

1 **Title**

2 Aligning Funding Models with Clinical Practice: Phases of Neonatal Care and the Link  
3 with Activity-Based Funding

4

5 **Article Type**

6 Article

7

8 **Authors**

9 Dylan A Mordaunt 1,2,3,\*

10

11 **Affiliations**

12 1 Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Bedford Park, South Australia

13 2 College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, South  
14 Australia

15 3 Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide,  
16 South Australia

17

18 **Correspondence**

19 d.a.mordaunt@gmail.com



21 186 words (250-word limit)

## 22 **Abstract**

### 23 **Objective**

24 To explore the potential impact of partitioning neonatal unit funding into acute and sub-  
25 acute/non-acute care (SNAP) types, within a level 6 neonatal unit under the  
26 Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA) National Efficient Price  
27 (NEP) Funding Model.

### 28 **Methods**

29 In a 12-month retrospective cohort from our neonatal unit, we simulated the effect of a  
30 care type change to SNAP. We then explored the trend in this activity type over the past  
31 20 years.

### 32 **Results**

33 341 patients with a length of stay greater than 10 days were identified from FY 2021-22.  
34 Modelling estimates that between 51 and 175 episodes could have a SNAP opportunity.  
35 When moderated, this corresponds with an uplift of between AUD \$0.3 - 1.7M, based on  
36 2023-24 value and NEP price.

### 37 **Conclusions**

38 Utilisation of a SNAP care-type change has the potential for a considerable uplift in  
39 funding for level 6 neonatal units, supporting service sustainability. This may be of use  
40 for other units, whilst the neonatal funding model continues to be reviewed and  
41 optimized by IHACPA. Implementation in our context, would require changes to both

42 local and state funding management systems, as well as alterations in the Electronic  
43 Medical Record (EMR).

44

45 **Keywords**

46 Health economics; healthcare financing; case-mix systems; neonatology and

47 perinatology

48 2475 (2500 word limit)

## 49 **Introduction**

50 Neonatal care is highly specialized and complex. Major innovations introduced in  
51 neonatal and public health over the past 50 years have both markedly improved  
52 outcomes in newborns and significantly increased the cost of neonatal care <sup>1</sup>. As these  
53 technologies have become more mature, and perinatal intervention at the limits of  
54 viability has become routine, with further advancements being made in terms of the  
55 gestational ages at which survival can occur, this has had two key effects <sup>2</sup>.

56 Firstly, neonatal care has become more specialised in terms of workforce skill mix and  
57 health technologies, with the consequence of centralising the neonatal intensive care  
58 capacity in our jurisdiction in two centres <sup>3</sup>. Secondly, funding models based on birth  
59 weight are not well aligned with the clinical and resulting operational context- for  
60 instance, units providing services to interstate patients may need to fund  
61 accommodation for patients with or without co-payment, whereas in some jurisdictions  
62 funding may be addressed through a separate accommodation scheme and not costed  
63 as part of the episode of care <sup>4</sup>.

64 What this means is that as intervention continues to occur closer to the limits of viability,  
65 the funding models have not kept pace with clinical models, resulting in a situation  
66 where the Australian Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA)  
67 National Efficient Price (NEP) Activity-Based Funding (ABF) model, has required  
68 specific adjustments to account for variance in outcomes for neonatal care diagnosis-

69 related groups (DRGs), with a longer-term plan to continue to review the underlying  
70 groupings for alignment with good clinical care <sup>5</sup>.

71 This is exacerbated in South Australia, where Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) and  
72 Special Care Baby Unit (SCBU) capacity is centralised in two units, following  
73 international trends <sup>6</sup>. This centralisation limits the tacit separation of admissions into  
74 different phases, such as between neonatal intensive care (hyperacute care) through to  
75 step-down care, and the convalescent nutritional and low acuity monitoring support  
76 often provided in services with lower Clinical Services Capability Levels, interstate  
77 (sometimes referred to as “feeders and growers” or “transitional” phase).

