

### More effective healthcare spending through measuring outcomes

Nathalie Moll, Director General, EFPIA





Healthcare systems across Europe are facing unprecedented challenges, driven by an ageing population and an increased prevalence of chronic disease





### Projected increase in public expenditure in healthcare due to demographic change (2013-2060) (% of GDP)

Population ageing creates sustainability challenge for EU health systems



NOTE: FOR THE EU, NMS (NEW MEMBER STATES) AND THE EA (EURO AREA) THE AVERAGE ARE WEIGHTED ACCORDING TO GDP.



EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2015). THE AGING REPORT.

### Relationship between healthcare expenditure and overall health status show potential to increase value for money

Health Life Expectancy at Birth





### **Outcomes vary widely across** countries





1. DEEP VEIN THROMBOSIS 2. ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION



### Variation of heart failure outcomes across European countries

### > 3x variation in death during first HF admission



Death during first admission, %

### **3x variation in 12 week** mortality rate for HF



12 week mortality rate, %

### >4x variation in 12 week readmission rate for HF



<sup>12</sup> week readmission rate, %

NOTE: THE SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED DURING 2000–2001 IN 115 HOSPITALS FROM 24 COUNTRIES BELONGING TO THE EUROPEAN SOCIETY OF CARDIOLOGY. A TOTAL OF 46,788 DEATHS AND DISCHARGES WERE SCREENED FROM WHICH 11,327 (24%) PATIENTS WERE ENROLLED WITH SUSPECTED OR CONFIRMED HEART FAILURE. THE STUDY EENSURED QUALITY OF DATA FOR COMPARABILITY THROUGH DIFFERENT MEASURES: CLUSTERS OF HOSPITALS WERE FORMED THAT GENERALLY INCLUDED ONE UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL AND ONE OR MORE COMPARABLE, LARGE SAMPLE OF OBTAIN A MORE REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF HOSPITAL DEATHS AND DISCHARGES, CASES HAD TO FULFILL FOUR CRITERIA TO BE MORE COMPARABLE, LARGE SAMPLE SIZES PROVIDE SUBSTANTIAL PROTECTION FROM RANDOM ERROR



SOURCE: THE EUROHEART FAILURE SURVEY PROGRAMME, EUROPEAN HEART JOURNAL (2003) 24, 442-463

### Large variations also within countries

### Premature mortality<sup>1</sup> 2008-2010 due to HF compared to French national average



### Risk factors alone can't explain the variation

Regional distribution of risk factors can explain part of the variation in mortality

 Age, income level, diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidemia, obesity, tobacco, alcohol, etc.

The report also mentions differences in offer and quality of care as contributors to mortality variation



1. BEFORE 65

### Huge practice variation between OECD countries

#### Rates of knee replacement vary hugely across OECD health systems. Is this justified?



#### ... asking the people who have had the operation is the way to find out.

Source: Trends in knee replacement surgery, 2000-2014, selected countries; OECD Health Statistics, 2016

### How do you identify the best clinical practice?

### Elderly people prescribed long-term benzodiazepines or related drugs 2013 (or latest year)

Elderly people prescribed long-acting benzodiazepines or related drugs 2013 (or latest year)







### Most comparative data on "proxy outcomes"...



8.3. Diabetes hospital admission in adults, 2008 and 2013 (or nearest years)

Note: Three-year average for Iceland and Luxembourg. Source: OECD Health Statistics 2015, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/health-data-en.

StatLink man http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933281111



### ...or very broad (mortality, survival et.c.)

#### 8.33. Colorectal cancer mortality, 2003 to 2013 (or nearest years)



\* Three-year average. Source: OECD Health Statistics 2015, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/health-data-en.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933281219



Information on data for Israel: http://oe cd/israel.disclaimer

### Reduced pain in legs after surgery for spinal stenosis





### Estimated 20 – 40 % waste in health systems

- According to a WHO report from 2010, on average 27% of healthcare expenditure is wasted
- There are several sources of waste, but **half** of the total waste is estimated to be due to **practice variation** and use of low-value interventions
- A recent OECD report concludes that around one fifth of healthcare expenditure could be channeled towards better use



