

First Look Summary - Patient level information and costing systems (PLICS):

Current practice and future potential for the NHS health economy

Sue Llewellyn*, Professor of Accountability and Management Control, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester

Naomi Chambers, Professor of Healthcare Management, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester

Sheila Ellwood, Professor of Financial Reporting, School of Economics, Finance and Management, University of Bristol

Christos Begkos, Lecturer in Management Accounting, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester.

Chris Wood, Research Associate, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester.

*Corresponding author. Email: sue.llewellyn@mbs.ac.uk, Tel: 0161 275 0433

This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research, or similar, and contains language that may offend some readers. Names of particular products and manufacturers have been changed.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Llewellyn *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Important

A 'first look' scientific summary is created from the original author-supplied summary once the normal NIHR Journals Library peer and editorial review processes are complete. The summary has undergone full peer and editorial review as documented at NIHR Journals Library website and may undergo rewrite during the publication process. The order of authors was correct at editorial sign-off stage.

A final version (which has undergone a rigorous copy-edit and proofreading) will publish as part of a fuller account of the research in a forthcoming issue of the Health Services and Delivery Research journal.

Any queries about this 'first look' version of the scientific summary should be addressed to the NIHR Journals Library Editorial Office - journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The research reported in this 'first look' scientific summary was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its predecessor programmes (NIHR Service Delivery and Organisation programme, or Health Services Research programme) as project number 11/1016/04. For more information visit <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/projects/hsdr/11101604>

The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' work and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments however; they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this scientific summary.

This 'first look' scientific summary presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees

are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health.

Scientific Summary

Background

To undertake a costing exercise, a cost object is necessary. Traditionally, the cost object in healthcare has been either a service line (e.g. orthopaedics) or a clinical intervention (e.g. a hip replacement). Costs can be used to set reimbursements. Since 2003/4 Payment by Results has reimbursed Trusts through tariffs set at the national average Health Resource Group (HRG) cost. An HRG is a group of clinically similar interventions requiring similar amounts of resources.

Since the mid-2000s, the Department of Health has recommended the patient as the cost object to enable a more granular analysis of the cost drivers in healthcare, resulting in Patient Level Information and Costing Systems (PLICS). The benefits were anticipated to be: an enhanced ability to understand financial drivers enabling cost benchmarking at patient, specialty and hospital levels; much improved clinical ownership of costs with the ability to compare the cost profiles of different clinicians for similar patients; a detailed knowledge of individual patient costs to inform patient classification, rather than reliance on the average cost; the ability to progress Payment by Results through setting a long term sustainable price to an efficient provider; and to inform dialogue between providers and commissioners.

The introduction of PLICS heralded a shift in hospital costing methodology from a mainly “top-down” mode of cost allocation (like HRG costing) to a more direct “bottom-up” approach, based on the principles of activity based costing, where every effort is made to cost all the cost drivers (e.g. interventions, activities and events) which can be associated with individual patients. One of the strengths of activity-based costing is revealing how traditional “top-down” costing methods (like HRG costing) over-cost routine products or services but under-cost complex products or services.

Identifying cost drivers at the patient level should also enable better allocative resource allocation not only along care pathways within hospitals but also across the whole NHS economy. Moreover, PLICS has the potential to produce a granular analysis of the cost of individual pathways both within Trusts (from referral to discharge) and across a ‘year of care’ (for chronic conditions which cross organizational boundaries). In addition to allocative efficiency, PLICS can enable better technical efficiency, this implies the use of resource inputs to maximum advantage in terms of either outputs (e.g. numbers of patients treated) or outcomes (e.g. numbers of patients benefitting from treatment).

The Health and Social Care Act (2012) transferred responsibility for tariffs and price setting from the Department of Health to the NHS Commissioning Board (now NHS England) and Monitor (the economic regulator for healthcare). Monitor propose that PLICS will now form the basis for the payment system through pricing healthcare services and, as such, would become mandatory across all care settings. The 2012 Act requires both competition and the collaboration needed to achieve care integration, although policy commentators note that the two may not always be compatible.

Objectives

Against this background, we aim to analyse the potential of PLICS in four areas:

- (a). Cost improvement through enhanced technical efficiency;
- (b). Better allocative efficiency of resources and congruence with patient preferences within healthcare economies (first, within and between Trusts, second, between primary and secondary/tertiary care and, third, along care pathways and year of care);
- (c). Understanding clinical variation in resource use and the relationships between cost and quality;
- (d). Greater clinical engagement through more clinical ownership of costs and information systems

Methods

Our 'sequential exploratory design' undertook quantitative data collection and analysis- through a large scale on-line survey of all English Trusts- before qualitative data collection and analysis at four case studies at different geographical locations in England. Three sites were generalist Foundation Trusts, the other a specialist Foundation provider. We surveyed Commissioning Support Units to explore the potential for PLICS in commissioning.

