

Medicare Essential: Medicare Reform for the 21st Century

Karen Davis

Eugene and Mildred Lipitz Professor Director, Roger C. Lipitz Center for Integrated Health Care Department of Health Policy and Management Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health kadavis@jhsph.edu

> Alliance for Health Reform briefing "Medicare for the 21st Century" Briefing June 3, 2013 Washington D.C.

Current Medicare Core Benefit – Fragmented and Complex

- Beneficiaries buy 3 policies Medicare, Medigap, Part D; complex, confusing, opportunities for risk selection
- · High administrative costs
- Barrier to more integrated design with incentives to seek high-value care, primary care teams and accountable care networks
- Rationale for reform:
 - Savings opportunities for beneficiaries and payers while continuing to ensure access and financial protection for beneficiaries
 - Medicare can be a major force for payment and delivery system reform to improve outcomes, quality, and lower costs
 - Improve return on investment in health care, while freeing up resources for other societal priorities



Medicare Essential: A New Option to Enhance Value

- 1. Single plan with comprehensive benefits, one premium, and lower administrative costs (replaces Part A, Part B, Part D, and supplemental coverage); default option beginning in 2014; Medicare Advantage and traditional Medicare continue; Medi-Gap minimum \$250 deductible
- Comprehensive benefits with reduced and rationalized cost-sharing; single deductible (\$250) for hospital, physician, and other A/B services; \$20/\$40/\$50 copayment for primary care, specialty care, ED use; limit on patient costs (\$3400)
- 3. Single Rx formulary and pharmaceutical benefits manager negotiating drug prices; lower cost-sharing for generic and essential medications
- 4. Provider payment reform blended/bundled/global provider payment options with value based-purchasing, shared savings
- 5. Reduced beneficiary cost-sharing for selecting high-value patientcentered medical homes and health systems.



Estimated Total Monthly Out-of-Pocket Costs for a Typical Medicare Beneficiary with Medicare Essential (Using Standard Providers and Using High-Value Providers), Compared with Traditional Medicare with Medigap and Part D, 2014

Estimated Monthly Expense	(1) Current Law: Medicare Plus Medigap Plan F Plus Part D	(2) Medicare Essential (Standard Providers)	(3) Net Difference [(2) – (1)]	(4) Medicare Essential (High-Value Providers)	(5) Net Difference [(4) – (1)]
Out-of-Pocket Costs for Medicare Cov	vered Services:				
Medical Care (Parts A and B)	\$0	\$80	\$80	\$40	\$40
Prescription Drug (Part D)	\$48	\$36	-\$12	\$8	-\$40
Premiums:					
Part B	\$127	\$127	\$0	\$127	\$0
Part D	\$35	\$0	-\$35	\$0	-\$35
Medigap Plan F	\$217	\$0	-\$217	\$0	-\$217
Medicare Essential	\$0	\$111	\$111	\$79	\$79
Monthly Cost: Premiums plus Out-of-Pocket	\$427	\$354	-\$73	\$254	-\$173



Notes: Estimates reflect full implementation of Medicare Essential in 2014.

Source: Estimates provided by Actuarial Research Corporation based on ARC Medicare micro-model.

Changes In Health Expenditures with Medicare Essential Compared To Projected Spending, By Payer Source, \$ Billions

	2014-2018	2014-2023
National Health Expenditures	-\$12.9	-\$179.9
Federal Government	32.6	0.0
State and Local Government	-8.1	-27.0
Private Employers	-27.1	-89.9
Households/Beneficiaries	-10.3	-63.1

Notes: Projected spending under current law assumes replacement of sustainable growth rate formula with freeze of Medicare physician fees throughout the ten-year period. Assumes increased participation in Medicare Essential over time compared to traditional Medicare, with 90% of those in Medicare core program selecting the option by the end of the decade. Share of Ma Advantage enrollment is assumed unchanged.

Source: Estimates provided to authors by Actuarial Research Corporation based on ARC Medicare micro-model.

Conclusion and Discussion

- · Potential to simplify and lower costs for beneficiaries
- · Lower administrative costs and complexity
- Better financial protection for beneficiaries
- Creates incentives for beneficiaries to choose lower-cost, higher quality care

- Supports spread of care system innovation

- · Potential to reduce retiree-benefit costs for employers
- New choice to compete on level playing field with Medicare Advantage plans
- · Inefficient Medigap plans likely to decline overtime



Thank you!



Co-author: Cathy Schoen, Senior Vice President for Research and Evaluation, The Commonwealth Fund, cs@cmwf.org



Kristof Stremikis, Senior Researcher, The Commonwealth Fund, ks@cmwf.org



Co-author: Stu Guterman, Vice President and Executive Director, Commission on a High Performance Health System The Commonwealth Fund, sxg@cmwf.org



Graduate Assistant Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health echang@jhsph.edu