### 4 key sources of waste have been characterized, 3 of which could be addressed through outcomes focus

		Description	Example		
	1 Overtreatment	Care routed in outdated habits, ignoring scientific findings, motivated by something other than optimal care, etc.	<ul> <li>Knee replacement rate ~2x OECD</li> <li>29 average and large variation</li> <li>across regions</li> <li>~1% of HC costs in overuse of CT</li> <li>and MRI scans</li> </ul>	D T es (e.g. Could be addressed through outcomes focus	
Practice variation	Failures of care delivery and coordination	Poor execution or lack of best practices, e.g. effective preventive care or patient safety, fragmented and disjointed care, low volume for specific treatments per hospital, etc.	Lower prevention care in diabetes resulting in more complications (e.g. amputations)		
			<ul> <li>Higher cumulative revision rate for primary hip arthroplasty for surgeons with lower caseload</li> <li>\$40B readmissions costs</li> </ul>		
3 Pricing incer	s, payment and ntives failures	Payments and incentives not rewarding valuable interventions, variation in pricing of services with equivalent outcomes	<ul> <li>Some payment mechanisms leading to higher complication rates</li> <li>&gt;200% differences in CABG<sup>1</sup> prices for same payer and state</li> </ul>		
4 Administrative complexity		Waste created by inefficient or flawed rules and overly bureaucratic procedures across stakeholders			

efpta

# Practice variation found in all countries and diseases and has been extensively described

### in literature

Currently most publically available practice variation data are related to surgical procedures. However, available data on chronic diseases and end-of-life suggest high PV for those diseases as well.

Regional practice variation



NOTE: WHERE POSSIBLE, APPROPRIATE CASE MIX ADJUSTMENT HAS BEEN PERFORMED. 10TH AND 90TH PERCENTILES ARE IN SOME EXAMPLES BASED ON PROXY (BY REMOVING TOP/LOWEST 10% REGIONS)

1. THE HCI INDEX COMBINES THE NUMBER OF DAYS PATIENTS SPENT IN THE HOSPITAL AND THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF INPATIENT PHYSICIAN VISITS DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS OF LIFE. 2 RATES WERE ADJUSTED FOR AGE, RACE, AND SEX USING THE U.S. MEDICARE POPULATION AS THE STANDARD 3. CTS STANDS FOR CARPAL TUNNEL SYNDROME SOURCE: DARTHMOUTHATLAS.ORG; VEKTIS REPORT "PRAKTIJKVARIATIERAPPORT 7 ELECTIEVE ZORG AANDOENINGEN APRIL 2014"; NHS CCG TOOLS; OECD HEALTH WORKING PAPERS, NO. 61

### 5 key elements have been identified in models that have proved successful at increasing HC value

### **Description of the component**

Contrib. to value

efpi

1	Identify target population (e.g. disease groups)	<ul> <li>Focus on disease groups and other relevant population sub-segments</li> <li>Identify patients based on their healthcare needs, behaviors, etc. to prevent and manage illness, rather than simply treat disease</li> </ul>		Identify patients with common needs and highest costs
2	Define target outcomes	<ul> <li>Define target outcomes to improve care and reduce costs</li> <li>That matter to patients and clinicians, balanced along full cycle of care - prevention and cure, comparable, linked to population</li> </ul>		Identify which health outcomes are needed for a healthy population
4	Measure and learn from variation	<ul> <li>easure and learn from variation</li> <li>Monitor outcomes and learn from variation to improve</li> <li>Establish registries, inter-operable data systems across providers, real-time measuring, transparency of outcomes, etc.</li> </ul>		Improve to achieve target outcomes at minimum cost
	Define treatment pathway with coordinated delivery	<ul> <li>Define treatment pathway around the patient vs. provider, enabling coordinated delivery across all stakeholders</li> <li>New models need to be based on the patient along the care chain, vs. single procedure or single episode of care</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Whole-person focus</li> <li>also reduce waste from coordination</li> </ul>
	Align payments and incentives	<ul> <li>Ensure reimbursement models enable value focus including outcomes along full cycle of care</li> <li>Payments aligned to providers' collective performance against target outcomes, instead of promoting price and volume. Ensure incentive design does not promote unwanted behaviors (e.g. hiding bad results)</li> <li>Gradual transfer of risk to providers</li> </ul>		Align stakeholders to achieve previous goals

### Geisinger ProvenCare CABG<sup>1</sup> bundle scheme led to reduced mortality and complications at lower costs



### Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) program is based on clinical guidelines and measurement

Geisinger launched ProvenCare as a collaborative approach to treat different diseases and treatments, including CABG surgery since 2006

A package price for elective CABG was developed, including

- preoperative evaluation
- all hospital and professional fees
- all routine post-discharge care (e.g. smoking cessation counseling, cardiac rehab)
- all follow-up care and rehospitalizations for any related postop. complication occurring within 90 days of surgery

Development of actionable ProvenCare processes based on clinical guidelines and close measurement of clinical outcomes through EHR

