Dear Secretary Becerra, Secretary Yellen, and Secretary Walsh:

We write regarding the interim final rule (IFR) released on September 30 entitled “Requirements Related to Surprise Billing; Part II”. The bipartisan No Surprises Act, passed by Congress in December 2020, was one of the most important patient protection bills in American history, but its success will depend on your departments following the letter of law in its implementation. We urge you to amend the IFR in order to align the law’s implementation with the legislation Congress passed.

Congress passed the No Surprises Act after extensive bipartisan and bicameral deliberations to protect patients from surprise medical bills and create a balanced process to resolve payment disputes between insurance plans and health care providers. During these deliberations, multiple proposals were considered including a benchmark rate, an independent dispute resolution (IDR) process, and a hybrid. Following a comprehensive process that included hearings, markups, and extensive negotiations, Congress rejected a benchmark rate and determined the best path forward for patients was to authorize an open negotiation period coupled with a balanced IDR process.

The No Surprises Act specified an IDR process that takes patients out of the middle of payment disputes. It allows providers and payors to bring any relevant information to support their payment offers for consideration, except for billed charges and public payor information. Per this process, the certified IDR entity shall consider:

- Median in-network rates
- Provider training and quality of outcomes
- Market share of parties
- Patient acuity or complexity of services
- In the case that a provider is a facility: teaching status, case mix, and scope of services
- Demonstrations of previous good faith efforts to negotiate in-network rates
- Prior contract history between the two parties over the previous four years

The process laid out in the law expressly directs the certified IDR entity to consider each of these listed factors should they be submitted, capturing the unique circumstance of each billing dispute without causing any single piece of information to be the default one considered.
Unfortunately, the parameters of the IDR process in the IFR released on September 30 do not reflect the way the law was written, do not reflect a policy that could have passed Congress, and do not create a balanced process to settle payment disputes. The IFR directs IDR entities to begin with the assumption that the median in-network rate is the appropriate payment amount prior to considering other factors. This directive establishes a de-facto benchmark rate, making the median in-network rate the default factor considered in the IDR process. This approach is contrary to statute and could incentivize insurance companies to set artificially low payment rates, which would narrow provider networks and jeopardize patient access to care – the exact opposite of the goal of the law. It could also have a broad impact on reimbursement for in-network services, which could exacerbate existing health disparities and patient access issues in rural and urban underserved communities.

We appreciate the complex nature of the patient protections that must be established and look forward to a final rule that accurately reflects Congress’s multi-year bipartisan and bicameral work to pass this landmark legislation. Therefore, we urge you to revise the IFR to align with the law as written by specifying that the certified IDR entity should not default to the median in-network rate and should instead consider all of the factors outlined in the statute without disproportionately weighting one factor.

Thank you for your continued efforts on this important matter. We look forward to working with you to ensure the best outcomes for our patients and the health of our communities.