


March 7, 2024

Themes from Expert Roundtable on Physician-administered Drugs

Chris Park



Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission

 @macpacgov
www.macpac.gov

Overview

- Background
 - Medicaid Drug Rebate Program (MDRP)
 - Policy differences between pharmacy and physician-administered drugs
- Roundtable themes
- Potential strategies
- Next steps



The background features a dark blue gradient with several overlapping, semi-transparent shapes in lighter shades of blue and white. These shapes include a large white circle on the left, a vertical white bar in the center, and various blue and white curved and rectangular forms that create a layered, geometric effect.

Background

Medicaid Drug Rebate Program (MDRP)

- Drug manufacturers must provide rebates in order for their products to be recognized for federal Medicaid match
- States must generally cover a participating manufacturer's products but may limit use (e.g., prior authorization, preferred drug list (PDL))
- Drugs included in MDRP are known as covered outpatient drugs
 - Generally a drug that can only be dispensed with a prescription, has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and manufacturer has a Medicaid rebate agreement

Statutory Rebates

- Based on average manufacturer's price (AMP)
- Single source and innovator, multiple source (e.g., brand drugs)
 - Basic rebate calculated as the greater of (a) 23.1 percent of AMP¹ or (b) AMP minus best price
 - Additional inflationary rebate
 - Line extension alternative rebate
- Non-innovator, multiple source (e.g., generic drugs)
 - Basic rebate is 13 percent of AMP
 - Additional inflationary rebate

¹ 17.1 percent of AMP for certain blood clotting factor drugs or drugs that are exclusively pediatric indications

Supplemental Rebates

- States can negotiate supplemental rebates with drug manufacturers in addition to the federal rebates
- Manufacturers pay these rebates to ensure that their products get placed on a state's PDL or have fewer restrictions on use
- Managed care organizations (MCOs) can negotiate their own rebates with manufacturers similar to state supplemental rebates

340B Program

- 340B program provides substantial discounts to specified safety-net providers (e.g., federally qualified health centers (FQHCs))
- Creates a ceiling on the maximum price manufacturers can charge these covered entities
 - Ceiling price calculated by subtracting Medicaid federal rebate amount from AMP
- Although the 340B program sits outside of Medicaid, it interacts with Medicaid rebate and payment policy
 - Drugs for Medicaid enrollees purchased under the 340B program are not eligible for federal rebates
 - Medicaid pays providers for drugs purchased through the 340B program and dispensed to Medicaid beneficiaries

Physician-administered Drugs (PAD)

- A drug typically administered by a health care provider in a physician's office or other clinical setting and generally covered through the medical benefit
- PADs (other than vaccines) may be included in the MDRP, depending on payment method
 - If a state bills and pays for the drug as a part of a bundled service within certain settings (e.g., a clinic visit or hospital stay), then it cannot claim the statutory rebate
 - If a state makes a direct payment for the drug separately from the other services, it can claim the statutory rebate
 - May 2023 proposed rule would change the definition so that a drug included in a bundled payment for a service could be considered a covered outpatient drug if the drug and its itemized cost are identified separately on the claim

Medicaid Drug Payment

Pharmacy

- Claim based on NDC code
- Ingredient cost and dispensing fee
- Fee for service (FFS) payment regulation requires ingredient cost payment at actual acquisition cost (AAC)
 - 340B providers at 340B ceiling price

PAD (medical benefit)

- Claim based on billing code (e.g., HCPCS or DRG)
- Cost of drug and administration fee
- No specific FFS payment regulations; states often pay a mark-up over acquisition cost
 - States can pay 340B providers similar to non-340B providers, including mark-up

Notes: NDC is National Drug Code. HCPCS is Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System. DRG is diagnosis related group.

Coverage for Dually Eligible Beneficiaries

Pharmacy

- Medicare Part D
- Medicaid does not pay for Part D drugs or any associated cost sharing

PAD (medical benefit)

- Medicare Part A or B
- Medicaid may pay premiums and cost sharing (20 percent in Part B)
- Medicaid can claim MDRP statutory rebate when paying cost sharing



Roundtable Themes

Expert Roundtable

- Milliman convened roundtable to discuss challenges associated with PADs and strategies to address them
 - Panel included federal and state officials, drug payment experts, Medicaid MCOs, drug manufacturers, beneficiary advocates, and providers
- Key themes
 - Tension between paying the mark-up on drug cost and overall payment adequacy
 - Challenges in utilization management under medical benefit
 - Provider role in managing spending
 - Administrative burden of value-based arrangements (VBA)
 - High-cost and limited access to cell and gene therapies