78 The concept of separating out phases of the neonatal admission has long been  
79 undertaken, including the separation of different levels of care between NICUs and  
80 SCBUs <sup>7</sup>. Further separation into transitional care is also well established <sup>8,9</sup>. Recent  
81 reviews of the NEP have advocated for unbundling neonatal or to remodel the neonatal  
82 Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) to follow a gestationally rather than weight-  
83 orientated model of funding <sup>10</sup>. This suggests that the current funding models are not  
84 aligned with good clinical practice and raises whether admissions should be separated  
85 into acute and sub-acute/non-acute (SNAP) care types, a common practice in other  
86 types of non-neonatal hospital care such as child and adult stroke care focused on  
87 functional gain.

88 In this study, we explored the predicted impact of introducing care-type change from  
89 acute to Australian National Subacute and Non-Acute Patient (AN-SNAP) care into a  
90 level 6 NICU and level 5 SCBU unit operation, and the potential impact that this would

91 have on financing of the units. We simulated the impact of care type changes on ABF  
92 funding and making long-term estimates on the trends around the identified cohort.

93

## 94 **Methods**

### 95 *Study*

96 We undertook a simulation study utilising administrative data from patients treated in  
97 South Australia. That is, we simulated the effect of changing care-type from acute  
98 admitted care to AN-SNAP within a retrospective cohort, providing an estimate of the  
99 financial impact of care-type change within the unit. We subsequently looked over a  
100 longer period to determine the activity trends around this sub-cohort, to determine  
101 whether this activity was increasing or decreasing.

### 102 *Setting*

103 Our context is a 50-bed level 6 NICU and associated level 5 SCBU, that sits alongside a  
104 level 6 obstetrics and perinatal service. This unit has a state-wide catchment from within  
105 both SA and the Northern Territory.

### 106 *Dataset and ethics*

107 Data was accessed from our institutional case-mix system and patient administration  
108 system (PAS). This work was undertaken under the auspices of quality improvement  
109 activities for which institutional ethics review is exempted in our organisation. This  
110 assessment was made by the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network Research  
111 Governance Office, under the South Australia Research Ethics and Governance Policy.

## 112 *Participants*

113 A review of “qualified” admissions (admissions where the infant required medical input)  
114 was undertaken to evaluate the length of stay (LOS) for neonates, compared to the  
115 IHACPA average length of stay (ALOS) for the episode DRG. In-scope admissions  
116 included any neonatal episodes with more than 10 qualified bed days that did not have  
117 a principal diagnosis of being “born in hospital” (i.e. no comorbidities) or were admitted  
118 with a low acuity diagnosis-related group (D complexity DRG).

## 119 *Valuation*

120 We revalued the cost of the admissions using the 2023-24 IHACPA NEP model, utilising  
121 all components of the model, including adjustments. This incorporated both uplift  
122 adjustments including outlier per diem payments and downward adjustments such as  
123 those from healthcare-acquired complications. These adjustments were separately and  
124 aggregated to create the total weighting for each scenario. The cost estimate was made  
125 by multiplying this NWAU estimate by the 2023-24 NEP value (AUD 6032).

## 126 *Analysis*

127 To calculate the potential funding uplift, it was assumed any patient with a length of stay  
128 less than 1.5 times the IHACPA ALOS was not long enough to be considered as a  
129 potentially convertible episode. For the remaining episodes with >1.5 times the IHACPA  
130 ALOS, the National Weighted Average Unit (NWAU) opportunity for the potentially  
131 convertible episodes was modelled by the following:

- 132 1. A modelled SNAP point was calculated at either 1.5 times IHACPA ALOS or the  
133 IHACPA upper bound for the acute DRG,



- 134 2. Any potentially convertible episode with LOS above the IHACPA ALOS were split  
135 into two separate episodes of care,  
136 3. The original episode (i.e. LOS equals modelled SNAP point) received the current  
137 inlier acute rate.