• From screening a patient for the risk of stroke before surgery, to making sure the patient has started on a daily aspirin regime upon discharge

### Proven positive effect on costs, mortality and complications

#### **Reduced complications**

**Reduced mortality** 



# In-hospital mortality (%)

#### **Reduced readmissions**



#### **Reduced costs**

- 4.8% reduction in cost per CABG case
- Health plan paid 28-36% less for CABG with Geisinger vs. other providers
- Hospital's contribution margin increased by 17.6%
- Total inpatient profit per case improved \$1,946



1. CORONARY ARTERY BYPASS GRAFT

SOURCE: "PROVENCARESM": A PROVIDER-DRIVEN PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE PROGRAM FOR ACUTE EPISODIC CARDIAC SURGICAL CARE, ANN SURG 2007; GEISINGER HEALTH SYSTEM, SUCCESSFUL CASE STUDIES IN ACCOUNTABLE CARE, ACO OCT 2010; PRESS ARTICLES

### Gesundes Kinzigtal (GK) has reduced mortality by 53% while reducing costs

### Gesundes Kinzigtal (GK) targets programs for chronic conditions

Since 2006, GK has been contractually accountable for the whole health care service budget for ~50% of the 69k inhabitants of the region

 GK cooperates with ~100 providers and has agreements with pharmacies, health clubs, etc.

GK's care and preventive programs target common chronic diseases

- Identification of patients at risk
- Individual treatment plan and goal-settings agreements
- Patient self-management and shared decision making
- Coordinated follow-up care through jointly developed care pathways, synchronization of medications across formularies, etc.
- System-wide electronic health records, incl. access for patients
- Insurers share the savings generated vs. usual cost for people associated with GK<sup>1</sup>

### GK has conducted several evaluations with external research institutions

### Proven positive effect on costs, mortality and patient experience

#### Positive patient and provider experience



#### **Reduced mortality**

Patients who

enrolled (after 2.5 yrs)

Mortality rate (%)

Patients who

didn't enroll



Margin per person increased by €151 for the GK population

 compared to nonenrolled



1. INSURERS GET ALLOCATED A FUND BASED ON GOVERNMENT RISK STRUCTURE COMPENSATION MECHANISMS DEPENDING ON THE PEOPLE THEY COVE

### Cataract registry findings allowed Sweden to lower PE rates by 80% - avoiding blindness for 500 patients



### Background

- National Cataract Registry established in 1992
- Postoperative endophthalmitis (PE) is a severe inflammation – risks leading to blindness
- Active work on identification and implementation of best practice to avoid PE done by the registry







### Transparency of outcomes variations also driver of quality improvement through competition



RIKS-HIA Quality Index<sup>1</sup> – a measurement of best practice adoption in ACS treatment





### ...and leads to decreased variation when low performers catch up with high performers

RIKS-HIA Quality Index<sup>1</sup> – a measurement of best practice adoption in ACS treatment



1. THE QUALITY INDEX FROM RIKS-HIA MEASURES SWEDISH HOSPITALS ADHERENCE TO NATIONAL GUIDELINES (BEST PRACTICE) REGARDING ACUTE CORONARY SYNDROME (ACS). THE INDEX IS BASED ON NINE DIFFERENT PROCESS METRICS WHICH ARE DESCRIBED IN THE APPENDIX. 2. DATA ON INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL PERFORMANCE WAS FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE 2006 RIKS-HIA ANNUAL REPORT. FROM 2006 ONWARDS THE PUBLIC AND THE MEDIA COULD EASILY ACCESS THE DATA AND COMPARE INDIVIDUAL HOSPITAL PERFORMANCE. SOURCE: RIKS – HIA ANNUAL REPORTS 2005 – 2009, BCG ANALYSIS



### Paying for Outcomes – a way to ensure value for money

- More flexible, value and outcomes-focused models would offer a greater reward for those technologies that deliver most value.
- Rewards would be tied to specific results achieved, not merely the amount of treatments (e.g. pills) sold.
- Tying incentives and payment to outcomes is not just appropriate for some medicines and therapy areas but for healthcare systems as a whole.



