



ADAP Advocacy Association
PO Box 15275
Washington, DC 20003

adapadvocacyassociation.org

Board of Directors:

Co-Chair
William E. Arnold
Washington, D.C.

Co-Chair
Philip A. Haddad, M.D.
Shreveport, LA

Secretary/Treasurer
Michelle Anderson
Dallas, TX

Elmer Cerano
Lansing, MI

Glen Pietrandoni R.Ph.
Deerfield, IL

Eric Flowers
Oakland, CA

Darryl Fore
Cleveland, OH

Joey Wynn
Fort Lauderdale, FL

Robert Suttle
New York, NY

Wanda Brendle-Moss
Winston-Salem, NC

Janine Brignola
Omaha, NE

Chrys Thorsen
Los Angeles, CA

CEO
Brandon M. Macsata
Washington, D.C.

Directors Emeritus:
Rani Whitfield, MD
Gary Rose
John D. Kemp, Esq.
Joyce Turner Keller

March 21, 2016

The Honorable Sylvia Mathews Burwell Secretary
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. Andy Slavitt Acting Administrator
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services
Room 445-G, Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

RE: Medicare Part B Drug Payment Model

Dear Secretary Burwell and Acting Administrator Slavitt:

On behalf of the ADAP Advocacy Association and its board of directors, we are writing to express our strong concern with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services' (CMS) notice on the Medicare Part B Drug Payment Model released in early February. We believe that this type of initiative, implemented without sufficient stakeholder input, will adversely affect the care and treatment of Medicare patients with complex conditions, such as cancer, macular degeneration, hypertension, rheumatoid arthritis, and primary immunodeficiency diseases. We therefore respectfully request that you not proceed with the Medicare Part B payment initiative.

Medicare beneficiaries – representing some of the nation's oldest and sickest patients – must often try multiple prescription drugs and/or biologics before finding the appropriate treatment for their complex conditions. These patients need immediate access to the right medication, which is already complicated by the fact that treatment decisions may change on a frequent basis. These vulnerable Medicare patients and the providers who care for them already face significant complexities in their care and treatment options, and they should not face mandatory participation in an initiative that may force them to switch from their most appropriate treatment.

A Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation (CMMI) initiative that focuses on costs rather than patients and health care quality, implemented based on zip codes or similar units rather than the unique challenges of patients, as envisioned in the CMS-posted contractor instructions, is misguided and ill-considered. Medicare beneficiaries with life-threatening and/or disabling conditions would be forced to navigate a CMS initiative that could potentially lead to an abrupt halt in their treatment. This is not the right way to manage the Medicare program for its beneficiaries.

RE: Medicare Part B Drug Payment Model

March 21, 2016

Page Two

As CMS contemplates payment and delivery system reforms, there is a critical need for transparent, comprehensive communications with stakeholders throughout the process. We were deeply disappointed that CMS only provided a limited opportunity for stakeholder input before recently implementing a mandatory model for Medicare beneficiaries undergoing hip and knee replacement surgeries. In doing so, the agency largely failed to consider stakeholder concerns that the initiative could negatively affect the care provided to vulnerable patients. We strongly oppose any effort to rush through a similar initiative that may adversely impact patients' access to life-saving and life-changing Medicare Part B covered drugs.

We believe these types of initiatives should be initially implemented in a targeted, patient-centered and transparent way that accounts for the unique needs of Medicare beneficiaries. In fact, CMMI is statutorily required to ensure that its initiatives target "deficits in care," and can only expand the scope and duration of a model after careful assessment of the model's impact on quality of care, patient access, and spending. We are very concerned, therefore, that CMS plans to implement an initiative that would immediately impact a range of Part B providers and would be applied to "most Part B drugs." Furthermore, given the success of the current Part B reimbursement methodology in ensuring patient access to the most appropriate treatments, it is unclear what "deficits in care" CMS is attempting to address in this initiative.

CMS expressed concern in its contractor notice that the 6% ASP add-on payment may "encourage the use of more expensive products because the add-on to the drug's cost is a percentage of the sales price." This assumption fails to take into account the fact that providers' prescribing decisions depend on a variety of factors, including clinical characteristics and the complex needs of the Medicare population. Most importantly, there is no evidence indicating that the payment changes contemplated by the model will improve quality of care, and may adversely impact those patients that lose access to their most appropriate treatments. In fact, data suggests that the current Part B drug payment system has been both cost effective and successful in ensuring patient access to their most appropriate treatment, as Part B expenditures remain relatively stable¹ and Part B drugs account for just 3% of total program costs.²

Finally, CMS must recognize that the Budget Control Act cut Medicare reimbursement for physician-administered drugs, further impacting some providers' ability to purchase drugs at the current payment rate. It is imperative CMS understands and evaluates this current reimbursement rate and its outcome while engaging multiple stakeholders before implementing any demonstration that would further reduce reimbursement rates. In closing, we urge you to ensure that our nation's oldest and sickest patients continue to be able to access their most appropriate drugs and services. We therefore ask that you permanently withdraw the Part B Drug Payment Model from consideration.

Sincerely,

Brandon M. Macsata
CEO