only be summed with achievement points from the same Quality Domain. The total number of points earned by the Contractor in each domain cannot exceed the maximum number of achievement points available in the domain. The maximum number of achievement points in the domain is calculated by multiplying the number of Pay-for-Performance (P4P) measures in the domain, in the given PY, by the number of available achievement points per measure.

For example, if in PY4, there are ten (10) clinical quality measures in Domain X in Pay-for-Performance, and each measure is worth ten (10) achievement points, the maximum number of achievement points in Domain X would be 100. Assume that in PY5 there are now twelve (12) clinical quality measures in Domain X in Pay-for-Performance, and that each measure is worth ten (10) achievement points, the maximum number of achievement points in Domain X would be 120.

#### Cumulative Example:

Total number of measures in domain: 2

Maximum number of achievement points in the domain = 20

Measure Attainment = 48.9% | Goal = 59.4%

Improvement Target = [(Goal Benchmark - Attainment Level) /5] = [59.4-48.9]/5 = 2.1

For example, for Measure A, if Contractor performance in PY4 is 54.54% and if Contractor performance in PY5 is 58.17% the Contractor will earn 8.8 Achievement Points [10 \* (58.17 - 48.9)/(59.4 - 48.9)]. The Contractor has improved from PY4 to PY5 by 3.63% [(58.17 - 54.54)] which will be rounded to the nearest tenth (e.g., one decimal point) to 3.6% which exceeds the Improvement Target of 2.1%. Thus, the Contractor will earn five (5) improvement points. No points above 5 are awarded for increases in excess of the improvement target.

In this scenario the Contractor would earn 13.8 points.

If there is only one (1) additional measure in the Domain and the Contractor earned 9 total points for this measure; the total score for the Contractor would be 20.0 (out of 20) given that domain scores are capped at the maximum number of achievement points (20) in the domain.

Once the total number of points has been calculated, EOHHS will divide the resulting sum by the maximum number of achievement points that the Contractor is eligible for in the domain to produce the Contractor's Domain Score. Domain Scores are a value between zero (0) and one (1) expressed as a percentage (i.e., 0% to 100%). In PY4 and PY5, EOHHS will score the Contractor on each P4P Quality Measure unless the Contractor does not meet eligibility requirements for a specific measure (e.g., it does not meet the minimum denominator requirement). In cases like this, the measure is not factored into the denominator. Reporting measures do not factor into the Domain Score. Additionally, improvement points do not count towards the denominator; they are therefore "bonus" points. Domain Scores are each capped at a maximum value of 100%.

Exhibit 5 below shows an example calculation of an unweighted Domain Score for a Quality Domain.

EXHIBIT 5 – Example Calculations of Unweighted Domain Score

	Example Calculation	ons of Unweighted Domain Score				
	Domain only has two Quality Measures (Measure A and Measure B)					
	Therefore, maxim	um number of achievement points is 2x10 = 20 points				
	Measure A:	Achievement points: 1.5				
	iviedsure A.	Improvement Points: 0				
Example 1	Measure B:	Achievement points: 0				
LXample 1	ivicasure b.	Improvement Points: 5				
	Total achievemen	Total achievement points: 1.5 + 0 = 1.5 points				
	Total improvement points: 0 + 5 = 5 points					
	Sum of achievement and improvement points: 1.5 + 5 = 6.5 points					
	Unweighted domain score = 6.5/20 * 100 = 32.5%					
	Domain only has two Quality Measures (Measure A and Measure B)					
	Therefore, maximum number of achievement points is 2x10 = 20 points					
	Measure A:	Achievement points: 8				
		Improvement Points: 5				
	Measure B:	Achievement points: 9.3				
	iviedsure b.	Improvement Points: 0				
Example 2	Total achievemen	t points: 8 + 9.3 = 17.3				
	Total improvement points: 5 points					
	Sum of achieveme	ent and improvement points: 17.3 + 5 = 22.3 points				
	However, total number of points cannot exceed maximum number of achievement points (20)					
	Therefore, to	otal domain points = 20				
	Unweighted doma	ain score = 20/20 * 100 = 100%				

# 2.5 Quality Measure Scoring Methodology (Budget Period 3)

In order to address the impact of the state of emergency declared by the federal or state government on ACO quality performance, domain scores for Budget Period 3 (BP3) are calculated using the following methodology.

#### 2.5.1 Achievement Points

For each measure in pay-for-performance status in BP3, the State will decide whether to set the individual ACOs' BP3 measure performance rates to 1) the higher of the ACOs' BP3 or Budget Period 2 (BP2) actual measure rates, or 2) the higher of the ACO's BP2 actual rates or the statewide median rates (i.e., measure level median performance among all ACOs) in BP2.

