



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures

Ohio Department of Medicaid
50 West Town Street, Suite 400
Columbus, Ohio 43215

RE: Casey A. Chamberlain, D.O. NPI: 1144436858
Program Year 2: Meaningful Use Stage 1 Year 1

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the Ohio Department of Medicaid (ODM), on Dr. Casey A. Chamberlain's (hereafter referred to as the Provider) compliance with the requirements of the Medicaid Provider Incentive Program (MPIP) for the year ended December 31, 2014. The Provider is responsible for compliance with the MPIP requirements. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of ODM. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures enumerated below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

1. We searched the Medicaid Information Technology System and determined that the Provider had an active Ohio Medicaid Agreement during the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods.
2. Using the Ohio e-license center, we verified the Provider type was the same as reported in MPIP and determined that the Provider was licensed to practice in Ohio during the patient volume and meaningful use attestation periods.
3. We reviewed the MPIP system and determined that the Provider underwent ODM's pre-payment approval process, was approved for incentive payment and received an incentive payment.

We compared the date of pre-payment approval with the date of the incentive payment and determined that pre-payment approval occurred prior to payment. In addition, we compared the payment amount with the MPIP payment schedule and determined that ODM issued the correct payment amount.

4. We obtained the Provider's list of all encounters for an alternate patient volume attestation period (June 1, 2014 to August 31, 2014) as the Provider stated they entered the incorrect original patient volume period (June 1, 2013 to August 31, 2013) in the MPIP system. We scanned the list and found duplicate encounters. We removed duplicates and recalculated encounters.

We also verified that all payers were included in the encounter list and found no unrecorded encounters.

5. We compared the Medicaid encounters from the Quality Decision Support System (QDSS) for the alternative patient volume attestation period to the final Provider's Medicaid encounters identified in procedure 3 to determine if the Provider's encounters exceeded 20 percent of QDSS. The variance exceeded 20 percent and we recalculated the Medicaid patient volume using the Provider's Medicaid encounter list and determined the Provider met the 30 percent patient volume requirement.

6. We found that the location where the Provider worked was now using a newer version of the electronic health record (EHR) software reported in the MPIP system. The newer version of the software was able to produce reports showing the Provider's use in 2014. We verified that the newer version of the EHR software was approved by the Office of the National Coordinator of Health IT.
7. We determined the Provider did not report multiple locations.
8. We obtained supporting documentation for the core measures and compared it to the applicable criteria. We found no exceptions. For those measures that require only unique patients be counted, we scanned detailed data to identify duplicate patients. We found no duplicate patients.
9. We obtained supporting documentation for the menu measures and compared it to the applicable criteria and we determined if the minimum number of measures was met including at least one public health menu measure. We found no exceptions. For those measures that require only unique patients be counted, we scanned the detailed data and found no duplicate patients.
10. We obtained supporting documentation for the clinical quality measures and compared it to the applicable criteria and we determined if the minimum number of measures was met with at least one measure from three different domains. We found no exceptions.

Responsible Party's Written Representation

The Provider declined to submit a signed representation letter acknowledging responsibility for maintaining records and complying with applicable MPIP regulations; making available all documentation related to compliance; responding fully to our inquiries; reporting any non-compliance subsequent to the end of the engagement period; and disclosing all communications received from regulatory agencies alleging noncompliance with the Ohio MPIP rules.

This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards. We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the Provider's compliance with the MPIP requirements. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported. This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Provider and ODM, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.



Dave Yost
Auditor of State

November 22, 2017



Dave Yost • Auditor of State

CASEY CHAMBERLAIN

ROSS COUNTY

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.

Susan Babbitt

CLERK OF THE BUREAU

**CERTIFIED
DECEMBER 26, 2017**