

Submission on ACC regulated payments for treatment

Name

Patrick Peng

Email

Patrick@physioimpact.co.nz

Business or organisation name (if applicable)

Physio Impact

Position title (if applicable)

Director

Is this an individual submission or on behalf of a business or organisation?

Behalf of group or organisation

Do you have a view on the proposed 1.72 percent and 2.05 percent increases to the payments to treatment providers listed in Table 1 in the discussion document? Please provide reasons for your view.

As a Physiotherapist and small practice owner. I have often found myself deliberating over the fact that the Physiotherapy profession (profession as in, a means of earning income), is becoming less and less prolific and fruitful over time. Over the last two years our business has had to increase our co-payment for treatment multiple times to keep up with our general increase in expenses due to typical inflation. This is because our ACC payments for treatment stay the same, while, everything else increases in cost.

The majority of our patients are ACC patients. This is overall putting a strain on our patient's ability to pay for Physiotherapy co-payments.

We are a country privileged to have free public health care and Accident compensation, however, because of this privilege, the general public and government ministries have a tendency to undervalue us as health care professionals. This is something that we Physiotherapists, in private practice, know all too well. The classic example...

"Oh my goodness, I feel so much better, thank you! Oh I have to pay for that half hour session? I thought ACC covered it all?"

"Yeah they did, about 10 years ago."

Since then the increases in payments for Physiotherapy services have been minimal and infrequent.

In summary, I agree with an increase in ACC regulated co-payments. I understand how there has been an additional .95% buffer due to the change in time frames of review, however, I don't think the proposed increases, values the Physiotherapy profession appropriately and progressively, over time.

“If I do a job in 30 minutes, it’s because I spent 10 years learning how to do that in 30 minutes. You owe me for the years, not the minutes.”

Do you have a view on the proposal to split out classes of Specified Treatment Providers into the separate classes shown in Table 1 in the discussion document, so payment rates can be differentiated in the future? Please provide reasons for your view.

Agreed. Different professions study for different periods of time, have varying amounts of knowledge on specific treatments, spend different amounts of time on patients and have vastly different mechanical, emotional and mental stresses. Make’s sense to have different classes of treatment providers. Harder for us to judge this without a more intimate knowledge on other treatment providers though.

Do you have a view on the proposed 2.05 percent increase to the payments to Audiologists listed in Table 2 in the discussion document? Please provide reasons for your view.

Do you have a view on removing all provisions that require deductions from regulated dental payments? Please provide reasons for your view.

Do you have any overall comments that you would like to make on the review or recommendations?

Date submitted

9/12/2019 13:47