

# Nevada Cost Growth Benchmark: Five Options for Responding to Provider Inflation & Workforce Cost Pressures

November 2022

\*Note: greyed-out cells will not be discussed in detailed presentation during the 11/16/22 meeting; items 2-4 will be prioritized for the discussion.

| Options  | Pros   | Cons  |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Make no adjustments. Hold insurers and provider organizations to current benchmark values.*                               | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistent with the original intent for the benchmark values to be established for long-term use.</li> <li>2. Maintains accountability for affordability during a period when wages are not growing as fast as inflation.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fails to acknowledge the impact that inflation and wage pressures are having on provider efforts to constrain their costs.</li> <li>2. Could result in the benchmark being viewed as unrealistic and thus lacking credibility.</li> <li>3. Doesn't recognize that Executive Order 2021-29 provides for possible modification of the benchmark or benchmark assessment in response to significant changes in the economy.</li> </ol> |
| 2. Make no adjustments. Commit to acknowledge the impact of inflation and labor shortages when interpreting results.         | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistent with the original intent for the benchmark values to be established for long-term use.</li> <li>2. Maintains some degree of accountability for affordability during a period when wages are not growing as fast as inflation.</li> </ol>                                  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removes the certainty and thus the influence of the benchmark value in constraining spending growth.</li> <li>2. Sanctions increased rates of spending growth without any prospectively defined restraint.</li> </ol>   |
| 3. Create a specific allowance for exceeding the benchmark on a time-limited basis for those years with very high inflation. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintains benchmark values but creates a temporary adjustment to inform interpretation of performance, thereby acknowledging the impact of inflation and labor shortages.</li> <li>2. Maintains accountability for affordability, albeit at temporarily increased levels.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sanctions increased rates of spending growth.</li> <li>2. Could be viewed as equivalent to changing benchmark values, and thus sets a precedent for doing so.</li> </ol>  |
| 4. Redefine the benchmark values on a time-limited basis for those years with very high inflation.                           | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledges the impact of inflation and labor shortages.</li> <li>2. Maintains accountability for affordability, albeit at temporarily increased levels.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sanctions increased rates of spending growth.</li> <li>2. Sets a precedent for modifying benchmark values.</li> </ol>   |
| 5. Waive the benchmarks during the period of high inflation and labor shortage.*   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledges the impact of inflation and labor shortages.</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconsistent with the original intent of the benchmark program.</li> <li>2. Sanctions unrestrained spending growth.</li> </ol>  |