



SENATE BILL 257: Medication Cost Transparency Act.

This Bill Analysis reflects the contents of the bill as it was presented in committee.

2021-2022 General Assembly

Committee:	Senate Finance. If favorable, re-refer to Rules and Operations of the Senate	Date:	May 24, 2021
Introduced by:	Sens. Perry, Britt, Johnson	Prepared by:	Jason Moran-Bates Staff Attorney
Analysis of:	Second Edition		

OVERVIEW: Senate Bill 257 would require pharmacy benefits managers (PBMs) to be licensed. It would add to the consumer protections in G.S. 58-56A-3, restrict PBMs from prohibiting pharmacies from taking certain actions, and establish rules for claim overpayments and PBM networks. It would also increase the Commissioner's ability to take enforcement action against PBMs.

BILL ANALYSIS:

Section 1.(a) would recodify G.S. 58-56A-10 as G.S. 58-56A-30.

Section 1.(b) would make several changes, including the addition of new sections, to Article 56A.

- **G.S. 58-56A-1. Definitions**, an existing section, would add new definitions for "340B contract pharmacy," "340B covered entity," "claim," "claims processing service," "maximum allowable cost list," "out-of-pocket costs," "pharmacy services administration organization," "pharmacist services," and "pharmacy benefits manager affiliate." The existing definition of "health benefit plan" would be referenced to a different statute, but the State Health Plan would remain excluded from the definition.
- **G.S. 58-56A-2. Licensure**, a new section, would prohibit PBMs from operating without a license. The initial application fee would be \$2,000, and annual renewal fees would be \$1,500. Applicants would have to provide corporate and financial documents to the Department of Insurance as part of the application process. This section would also establish procedures for the Department to deny license applications.
- **G.S. 58-56A-3. Consumer protections**, an existing section, would be amended to extend its current consumer protection provisions. Under the new language, PBMs could not prohibit pharmacies from charging a shipping and handling fee for mailed prescriptions, as long as the insured is notified about the fee.
- **G.S. 58-56A-4 Pharmacy and pharmacist protections**, an existing section, would be extensively amended. It would:
 - Prohibit PBMs from charging fees not on the remittance form or agreed to in advance by then pharmacy.
 - Allow pharmacists to refuse to fill prescriptions if they believed the prescription was not in the patient's best interest, or if there were a question about the validity of the prescription.

Jeffrey Hudson
Director



Legislative Analysis
Division
919-733-2578

Senate Bill 257

Page 2

- PBMs would be prohibited from preventing pharmacies from dispensing any drug, including specialty drugs, and from retaliating against pharmacies.
- Retroactive denials or reductions of paid claims would be prohibited in most circumstances.
- PBMs would retain the right to recover overpayments.
- **G.S. 58-56A-5. Maximum allowable cost price**, an existing section, would be amended to prohibit PBMs from including dispensing fees in the maximum allowable cost price. PBMs would also be required to establish a procedure for pharmacies to appeal PBMs' reimbursement decisions.
- **G.S. 58-56A-15. Pharmacy benefits manager networks**, a new section, would create new rules for PBM networks.
 - All network pharmacies must be able to participate on the same terms, without benefit differentials.
 - Pharmacies that are members of pharmacy service administration organizations that enter into contracts with PBMs would be entitled to receive a copy of the contract provisions applicable to the pharmacy.
 - Payments due a pharmacy must be paid even if the pharmacy is terminated from the network.
- **G.S. 58-56A-20. Pharmacy benefits manager affiliate disclosure; sharing of data**, a new section, would prevent PBMs from sharing information in a manner that violated HIPAA.
- **G.S. 58-56A-25. Enforcement**, a new section, would allow the Commissioner to examine the affairs of any PBM. The Commissioner could retain the professionals necessary to conduct the exam, and PBMs would bear the cost of the examinations. None of the information disclosed during the examination would be a public record under Chapter 132. Violations of Article 56A would be subject to penalties, including revocation of licensure.
- **G.S. 58-56A-30. Civil Penalties for violations; administrative procedure**, an existing section, would be amended to allow the Commissioner to petition a court to compel a PBM to pay restitution to (i) pharmacies harmed by the PBM's violation of Article 56A or (ii) the Department of Insurance.
- **G.S. 58-56A-45. Rules**, a new section, would give the Commission the power to adopt rules necessary to implement the provisions of Article 56A.
- **G.S. 58-56A-50. Contracts with 340B covered entities**, a new section, would prohibit contracts between PBMs and 340B entities and their contracted pharmacies from conditioning reimbursement, fees, chargebacks, or other adjustments on the entities' participation in the 340B drug discount program. PBMs would not be allowed to discriminate against 304B entities or their contracted pharmacies in any way that interferes with the right of individuals to use in-network pharmacies of their choice. The pharmacy of choice provisions of G.S. 58-51-37 would apply to PBMs with respect to 340B entities.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill would make conforming changes to G.S. 58-2-40 (the powers of the Commissioner of Insurance) and G.S. 58-56-2 (third party administrator definitions), respectively.

Senate Bill 257

Page 3

EFFECTIVE DATE: The bill would be effective October 1, 2021, and apply to contracts entered into, renewed, or amended on or after that date.

BACKGROUND: The 340B drug discount program requires drug manufacturers to enter into a pricing agreement for certain drugs with the federal Department of Health and Human Resources in exchange for Medicaid and Medicare Part B covering those drugs. The agreements establish front end discounts on outpatient drugs purchased by healthcare providers listed in the federal statute.

**Amy Darden, Staff Attorney, substantially contributed to this summary.*