



Payment and Coverage of High-Cost Specialty Drugs: Report from Technical Advisory Panel

Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission

Chris Park

January 29, 2021

www.macpac.gov

 [@macpacgov](https://twitter.com/macpacgov)

Overview

- Technical advisory panel meetings
 - Pipeline analysis
 - Model framework and selection
 - Stakeholder perspective
- Differential rebate for accelerated approval drugs
- New benefit for cell and gene therapies
- Next steps

Technical Advisory Panel

Meeting 1

Analyze specialty drug pipeline in order to identify specific types of drugs that may be challenging for Medicaid programs to manage.

Meeting 2

Based on the pipeline priorities, identify alternative coverage and payment models and discuss model design, potential barriers, etc.

Meeting 3

Understand the effect of each model on stakeholders. Refine policy and design of each model.

Summary of Pipeline Analysis

- Analysis of drugs in clinical trials likely to have the greatest effect on Medicaid in the next three to five years based on expected cost and patient population
- Focus on three groups of drugs
 - Cell and gene therapies
 - Drugs receiving accelerated approval
 - Specialty drugs for sensitive populations

Challenges and Potential Solutions by Drug Type

Accelerated approval drugs

Challenges

Solutions

Limited evidence

Targeted closed formulary

Differential rebate

Value-based payment

Outcomes-based contract

Increased FMAP

Cell and gene therapies

Challenges

Solutions

High upfront cost

Budget volatility

Uncertain long-term benefit

New national benefit

Risk pool

Value-based payment

Outcomes-based contract

Increased FMAP

Pay over time

Drugs for sensitive populations

Challenges

Solutions

Limited negotiating power

Targeted closed formulary

Value-based payment

Model Design Elements

- Participation – Is it mandatory? Include other payers?
- Inclusion – Which products are included?
- Price – How is net price determined?
- Supply chain – Does supply chain change?
- Duration – Would model change over time?
- Funding – How is model funded?

Differential rebate for accelerated approval drugs

Differential Rebate

- Higher rebate applied until drug gets full approval
 - Reduce Medicaid spending while there is limited evidence of clinical effectiveness
 - Create incentive for manufacturers to complete confirmatory trials
- Could increase inflationary rebate if confirmatory trial not completed after a set number of years

Differential Rebate Model Design Elements

Design Elements

Participation	Change to MDRP would include all state Medicaid programs.	Supply Chain	The drug supply chain would remain unchanged.
Inclusion Criteria	All drugs that have been approved via the FDA's accelerated approval pathway that have not yet completed confirmatory trials.	Duration	Model would be a permanent change to the MDRP. Once manufacturers complete confirmatory trials the rebate would revert to the standard amount.
Price	A higher mandatory rebate from launch through completion of confirmatory trials. This could be coupled with an increased inflationary penalty to mitigate increasing list prices.	Funding	No new funding required. Increased manufacturer rebates would reduce Medicaid spending.

Note: MDRP is Medicaid Drug Rebate Program.

Differential Rebate – Stakeholder Perspective

- Beneficiaries
 - Keep mandatory coverage of these products under MDRP
 - May lose early access to some products
- Manufacturers
 - Still have incentive to pursue accelerated approval for early access
 - Needs to weigh against the cost of the additional rebate
- Payers could get evidence from the confirmatory trials in a more timely manner
- Providers would not change prescribing patterns

New benefit for cell and gene therapies

New Benefit for Cell and Gene Therapies

- Carve-out coverage of durable cell and gene therapies from the Medicaid Drug Rebate Program (MDRP) into new benefit
 - Allows for new coverage, payment, or rebate requirements without disrupting the existing structure of the MDRP
 - Could create more flexibility in coverage requirements
- Addresses states' concerns about high up-front costs and budget volatility by:
 - increasing federal funding
 - pooling utilization nationally to increase predictability
 - consolidating purchasing power

New Benefit Design Elements

Design Elements

Participation	Mandatory for all state Medicaid programs. Could be expanded to include other payers (e.g., Medicare).	Supply Chain	Value-based payment would affect providers operating under buy-and-bill model.
Inclusion Criteria	Cell and gene therapies that are expected to have durable benefits.	Duration	Permanent change to program. Could include a mechanism so that drugs would move out of the benefit if sufficient competition becomes available.
Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard minimum rebate (separate but similar to MDRP). Negotiate outcomes-based contract. Value-based payment based on an independent assessment of product value. 	Funding	Full federal funding or increased FMAP.

Note: MDRP is Medicaid Drug Rebate Program.

New Benefit – Stakeholder Perspective

- Beneficiaries
 - Could create better access by adopting a unified approach to coverage and payment
 - Need to protect access through strong appeals process
- Manufacturers
 - Important to ensure access in Medicaid
 - Value-based assessment could be used to start negotiation but shouldn't be used as a price ceiling
- Providers
 - Could result in additional authorization requirements but probably wouldn't change decision making
 - Could disrupt revenue stream through buy-and-bill

Next Steps

- Feedback on the two model options
 - Differential rebate for accelerated approval drugs
 - New benefit for cell and gene therapies
- Whether to move forward with either model as a potential recommendation



Payment and Coverage of High-Cost Specialty Drugs: Report from Technical Advisory Panel

Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission

Chris Park

January 29, 2021

www.macpac.gov

 [@macpacgov](https://twitter.com/macpacgov)