The design strategy uses the initial quantitative results to inform secondary qualitative data collection, with the two forms of data remaining separate but connected. This can be particularly useful when unexpected results arise from the quantitative stage. In our study, the percentage of Trusts considering their PLICS data to be commercially sensitive was unexpectedly high at 74% and the sharing the data with commissioners was unexpectedly low at 5%. In consequence, at the interviews we investigated the issues of commercial sensitivity and data sharing in the context of Monitor's current role to enable both competition and collaboration. The interviews were semi-structured in design, audio-recorded and transcribed as Microsoft Word documents, except once where consent to audio record was withheld and hand written notes taken instead. The total number of interviewees was 54.

To triangulate our findings at the case study sites, we collected 25 sets of documents relating to PLICS including: samples of PLICS data; business cases for investment; service line reports; presentations on PLICS; and strategy documents. We also undertook exploratory observational work (covering presentations and interactions) during the PLICS implementation process at one of the case study sites and at a national benchmarking group. Both the documentary evidence and the observational work enabled corroboration of some putative PLICS uses- as discussed in the interviews. A notable aspect of the study was the involvement of practitioner team members: a senior clinician, provider Director of Finance, and commissioner Director of Finance, who provided advice, guidance and support.

The analysis of the survey data was done through SPSS. For the interview data, a sample of six transcripts were analysed through an initial 'hand-coding' exercise where content was organised into themes, generating a draft theme-code template, enabling two researchers to review each transcript. Once hand coding was complete the dataset was imported into the

qualitative data analysis package NVivo to generate codes, segment text and filter the data, and to describe, label and group together different themes.

Our methodology and ontology followed a 'critical realist' approach which accepts that the nature of the object determines the form of its science. Working from participants' views, we paid attention to 'what works' with PLICS, specifically in which contexts and with which mechanisms, thus conforming to critical realist research guidelines for social science research.

The study took place between July 2012 and October 2015.

Findings

We discuss findings under our research objectives which assess the potential for PLICS in four areas:

Cost improvement through enhanced technical efficiency

The most significant use of PLICS was cost improvement within the Trusts, particularly to meet Cost Improvement Programmes. In the survey 50% of respondents at the Trusts stated they were members of a Cost Improvement Programme or similar initiative. Sometimes cost improvements were achieved simply through cost reduction (e.g. using less expensive equipment or prostheses) rather than being driven by greater technical or allocative efficiency. Although technical efficiency was achieved, where possible, through: switching patients who would have been in-patients to day cases; reducing length of stay and, therefore, raising throughput; and improved theatre utilization.

In the survey 83% of respondents stated they use PLICS to identify how much a particular patient costs using direct and attributed costs. Perhaps unexpectedly, given that patient level costs generate costings at the *individual* patient level, in terms of cost improvement, at interview, we did not find much interest in outliers i.e. either very high or very low patient

costs for a particular intervention. Rather attention focussed “shifting the cost curve graph for the majority of patients” i.e. consideration of how to reduce costs for the majority of patients within the normal cost range.

Most controversially, respondents at the three generalist case study sites commented that cost improvement for the Trust as a whole could be achieved through simply disinvesting in high cost areas of clinical work. At interview, this was clearly a sensitive area but the indications were that at two sites disinvestment was an active issue. In our survey 55% of respondents stated that services had been terminated or moved to a different provider as a result a Trust initiative, whilst 14% said that PLICS had informed this decision.

Better allocative efficiency of resources and congruence with patient preferences within healthcare economies

There was only modest utilization of PLICS to allocate resources across services and settings. The main focus for resource reallocation was within the Trusts. Service lines which made a surplus under the tariff cross-subsidized those making a loss. PLICS was used to pinpoint which HRGs were loss-making within service lines. In the survey, 61% of respondents stated they use PLICS to benchmark services against other providers. Congruent with this, two case study sites were part of a National Benchmarking Group and both Trusts used PLICS benchmarking data to determine whether the extent of the loss on a particular HRG was comparable within the benchmarking peer group. If the loss was comparable that was taken to indicate a tariff issue (i.e. the tariff reimbursed below the level of a cost-efficient provider) but if the loss was less (or there was no loss) then the HRG was closely scrutinised for cost inefficiencies before any cross-subsidization occurred.