138 The new ‘SNAP’ episode (i.e. remaining qualified bed days above the modelled SNAP  
139 point) was funded as a SNAP episode of care (see Figure 1). The potential SNAP  
140 episode uplift was modelled using the funding parameters for Episode Type “‘4ES5’ –  
141 Maintenance, Age <= 17, LOS <= 91”<sup>5</sup>.

#### 142 *Long-Term Trends*

143 To explore the long-term trends related to this opportunity, we filtered raw activity data  
144 from 2000-23 with the same inclusion and exclusion criteria and visualised these using  
145 matplotlib and Seaborn<sup>11, 12</sup>.

146

## 147 **Results**

### 148 *Baseline Characteristics*

149 In the financial year 2021-22, there were 308 neonatal admissions deemed to be  
150 potentially convertible episodes (Figure 2), representing a total of 10,143 occupied bed  
151 days (OBDs) with an average length of stay of 32.9 days compared with the IHACPA  
152 ALOS for the same case-mix of 22.2 days. 33 of these admissions were low complexity  
153 (D complexity DRGs), and therefore excluded from further analysis. Of the remaining  
154 308 admissions, modelling estimates that either 175 (upper estimate) or 51 (lower

155 estimate) episodes could have a SNAP opportunity. The remaining 133 episodes were  
156 excluded due to having a LOS less than the modelled SNAP point.

### 157 *Analysis*

158 The lower estimate of the uplift was 92.3 NWAU (51 episodes) and the upper estimate  
159 was 485 NWAU (124 episodes), corresponding to AUD \$556,616 and \$2,926,011, in  
160 2023-24 value. This is in the context of a modelled base for the activity of 2857 – 2895  
161 NWAU (\$17.2-17.5M). Long-term trends are visualised in Figure 6 and showed that this  
162 cohort is likely increasing in incidence within our centre.

163

## 164 **Discussion**

### 165 *Estimated Financial Impact of Introducing SNAP Care*

166 In this study of a level 6 neonatal unit, we identified between \$0.5M and 3M in potential  
167 financial uplift from within the 2021-22 financial year, through utilising a care type  
168 change from acute admitted to SNAP. This is in the context of a base activity of \$17.2-  
169 17.5M. When compared with the actual revenue from 2021 of \$19.6M against a budget  
170 variance of \$1.4M unfavourable, the potential uplift may be enough to account for the  
171 cost variance. With reference to long-term trends, this estimate appears to be at least  
172 stable, if not growing in potential impact.

### 173 *The Disconnect Between Funding and Clinical Practice*

174 The challenges in aligning the NEP to good clinical practice are well described in  
175 submissions to IHACPA in recent years. Children's Healthcare Australia describe

176 scenarios in which bundled payments (where newborn care is included in the maternity  
177 care price), has significant limitations, including post-natal maternity mental health  
178 admissions. The issue of bundling ICU payments into neonatal DRGs is also highlighted,  
179 with the key message being that wide variability in length of stay, complexity, variability  
180 in the need for ICU care and variability in the type of ICU care utilised (Paediatric  
181 compared with Neonatal Intensive Care Units), make bundling less suitable in this  
182 context because the variance isn't primarily accounted through an efficiency lens <sup>10</sup>.

183 These challenges have led Queensland to unbundle neonatal from maternity funding <sup>13</sup>.  
184 Within the feedback provided about this matter over multiple consultation periods,  
185 stakeholders noted that bundled payment does not reflect the current cost of care, that  
186 this could drive adverse resource allocation and that it may have the effect of separating  
187 mother and baby, which does not reflect current best practice <sup>14</sup>.