### Industry vision on payment for outcomes A Roadmap for change

- 1. Alignment on a **sustainable framework of value** that reflects the opportunity for outcomes based payment models
- 2. Resolution of disincentives created by price referencing through the evolution of outcomes-based pricing models on a European wide basis
- 3. Develop and implement **national scale outcomes data** capture mechanisms that can support outcomes based pricing models, with proof of concept pilots already underway
- 4. Agreed approach to horizon scanning systematically implemented at country level providing health planners with 5-year forward visibility of emerging technologies and implications for pricing and budgeting
- 5. Robust case studies of outcomes based pricing models, operating at scale across European markets, showing how prices can change over time depending on the value delivered



### Outcomes-based payments for medicines are already in place, but is still the exception

- Both in Europe and the US, there are "Managed Entry Agreements" for introducing innovative medicines where the pricing & reimbursement is related to health outcomes
- In Italy, registries run by the national agency AIFA monitor the introduction of many new medicines, and rebates are triggered for non-responders
- In Germany, Novartis concluded an agreement on Aclasta, a treatment for osteoporosis, where there is a refund if the patient suffers from a fracture within 1 year from treatment
- However, the total number of outcomes-based agreements is still small compared to pure financial deals

And we could not have positive outcomes if we didn't have the therapies in the first place.



### Since 1990s, +1,100 new medicines for European patients, radically improving their lives<sup>[EVA]</sup>

**Overview of recent, life-changing medicines** 

HIV

85%

drop in the number of HIV deaths since its peak in 1995 in Europe and the US<sup>[WHO]</sup>

### Multiple sclerosis Before 🖉 After

"The whole week leading up to my infusion is very rough: a lot of my regular symptoms are slightly increased: intense burning pain in my legs, leg weakness, spasms, very bad fatigue, etc."<sup>[GAR]</sup>

"A day or two after that, I feel the best I ever feel. My head becomes clear, I remember more, I can walk and stand longer too. I still have issues, but overall I feel considerably better."<sup>[GAR]</sup>

### Cancer

21% decline in cancer mortality rate since its peak in 1991 in Europe<sup>[WHO]</sup>

83% of cancer survival gains are attributable to new treatments<sup>[SUN]</sup>

### **Hepatitis C**

90% cure rate for treated patients with 8-12 weeks of treatment<sup>[PHR][HEP]</sup>

+133% increase in cure rate for European patients[PHR][HEP]

RA patients receiving new biologics have the ability to remain in employment 31 weeks longer and earn €26,000 more than patients on conventional therapy<sup>[HAL]</sup>

QoL=quality of life; HIV=human immunodeficiency virus; Source: [EVA] Evaluate Pharma database (accessed 2017); [WHO] WHO Mortality Database Garlit. 'The Before and After of a Tysabri Infusion' (2016); [SUN] Sun et al. (2008); [HEP] PhRMA. '25 years of progress against hepatitis C' (2014); [PHR] PhRMA 'Biopharmaceutical research industry profile' (2015); [HAL] Halpern et al. (2009)



### IP provisions work side-by-side to enable pharmaceutical and biotech companies to continue innovating

### Application of IP incentives[EFP]



### IP have been designed to ensure the competitiveness of European countries for innovation

etpīa 26

EU=European Union; IP=intellectual property; RDP=regulatory data protection; SPC=supplementary protection certificate Source: [EFP] EFPIA, IP incentives messaging guide

### EU IP incentives and rewards encourage ongoing research into areas of unmet need

### Overview of European IP incentives<sup>[EFP]</sup>

commercial use

Patent<sup>[REU]</sup>

(1474)

**Supplementary** 

Protection

Certificate (1992)

**Regulatory Data** 

**Protection** 

Orphan

Designation

(2000)

**Paediatric** 

Extension

(2007)

### Euro. pharma. & biotech patent grants<sup>[WIP]</sup>



### "[SPC] aims to guarantee laboratories working to develop new medicinal products a level of protection equal to that enjoyed by R&D in other sectors."[EUR]

EU=European Union; IP=intellectual property; Source: [EFP] EFPIA. IP incentives messaging guide; [EUR] European Commission. Proposal for a Co Regulation concerning the creation of a supplementary protection certification for medicinal products (1990); [WIP] WIPO statistics database (accessed 2017); [REU] Reuters, Six significant moments in patent history, 2014



### **Orphan incentives & paediatric rewards** key to foster successful innovation in previously underserved areas



Case study: orphan medicines **Biopharmaceutical orphan medicine R&D** expenditure in the EU (€, millions)[OHE]



Cumulative orphan designations granted by the EMA (pre-1997-2017)[CRA]





### Since the creation of relevant IP provisions, 220 new orphan-related SMEs were created (from 32 initially), and 68 paediatric-related SMEs (from 21 initially)[SME]