In the survey only 2% of respondents at the Trusts reported sharing PLICS data with patients groups, however, 86% of respondents stated that patient preferences had influenced service redesign as part of a Trust initiative, with 5% saying that PLICS data had informed this decision. However, at interview, we found few indications that patient preferences were actively sought, as opposed to being discussed, before decisions were made on resource allocation across services and settings.

Resource allocation between Trusts most often involved reconfiguration of services to reduce care variation and duplication between sites. Such reconfiguration proposals sometimes came up against the difficulty of satisfying Monitor that the proposal was not anti-competitive and did not jeopardize the financial standing or sovereignty of the Trusts concerned.

With respect to PLICS use in decisions on resource allocation between primary and acute care, in the survey, 52% of respondents said services had been moved to a different care setting as part of a Trust initiative, 13% said PLICS informed this decision. The main interview evidence on resource allocation between primary and acute care comes from one of our case studies with a transformation programme which sought to reduce duplication between the Trust and community services and also to strengthen partnerships with local GPs. However, the Trust became concerned about commercial sensitivity and, at the time of writing, it looked unlikely that PLICS data would be shared with the external (to the Trust) healthcare organizations along the pathway or with commissioners.

In terms of “year of care”, in the survey, 39% of respondents stated that their organization collected data which would allow costing on a “year of care”. However this reported figure should be treated with caution because we assume respondents were aware only of the acute part of the year of care costs. Generally, in the community, there are no standard currencies (units of healthcare for which payment can be made e.g. an “HRG”, a “year of care” or a “mental health cluster”), no standard service definitions and no adequate data collection systems, so there is little infrastructure to build PLICS.

Understanding clinical variation in resource use and the relationships between cost and quality

In the survey, 63% of respondents stated they use PLICS to identify resource variation and, hence, cost between consultants but only 17% use PLICS to understand the relationship between cost and quality (defined in the survey as “clinical outcomes”). This situation begs the question of whether any resource variation between clinicians is justified by better clinical outcomes. At interview, respondents commented favourably on the use of PLICS to identify clinical variation but respondents were divided on the question of whether clinicians

were open to changing their practice when shown the PLICS costs. Other clinicians referred to the imperative to include the cost of adverse events (e.g. falls) and downstream costs, for example, longer time in theatre may improve clinical outcomes but they recognized that making links between costs and quality was not, currently possible. At interview, we found that the Trusts had separate reporting systems for costs and clinical outcomes, creating problems for using PLICS to link cost with quality

Greater clinical engagement through more clinical ownership of costs and information systems

In the survey 88% of Trusts reported sharing PLICS data with clinicians but clinical ownership does not occur without the finance function strategizing over how to engage clinicians. Strategies included: communication events; finance “hit squads” to assist service lines with specific issues; mandating PLICS data for clinical investment business cases; creating clinicians as PLICS champions; using artefacts such as profitability “bubble charts” to create consensus around PLICS data; and involving clinicians in decisions about cross-subsidization and the inclusion of overheads in PLICS costs.

Generally clinicians lack formal financial training, this sometimes resulted in decisions which seemed to represent cost savings for variable costs but which neglected fixed costs and the need to run at or near capacity to generate income under the tariff.

Clinicians do not receive PLICS data as frequently as service line reports, 58% of respondents reported receiving PLICS reports quarterly, with only 23% having a monthly PLICS report. Operational financial management at the Trusts was through service line reporting and traditional Directorate budgets, hence these were often more relevant to clinicians. At interview, both clinicians and finance staff considered PLICS to be more of a strategic tool.

Finally, we did not anticipate all PLICS uses. At the specialist case study much of the work with PLICS was in accordance with its activity-based costing principles i.e. to identify the funding shortfall under the HRG-based tariff for their complex care and to press for boosting the tariff. Another development was the use of PLICS to cost, and thus identify the

profitability of private patients and, potentially, drive new healthcare initiatives which were financially rewarding to the Trusts but may be marginal in terms of patient benefit.

Conclusions

We conclude that financial pressure within the NHS, along with its current competitive, business oriented ethos, induces the Trusts to act in their own interests rather than that of the whole health economy. This seems likely to continue as Monitor develops PLICS into a rule-based pricing mechanism. Yet, it is still unclear if equivalent health care interventions are cheaper outside of acute care. If PLICS is developed for community services it has a significant role as evidence but, currently, its potential is not being realized because of the general lack of robust PLICS data for community services and the reluctance of the Trusts to share their data with commissioners. Overall, we found competitive forces rather than collaborative cross-organizational initiatives drove the use of PLICS.