### 188 *Challenges of Birth Weight-Based Funding Models*

189 The Australia and New Zealand Neonatal Network submitted to IHACPA to move  
190 towards funding based on gestational age, given that this is a better predictor of clinical  
191 course than weight-based DRGs <sup>15</sup>. Since DRGs (in version 12 and below) are based  
192 on data obtained from the National Minimum Dataset, and that dataset doesn't currently  
193 collect information on gestational age, this is a key barrier to progressing this. Since the  
194 International Classification of Diseases Tenth Version (ICD-10-AM) Twelfth Edition has  
195 included greater detail around gestational age and this forms the basis for AR-DRGs,  
196 costed data is said not to be available to IHACPA until the AR-DRG 13.0 development  
197 cycle <sup>15</sup>.

198 *Aligning Funding with Clinical Phases of Care*

199 The academic and grey literature discussing neonatal care converges on a number of  
200 concepts- 1) neonatal care is effective, costly and specialized; 2) neonatal care is  
201 provided in a variety of ways for a number of reasons, some of which include integration  
202 with the local health system and patient-specific needs (e.g. use of a Paediatric ICU  
203 rather than NICU for extra-corporeal membranous oxygenation in some centres); 3)  
204 There are likely to be three broad phases of care- hyperacute (e.g. intensive care),  
205 acute (e.g. special-care baby unit), sub-acute/maintenance/transitional care. Whilst  
206 ANZNN have submitted that a gestationally-orientated funding system will greater align  
207 with the clinical course of care, this doesn't account for the system aspects of care  
208 pointed to in the SA context- that the duration of care intersects with the duration of  
209 each phase and is highlighted when each phase is routinely provided within a centre  
210 that provides all three phases of care, in contrast to the tacit separation that occurs  
211 when the phases of care are provided separately.

212 *The Economic Burden and the Cost of Neonatal Care in Context*

213 The health economic and financing context of neonatal units, particularly in high income  
214 countries, reflects the complexities of providing high-quality, specialized care within the  
215 constraints of healthcare budgets and policies. Neonatal care, especially in NICUs, is  
216 resource-intensive, involving advanced technologies, highly specialized staff, and  
217 extensive use of pharmaceuticals and medical supplies<sup>16</sup>. The cost of neonatal care  
218 can be substantial, with expenses for preterm or critically ill infants significantly higher  
219 than for term infants without complications. Future advancements such as critical care

220 genomics or genomic newborn screening are likely to add further cost and clinical and  
221 operational complexities, leading to improved health outcomes <sup>17</sup> .

222 However, the cost of the outcomes of newborn conditions such as prematurity  
223 undermanaged, are also substantial <sup>18</sup> . Economic evaluations of interventions to prevent  
224 or treat newborn conditions are generally considered highly cost effective <sup>16, 19</sup> . The  
225 benefits include significantly improved survival rates for extremely preterm and critically  
226 ill infants, reduced long-term disability, and enhanced quality of life for survivors <sup>20</sup> . The  
227 investment in neonatal care not only saves lives but also contributes to reduced future  
228 healthcare costs, and improved developmental outcomes, supporting the argument that  
229 the high initial costs are justified by the substantial long-term benefits to individuals and  
230 society <sup>16</sup> . This emphasizes the importance of continued investment in and optimization  
231 of neonatal care to ensure its sustainability and accessibility, aligning with broader  
232 health policy objectives of maximising health outcomes within available resources.

### 233 *Limitations of the Simulation Study*

234 This exploration into care-type changes demonstrates a proactive approach to  
235 leveraging existing components of the ABF model (AN-SNAP) to enhance the financial  
236 sustainability of neonatal care and enable appropriate care. The limitations of the study  
237 are specific to the method used, and then questions about the appropriateness of  
238 applying the funding model to this context.

239 The limitations of the simulation are primarily that it provides an indication of the  
240 possible financial uplift in implementing the SNAP care type. The actual uplift would  
241 depend on implementation in practice and determining clinically appropriate indicators

242 for care type change. This latter piece could be developed but there are currently no  
243 standardised tools available to guide when neonatal care shifts between the  
244 aforementioned phases of care. Given that neonates are entirely dependent for  
245 activities of daily living, current assessment instruments such as the FIM and paediatric  
246 modifications, wouldn't be particularly helpful.