EMA=European Medicines Agency; EU=European Union; OD=orphan designation; PE=paediatric regulation; R&D=research and development; SME=Shall and medium-Sized enterprise Source: [OHE] Office of Health Economics (2010): [CRA] CRA. An evaluation of the broader economic and societal impact on Orphan medicine regulation (2017); [EMA] EMA. '10 year report to the EC'; [SME] Charles River Associates analysis of EMA SME Register (2017)

### Lack of incentives and/or access to data could be key barriers to outcomes-based models

### POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS



**DESIGN REQUIREMENTS** 

therapies



### Muchas gracias y preguntas?





### Lack of access to data is key barrier to outcomes-based models

### POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS



**DESIGN REQUIREMENTS** 

therapies

SOURCE: DESK RESEARCH; INTERVIEWS WITH STAKEHOLDERS; BCG ANALYSIS

### Multiple data sources in the healthcare system necessary to get full information on practice variation, costs and health outcomes

#### **DATA SOURCES**

#### **TYPICAL 'OWNERS' AND EXAMPLES**

etp

Clinical trials	Randomized studies to determine efficacy and safety	Trials run by Academic Medical Centers, Biopharma companies	AstraZeneca V NOVARTIS
Disease registry	Repositories of data around explicitly-defined disease-specific measures	Maintained by academic research centers, specialty societies, regional and national database owners	The Society of Thoracic Surgeons
EMR	IT systems capturing data at point of care	Operated by providers and systems vendors	
Claims	Aggregated claims/ administrative datasets	Collected by private and government payers	
Modalities + service providers	Laboratory, pharmacy, and imaging datasets	Owned by providers or diagnostics companies	Quest Diagnostics
Patient sources	Patient communities / Patient-generated data	Collected by providers, start-up companies, and IT vendors	patientslikeme HealthVault

### **EFPIA is working through IMI to develop tools to utilise data better in different disease areas**

### "BD4BO"

Goal: Support the evolution towards outcomes-focused and sustainable healthcare systems, exploiting the opportunities offered by big and deep data sources





### **Current model for utilising data**



### **Pooled model**





## EHDN: €28m, 12 Pharmas, EU partners, 5 years, 100m Patients' Data

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE FULL PROJECT**



catalogue

#### **Harmonisation SMEs**

- Interactions with EHDN consortium
- Receives certification and training (if needed)
- Implementation of harmonisation to the OMOP CDM



### **RESEARCH & INNOVATION**

#### Participant Portal

Healthcare data are very fragmented. Even data within one healthcare centre are typically spread across different repositories. Across entities, different standards are used to code diagnosis, lab results, drugs or procedures. In most healthcare systems, a majority of the core clinical data is buried in unstructured (text) notes, making data analysis even more challenging.

The EHDN will provide a harmonised model to address the structural heterogeneity and the use of different coding standards, expediting efficiencies in the research process

Besides the technical heterogeneity amongst data sources, a similar diversity in governance processes to perform studies using data collected by healthcare providers, can be seen.

The EHDN will specifically seek to provide a pragmatic governance framework that can be used to accommodate cross-centre studies, within the confines of societal parameters that manage data use in the EU.

#### Scope:

The first goal of the EHDN is to 'reduce to practice' the approaches pioneered in these earlier research projects and develop a standard methodology.

The second goal of EHDN is to help mature both the supply side and the demand side of this 'health data eco-system' in compliance with robust privacy and ethics governance.

The third goal of EHDN is to stimulate development of new and augmented health services through available and expanded technologies, in the interest of health outcomes.

#### Expected Impact:

The EHDN project aims to improve Europe's (technical) capabilities to undertake systematic health outcomes research at an unprecedented scale across the entire region..

The aim of the EHDN is to not just create a network of data providers that are making data available, but also to facilitate further research that will allow these data providers to gain additional value while working towards a value based outcome mandate.

Data providers should find it easier to also participate in other future research studies.

This project should therefore also result in an increased use of outcomes based models in actual healthcare delivery and regulatory/HTA decision making

### What will the data network deliver?

An operational network of hospital and other quality data sets covering up to 20% of the EU population or approx. 100 million persons in support of existing and new BD4BO and other health outcome related initiatives;

Enable inclusion of novel data types and use of the data by new stakeholder groups;

Define and clarify value proposition for data providers including an agreed strategy that will maximise the number of data providers that are willing to put data into the EHDN;



DDN

20%

of the EU

populatio



Disease specific BD4BO projects will have resource and capability to enable access to the multiple data repositories that these projects identify, including guidance on mapping to the common data model.





### European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations





Leopold Plaza Building \* Rue du Trône 108 B-1050 Brussels \* Belgium Tel: + 32 (0)2 626 25 55 www.efpia.eu \* info@efpia.eu