If the State determines BP3 measure performance rates by comparing the individual ACOs' BP2 actual rates to BP3 actual rates, then ACOs earn achievement points following the scoring approach set forth in Section 2.3.1. If the State determines BP3 measure performance rates by comparing individual ACOs' BP2 actual rates to the BP2 statewide median rates, then:

- For measures where an ACO demonstrates a higher BP2 rate than the BP2 statewide median, the ACO earns achievement points based on its own rate, following the scoring approach set forth in Section 2.3.1
- For measures where the statewide median demonstrates a higher rate than the ACO's own rate, the ACO earns achievement points based on the statewide median, following the scoring approach set forth in Section 2.3.1
- In order to prevent such cases where an ACO's measure performance rate would improve excessively through the use of the statewide median, the number of raw (i.e., percentage) points an ACO may earn when replacing an ACO actual measure rate with that of the statewide median rate is capped at 10 raw points

EXHIBIT 6 - BP3 Measure Rate Calculation with Raw Point Cap = 10.0

Measure	ACO BP2	BP2 Performance		Raw
	Rate	Statewide	Rate Used For	Point
		Median	BP3	Сар
Α	73.0%	74.0%	74.0%	No
В	73.0%	70.0%	73.0%	No
С	73.0%	80.0%	80.0%	No
D	73.0%	84.0%	83.0%*	Yes

<sup>\*</sup>BP3 Performance Rate 'capped' at 83.0% (i.e., 73.0% + maximum allowance of 10.0 raw points, using BP2 state median)

Results from the 'Performance Rate Used for BP3' column are then compared to measure benchmarks for the calculation of Achievements Points, following the scoring approach described in Section 2.3.1

#### 2.5.2 Improvement Points

If the State sets individual ACOs' BP3 measure performance rates to be the ACOs' actual BP3 measure rates, then the improvement point calculation process will follow the process used for Budget Period 2 (BP2), Budget Period 4 (BP4), and Budget Period 5 (BP5), as described above in Section 2.3.2. If the State sets individual ACOs' BP3 measure performance rates as either individual ACOs' BP2 rates or the BP2 statewide median rates (capped or uncapped), then improvement point calculation for BP3 is determined by the following methodology:

#### Step 1: ACO Improvement

- a. For each applicable measure, ACO BP2 actual rates are compared to ACO BP1 actual rates
  - i. For measures where an ACO demonstrates improvement (i.e., reaches the predetermined improvement targets), the ACO earns improvement points
  - ii. For measures where an ACO fails to demonstrate improvement, then Step 2 is implemented

#### Step 2: Statewide Median Improvement

- a. For each applicable measure (i.e., from Step 1.a.ii), the statewide median for BP1 is compared to the statewide median for BP2
  - i. For measures where the State demonstrates improvement (i.e., reaches the predetermined improvement targets), the ACO earns improvement points

*Note*: The number of measures by which an ACO may use Step 2.a.i to earn improvement points is capped at a number to be determined by the State, thereby preventing an unintended inflation of ACO scores (see example in Exhibit 7)

ii. For measures where the State fails to demonstrate improvement, the ACO does not earn improvement points

Note: For purposes of simplicity, this example assumes each measure has the same Improvement Target across measures A-G

Measure Improvement Target = 2.1

State Improvement Median = 2.1

Measure	ACO BP1 Actual Rate	ACO BP2 Actual Rate	ACO Improvement	Improvement Used	Improvement Points Received (Source)
Α	50.0%	53.1%	3.1	ACO = 3.1	YES (Step 1)
В	40.0%	49.1%%	9.1	ACO = 9.1	YES (Step 1)
С	59.0%	58.0%	-1.0	State Med = 2.1	YES (Step 2)
Ţ,	33.070	33.070	1.0	State Wed - 2.1	cap count 1/3

D	65.0%	65.0%	0.0	State Med = 2.1	YES (Step 2)
, o	03.076	03.0%	0.0	State Med – 2.1	cap count 2/3
E	20.0%	22.0%	2.0	State Med = 2.1	YES (Step 2)
-	20.076	22.076	2.0	State Med - 2.1	cap count 3/3
F	25.00/	26.00/	1.0	State Med = 2.1	NO
•	25.0%	26.0%	1.0	State Med = 2.1	cap reached*
G	20.0%	30.0%	10.0	ACO = 10.0	YES (Step 1)

<sup>\*</sup>In this example, this ACO used the state median improvement (2.1) for measures C, D, E, thereby reaching the cap of using the state median 3 times. As such, this ACO may not utilize the state median for measure F.

#### EXHIBIT 7 - Example of Improvement Point Calculation with Cap = 3 Measures

Note: Use of the state median only 'counts' toward the cap in such measures where its usage results in the allocation of improvement points. In other words, in such cases where the state median is higher than ACO improvement, but does not reach the Improvement Target, then use of the state median does not count toward the cap.