#### 247 *Implementation Challenges*

248 In our context, there were three significant practical challenges identified- 1) whether the  
249 level of effort required to implement care-type change in this cohort is likely to return  
250 significant enough of a return (in terms of sustainability and impact on clinical care) to  
251 warrant the investment; 2) the existing implementation of neonatal ABF in SA has  
252 several constraints over and above that required by the IHACPA NEP model; 3) That  
253 changes would impact multiple systems, including operational financing and in particular,  
254 the PAS and interdependent Electronic Medical Record (EMR). SA uses the Sunrise  
255 EMR and PAS provided by Alere, but these problems are not inherent to the system,  
256 but rather related to SA's configuration of the PAS functions in the system.

#### 257 *Further Implications for Practice*

258 Finally, the study serves as a reminder of the evolving nature of healthcare financing  
259 and the need for continuous review and adaptation of funding models to ensure they  
260 meet the changing needs of specialized care units. This project not only contributes to  
261 the body of knowledge on healthcare financing and neonatal care but also provides a  
262 practical framework for other units to follow, potentially leading to better healthcare  
263 outcomes and financial efficiency.

264

## 265 **Conclusion**

266 In this study we simulated the financial uplift involved in introducing a care type change  
267 into neonatal care in our level 6 unit. This demonstrated a 2.8-17.4% uplift in funding.

268 Exploring episode characteristics over 23 years demonstrated a long-term trend within  
269 our unit to an increase in this SNAP-eligible cohort. Understanding this further could be  
270 subject to future research.

271 We explored that there are several potential barriers to implementation, including  
272 practical steps to introduce this into the South Australian funding system and IT systems,  
273 as well as a lack of standardised tools available for determining when it would be  
274 clinically appropriate to change care type.

275

## 276 **Acknowledgements**

277 Kirsty Taylor and Cameron Abbott from Deloitte Financial Advisory Pty. Ltd. provided  
278 advice and undertook the initial analysis.

279

## 280 **Declaration of Funding**

281 This research did not receive any specific funding.

282

## 283 **Disclosures**

284 There are no relevant disclosures.

285

## 286 **Author Contributions**

287 DM is responsible for the concept, additional analysis and the manuscript.

## 288 **Data Availability Statement**

289 Data is not available for sharing as this was not included as a part of the institutional  
290 approval.

291

## 292 **References**

293 1. Morgan AS, Mendonça M, Thiele N, David AL. Management and outcomes of  
294 extreme preterm birth. *Bmj*2022 Jan 10;376:e055924.

295 2. Lawn JE, Blencowe H, Oza S, You D, Lee ACC, Waiswa P, et al. Every  
296 Newborn: progress, priorities, and potential beyond survival. *The*  
297 *Lancet*2014;384(9938):189-205.

298 3. Doyle LW, Darlow BA. The changing face of neonatal intensive care for infants  
299 born extremely preterm (<28 weeks' gestation). *Seminars in Perinatology*2021  
300 2021/12/01;45(8):151476.

301 4. Health Ato, Welfare. Hospital resources 2017–18: Australian hospital statistics.  
302 Canberra: AIHW2019.



