

# Patient & Provider Concerns With IPI Model

In October 2018, the Administration released an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) regarding a potential International Pricing Index (IPI) Model for Part B drugs. Patient, provider and healthcare stakeholder groups have voiced strong concerns with several aspects of the mandatory IPI Model under consideration, which many have warned would disrupt patient care and restrict physician and patient access to needed drugs and therapies.



## **AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY CANCER ACTION NETWORK**

“We believe that the Model as written could actually make it harder for cancer patients, especially those living in rural areas, to find the right provider to treat their cancer with the right drug. We cannot sacrifice this patient access for program savings that may or may not materialize, based on price-setting processes that no American citizen can control,” said Christopher W. Hansen, President of the ACS CAN.



## **THE ARTHRITIS FOUNDATION**

“The Arthritis Foundation believes the IPI model’s projected benefits are outweighed by potential negative impacts on patient access. We are not confident that patients will have access to needed treatment for rheumatic diseases under the model,” said Anna Hyde, Vice President, Advocacy and Access, the Arthritis Foundation.



## **PART B ACCESS FOR SENIORS AND PHYSICIANS (ASP) COALITION**

“The model would restrict access in the short-term, and reduce incentives for medical advancement in the long-term, ultimately posing serious risks to vulnerable Medicare beneficiaries,” in a letter signed by 339 patient and provider stakeholder groups.



## **THE US ONCOLOGY NETWORK**

“The IPI model lacks a patient-centered focus and could result in disparate care for beneficiaries being treated in geographic areas subject to the model... the IPI model would be forced on cancer patients with no notice or explanation of the extensive change to their care delivery,” said Dr. Michael Seiden, President of The US Oncology Network.



## **COMMUNITY ONCOLOGY ALLIANCE**

“We are greatly concerned that the IPI Model, which would conduct nothing short of a mandatory national experiment on Medicare Part B beneficiaries, could disrupt access to the innovative therapies and care that vulnerable seniors with cancer and other serious diseases need and are guaranteed under Medicare.”



### **AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY**

“ASCO strongly opposes a mandatory demonstration program. Because oncology practices vary significantly with respect to patient and payer mix, the proposed model will not be viable for all oncology practices.”



### **ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY CANCER CENTERS**

“ACCC is concerned that the IPI Model framework does little to adequately address the cost of cancer care. The IPI Model risks reducing overall reimbursement to cancer care providers while increasing their administrative burdens by inserting another middleman between providers and manufacturers,” said Thomas A. Gallo, President of the ACCC.



### **AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION**

“The AMA does not support a large-scale, mandatory implementation of this demonstration program, given the potential of unintended and adverse consequences for patients.”



### **AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RHEUMATOLOGY**

“We believe practices could be negatively impacted if they are subjected to a mandatory demonstration which will make it more difficult for physicians and other healthcare providers, particularly those in small practices and rural settings, to administer Part B medications in their communities, creating a dire patient access issue,” said Dr. Paula Marchetta, President of the American College of Rheumatology.



### **AMERICAN ACADEMY OF NEUROLOGY**

“Any true demonstration project should be voluntary, small scale, and centered on the quality and value of medical care provided to patients. This mandatory, wide reaching proposal does seem to not fit the typical definition of a pilot program. The AAN is concerned that this program lacks the evidentiary support that would be needed to justify such a wide launch,” said Dr. Ralph L. Sacco, President, American Academy of Neurology.



### **ALLIANCE OF SPECIALTY MEDICINE**

“We are concerned about the demo as currently conceptualized because we fear it would lead to increased complexity in Part B drug acquisition and shift costs to physicians in Part B. Further, we are concerned about procedural shortcomings in the form of mandatory physician participation...,” stated the Alliance of Specialty Medicine.

**STOP IPI FROM RESTRICTING ACCESS  
TO NEEDED DRUGS & THERAPIES**