# 2.6 Domain Scoring Methodology for Member Experience Quality Domains (Budget Periods 2 and 3)

In order to address the impact of the state of emergency declared by the federal or state government on ACO quality performance, member experience domain scores for BP2 and BP3 are calculated using the following methodology:

#### 2.6.1 Achievement Points

For each composite in the Overall Care Delivery domain, the State will decide whether to set the individual ACOs' BP3 performance rates to 1) the higher of their BP1 or BP2 actual rates, or 2) the higher of their BP2 or BP3 actual rates. Regardless of which comparison the State decides to use, the rate selected will be used not just for the BP3 performance rates, but also the BP2 performance rates, given that the timing of BP2 data collection (i.e., January through May of 2020) could lead to BP2 actual rates being variably impacted across ACOs as a result of the state of emergency declared by the federal or state government. Upon determination of the ACOs' BP2 and BP3 performance rates, achievements points will be determined following the process set forth in Section 2.3.1.

EXHIBIT 8 Example of Member Experience Calculation When Deciding Between BP1 and BP2 Actual Rates

ACO A 85% 87.0 % 87.0%

#### 2.6.2 Improvement Points

Improvement point calculation for BP2 and BP3 is determined by the following methodology:

#### Step 1: ACO Improvement

- a. For each composite within a domain, compare ACO BP1 actual rates to BP2 performance rates
  - i. For composites where an ACO demonstrates improvement (i.e., reaches the improvement target), the ACO earns improvement points
  - ii. For composites where an ACO fails to demonstrate improvement, then Step 2 is implemented

#### Step 2: Statewide Improvement

- a. If the State sets individual ACOs' BP2 and BP3 performance rates to be the higher of their actual BP1 or BP2 rates, then for each composite within a domain, compare BP1 statewide median rates to BP2 statewide median rates. If the State sets ACOs' BP2 and BP3 performance rates to be the higher of their BP2 or BP3 actual rates, then for each composite within a domain, compare BP1 statewide median rates to the higher of BP2 statewide median rates or BP3 statewide median rates.
  - i. For composites where the State demonstrates improvement (i.e., reaches the improvement target), the ACO earns improvement points
  - ii. For composites where the State fails to demonstrate targeted improvement, the ACO does not earn improvement points

Note: In order to prevent such cases where an ACO's performance would improve excessively through the use of the statewide median, the number of composites by which an ACO may use Step 2.a.i to earn improvement points is capped at one

EXHIBIT 9 - Example of Improvement Point Calculation with Cap = 1 Composite

Note: This example assumes each composite has the same Improvement Target across composites A-D, and that the State is comparing BP1 rates to BP2 rates.

Measure Improvement Target = 1.0

Composite - Example	ACO BP1 Actual Rate	ACO BP2 Performance Rate	ACO Improvement	Improvement Used	Improvement Points Received (Source)
A – Willingness to Recommend (Adult Survey)	75.1%	75.9% (target not met by ACO) State Med = 1.0	YES (Step 2 applied)		
B - Willingness to Recommend (Child Survey)	85.1%	87.0%	1.9 (target met by ACO)	ACO = 1.9	YES (Step 2 not needed)
C - Communications (Adult Survey)	89.5	88.7%	-0.8 (target not met by ACO)	State Med = 1.0	NO (Capped at 1: Composite A already received points)
D - Communications (Child Survey)	78.1%	78.5%	0.4 (target not met by ACO)	State Med = 0.8 (target not met by State)	NO

# 2.7 Methodology for Establishing Performance Benchmarks for Quality Measures

EOHHS will establish the attainment threshold and goal benchmark for each Quality Measure. EOHHS anticipates establishing these performance benchmarks as follows:

- For Quality Measures based on NCQA HEDIS measures, EOHHS anticipates using NCQA Quality Compass percentile benchmarks where possible
- For non-HEDIS claims-based Quality Measures, EOHHS anticipates using existing MassHealth data sources such as MassHealth historical claims or encounter data
- For non-HEDIS Clinical Quality Measures, or other Quality Measures where EOHHS does not have access to applicable data, EOHHS anticipates using MassHealth benchmarks based on the ACO-attributed population

# 2.8 Methodology to Calculate Quality Score

EOHHS will calculate the Contractor's Quality Score by multiplying the unweighted domain scores for each domain by the domain weights detailed in Exhibit 1, and then summing the resulting weighted

domain scores together. The Contractor's Quality Score will be a number between zero (0) and one (1), inclusive.