- 303 5. Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority. Pricing Framework for  
304 Australian Public Hospital Services 2024–25. Online: Australian Government; 2023. p.  
305 37.
- 306 6. England N, Improvement N. Implementing the recommendations of the neonatal  
307 critical care transformation review. London: NHS England2019.
- 308 7. Foster J, Pathrose SP, Briguglio L, Trajkovski S, Lowe P, Muirhead R, et al.  
309 Scoping review of systematic reviews of nursing interventions in a neonatal intensive  
310 care unit or special care nursery. J Clin Nurs2024 Jun;33(6):2123-37.
- 311 8. Duddridge E. What are the advantages of transitional care for neonates? British  
312 Journal of Midwifery2001 2001/02/01;9(2):92-8.
- 313 9. Lasby K, Newton S, von Platen A. Neonatal transitional care. Can Nurse2004  
314 Oct;100(8):18-23.
- 315 10. Women’s and Children’s Healthcare Australasia. Submission to the Independent  
316 Hospital Pricing Authority on the Pricing Framework for Australian Public Hospital  
317 Services 2020-21. Independent Hospital Pricing Authority; 2020.
- 318 11. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. Computing in science &  
319 engineering2007;9(03):90-5.
- 320 12. Waskom ML. Seaborn: statistical data visualization. Journal of Open Source  
321 Software2021;6(60):3021.
- 322 13. Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority. Pricing Framework for  
323 Australian Public Hospital Services 2024–25 - Consultation Report. Online: Australian  
324 Government; 2023. p. 41.


- 325 14. Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority. Pricing Framework for  
326 Australian Public Hospital Services 2022-23 - Consultation Report. Online: Australian  
327 Government; 2021. p. 39.
- 328 15. Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority. Development of ICD-10  
329 AM/ACHI/ACS Thirteenth Edition and AR-DRG Version 12.0 Consultation Paper.  
330 Online: Australian Government; 2023. p. 57.
- 331 16. Cheah IGS. Economic assessment of neonatal intensive care. Transl  
332 Pediatr2019 Jul;8(3):246-56.
- 333 17. Mordaunt D, Gonzalez F, Lunke S, Eggers S, Sadedin S, Chong B. The cost of  
334 proband and trio exome and genome analysis in rare disease: A micro-costing study.  
335 Genet Med2023;26(4):101058.
- 336 18. Petrou S, Sach T, Davidson L. The long-term costs of preterm birth and low birth  
337 weight: results of a systematic review. Child Care Health Dev2001 Mar;27(2):97-115.
- 338 19. Mangiaterra V, Mattero M, Dunkelberg E. Why and how to invest in neonatal  
339 health. Seminars in Fetal and Neonatal Medicine2006 2006/02/01/;11(1):37-47.
- 340 20. Younge N, Goldstein RF, Bann CM, Hintz SR, Patel RM, Smith PB, et al.  
341 Survival and Neurodevelopmental Outcomes among Periviable Infants. N Engl J  
342 Med2017 Feb 16;376(7):617-28.
- 343
- 344

345 **Figure 1. Opportunity Calculation – Qualified Neonate SNAP (Upper Estimate)**


346 Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA), Average Length of Stay

347 (ALOS), Length of Stay (LOS), Weighted Activity Unit (WAU).

**Original acute episode of care**




**New episodes of care**



348

349 **Figure 2. Qualified Neonate SNAP Opportunity Summary**

350 Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA), Average Length of Stay  
351 (ALOS), Length of Stay (LOS), Weighted Activity Unit (WAU), Diagnosis-Related Group  
352 (DRG).




<sup>^</sup> WAU value moderated by 50%

353

### Figure 3. Potential Sub-Acute Neonatal Admissions Cohort Determination


Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA), Average Length of Stay (ALOS), Length of Stay (LOS), Weighted Activity Unit (WAU), Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG).




### Figure 4. Case Study – Long-Stay Neonatal Admission - Upper Estimate

Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA), Average Length of Stay (ALOS), Length of Stay (LOS), Weighted Activity Unit (WAU), Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG).

#### Current Admission Funding Profile Acute episode of care




#### Modelled Episode of Care Change Acute & SNAP episode of care



**Figure 5. Case Study – Long-Stay Neonatal Admission – Lower Estimate**

Independent Health and Aged Care Pricing Authority (IHACPA), Average Length of Stay (ALOS), Length of Stay (LOS), Weighted Activity Unit (WAU), Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG).

**Current Admission Funding Profile Acute episode of care**



**Modelled Episode of Care Change Acute & SNAP episode of care**




Figure 6. Long-Term Trends of SNAP-able Neonatal Admissions (2000-23)