Drug Mark-up and Payment Adequacy

- Appropriate mark-up
 - Not all states pay a mark-up. There were a couple of state examples where they paid for PADs through pharmacy benefit at acquisition cost
 - Mark-up should reflect upfront risk posed for purchasing high-cost drugs, but the typical mark-up (e.g., 6 percent) could be excessive for very high-cost drugs
 - Providers rely on drug mark-up to subsidize costs not covered by the administration fee
- Drug payment could be tiered to limit mark-up on higher cost drugs
 - Administration fees need to be adjusted to account for difference in service intensity and costs across different treatments
- Manufacturer could consider a higher rebate so long as the additional amount was passed along to provider in form of higher payment

Drug Mark-up and Payment Adequacy, cont.

- Payment to 340B providers at 340B ceiling price could lower spending
 - Concern that 340B providers need the spread (difference between payment and 340B price) to provide charity care and community benefits
 - State example of paying a mark-up over the 340B ceiling price but limiting it to \$600
 - Different payment tiers based on amount of charity care and community benefit provided
- Bundled payments often do not adequately cover drug costs, particularly for cell and gene therapies
 - Delay in updating DRGs to account for cost of new therapies
 - Payment outside of bundle is more likely to be at acquisition cost
- State not eligible for MDRP rebate if paid in a bundle

Challenges in PAD Utilization Management

- Greater challenges managing PADs under the medical benefit
 - Prior authorization processes are not as robust under the medical benefit and may be managed separately from pharmacy benefit
 - States do not always have staff and capacity to develop robust clinical guidelines for complex therapies
- Better integration between clinical teams under medical and pharmacy benefits would be beneficial
 - Some states are working towards integration, but it takes time and resources
- Split between medical and pharmacy benefit is confusing under a drug carve-out of managed care
- Concern over prior authorization turnaround time for PADs
 - PADs are more complex and require more information to get approval
 - Need for more standardization across FFS and managed care

Provider Role in Managing Spending

- Providers should have an active role in managing spending
 - Challenging because provider does not know the net cost after rebates
 - State could assign a cost ranking (e.g., 1 to 4 dollar signs) to indicate relative net cost
- Payment structures based on net cost tiers
 - Lower net cost drug would have a higher mark-up
- Shared savings with providers in which provider gets a bonus for using the most cost-effective drugs
- Concern about making cost a primary factor in provider prescribing decisions
 - Need a standardized and robust medical exceptions process, particularly for conditions that require more personalized treatment

Administrative Burden with VBAs

- VBAs and outcomes-based contracts (OBCs) are challenging to develop and administer
- Generally easier to enter into these arrangements with state Medicaid programs rather than MCOs
 - One agreement covers entire population and doesn't trigger best price concerns
- Administrative barriers include:
 - Burden and lack of resources to support outcomes tracking and reporting
 - Uncertainty on who bears responsibility for monitoring and tracking outcomes between state, MCOs, manufacturers, and providers
 - Lack of negotiating power under the MDRP

Cost of and Access to Cell and Gene Therapies

- Cell and gene therapies have extremely high-cost and access only at a small number of qualified treatment centers (QTC)
- Additional operational challenges because a QTC may not be in the state
 - Need for out-of-state provider agreements
 - Additional services such as transportation
- Provider administering cell or gene therapy may be different than the provider performing follow-up care
- Therapy cost and payment structures limit ability to use different providers
 - Current outpatient administration fees are not sufficient to cover risk of such specialized treatment
 - Smaller providers don't have upfront capital to purchase cell and gene therapies
 - Bundled payment may not sufficiently cover cost of therapy and discourage some providers from seeking QTC status

Potential Strategies

- Reduce mark-up on drug and increase payment on administration fee and other services
 - Could tier payment to providers based on drug characteristics (e.g., higher relative mark-up on drugs with lower net cost)
 - Could tie payment to 340B providers to amount of charity care and community benefit provided
 - Could implement payment incentives (e.g., shared savings) to encourage use of lower net cost products
- Remove high-cost drugs (e.g., cell and gene therapies) from bundled payment arrangements
- Unify prior authorization across pharmacy and medical benefits

Next Steps

- Staff can draft an issue brief highlighting the variety of challenges of PADs and potential payment and utilization management strategies
 - Strategies identified by the participants are all activities states could pursue under current authority
- Commissioner feedback on the findings of the roundtable and if there is additional work you would like to pursue in this area


March 7, 2024

Themes from Expert Roundtable on Physician-administered Drugs

Chris Park



Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission

 @macpacgov
www.macpac.gov