# 3 Methodology to calculate DSRIP Accountability Score

# 3.1 Overall Approach

The amount of at-risk DSRIP funds a Contractor earns will be determined by its DSRIP Accountability Score. The Contractor's DSRIP Accountability Score will be based on the ACO's TCOC achievement, as well as their quality performance on the same four (4) Quality Measure domains used for the Contractor's Quality Score. The Contractor's TCOC achievement will be calculated as described in Section 3.2 below; the Contractor's quality performance will be calculated as described in Section 3.3 below. The relative contributions of the Contractor's TCOC achievement and quality performance are detailed in Exhibit 10:

EXHIBIT 10 - ACO DSRIP Accountability Domains

DSRIP Accountability Domain	% Contribution to DSRIP Accountability Score		
	Performance Year (PY) 0	PY 1-2	PY 3-5
Total Cost of Care achievement	NA	NA	25%
Quality performance	NA	100%	75%

#### 3.2 Total Cost of Care Performance

This domain reflects a Contractor's TCOC performance for its Enrollees, relative to the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark as described in Section 4 of the Contract. The Contractor's TCOC component of its DSRIP Accountability Score will be calculated in the following manner:

- If the Contractor's TCOC Performance is lower than the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark (i.e., the Contractor has Savings), as described in Section 4 of the Contract, the Contractor's TCOC component of its DSRIP Accountability Score equals 100%
- If the Contractor's TCOC Performance exceeds the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark by more than 5% of the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark, as described in Section 4 of the Contract, the Contractor's TCOC component of its DSRIP Accountability Score equals 0%
- If the Contractor's TCOC Performance exceeds the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark by less than 5% of the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark, the Contractor's TCOC component of its DSRIP Accountability Score equals: one (1) minus (the Contractor's TCOC Performance minus the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark / (5% of the Contractor's TCOC Benchmark)

# 3.3 Quality Performance

The Contractor's quality component of the DSRIP Accountability Score will be the exact same number as the Contractor's Quality Score, as described in Section 2.

# **3.4** DSRIP Accountability Score

EOHHS will calculate the Contractor's DSRIP Accountability Score by multiplying the Contractor's TCOC component of its DSRIP Accountability Score (as calculated in Section 3.2 above) and the Contractor's quality component of its DSRIP Accountability Score (as described in Section 3.3 above) by the domain weights in Exhibit 10 above, and summing the resulting amounts together. The resulting number is the Contractor's DSRIP Accountability Score, which will be a number between zero (0) and one (1), inclusive.

# APPENDIX I TCOC BENCHMARK

# EXHIBIT 1 TCOC BENCHMARKS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PAYMENTS Contract Year 5

Listed below are the Per Member Per Month (PMPM) TCOC Benchmarks and Administrative Payments for Contract Year 5 (January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022), subject to state appropriation and all necessary federal approvals.

TCOC Benchmarks do not include EOHHS adjustments described in Sections 4.3.E of the Contract.

Exhibit 1.1: ACO TCOC Benchmarks (per member per month) Effective January 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022

RC I Adult	
Effective Ja	<u>nuary 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022</u>
<u>REGION</u>	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$517.29
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$522.70
Southern	\$569.66
Central	\$475.28
Western	\$461.05

RC I Child	
<b>Effective January 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022</b>	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$225.32
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$210.23
Southern	\$213.92
Central	\$207.77
Western	\$206.58

RC II Adult Effective January 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$1,864.77
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$1,972.48
Southern	\$2,026.28
Central	\$1,804.62
Western	\$1,582.58

RC II Child Effective January 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$948.11
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$935.87
Southern	\$850.70
Central	\$893.44
Western	\$652.63

<u>RC IX</u> Effective January 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$599.10
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$572.28
Southern	\$658.29
Central	\$591.24
Western	\$531.53

<u>RC X</u>	
Effective Ja	nuary 1, 2022 – June 30, 2022
<u>REGION</u>	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$1,903.40
Greater Boston	\$1,813.99
Southern	\$1,915.54
Central	\$1,864.48
Western	\$1,615.14

RC I Adult Effective July 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$511.41
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$517.99
Southern	\$562.82
Central	\$469.97
Western	\$455.28

RC I Child Effective July 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$220.92
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$207.15
Southern	\$209.89
Central	\$204.12
Western	\$202.46

RC II Adult Effective July 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$1,836.17
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$1,948.21
Southern	\$1,999.30
Central	\$1,780.15
Western	\$1,560.40

RC II Child	
Effective Jul	<u>y 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022</u>
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$931.75
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$922.74
Southern	\$836.31
Central	\$879.50
Western	\$640.71

RC IX Effective July 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$590.50
<b>Greater Boston</b>	\$563.65
Southern	\$648.07
Central	\$582.29
Western	\$521.97

RC X Effective July 1, 2022 – December 31, 2022	
REGION	TCOC BENCHMARK
Northern	\$1,872.78
Greater Boston	\$1,781.88
Southern	\$1,877.93
Central	\$1,832.34
Western	\$1,581.76