

# PRICE REPORTING COMPLIANCE: BEST PRACTICES IN REPORTING MEDICAID DRUG REBATE PROGRAM AND PART B ASP DATA

November 16, 2004

Andrew Ruskin Vinson & Elkins LLP Washington, DC



# A. MMA Changes

- 1. Removes from State Medicaid programs drug coverage obligations for certain dual eligibles.
  - a. Therefore, also removes Medicaid drug rebate obligations for this population.
- 2. Expands scope of exceptions to best price.
  - a. Covered drug discount cards.
  - b. Part D prescription drug plans.
  - c. MA-PD plans.
  - d. Inpatient drugs to 340B hospitals.



#### B. Continued Congressional interest

#### 1. Nominal Pricing

- a. CMS interprets nominal price exception to apply to prices that are less than 10 percent of AMP.
- b. Congress is concerned about commercial uses of exception as a "pull-through".
- c. Compliance tip determine whether there are "strings attached" to use of nominal pricing.

#### 2. 340B

- a. Congressional concern sparked by OIG findings, such as overpayment in a single month in 2002 of \$41 million.
- b. Question of HRSA enforcement authority.



#### C. OIG Initiatives

- 1. Work Plan
  - a. Computation of AMP versus AWP.
    - 1) Includes a determination as to whether manufacturers are circumventing rebate obligations.
  - b. Computation of AMP and best price.
    - 1) Includes a question regarding consistency in interpreting retail class of trade.
  - c. Oversight of manufacturer recalculations of rebates.
  - d. Incorrect classification as a generic.



- 2. Settlements
  - a) Schering (July, 2004)
    - 1) Alleged to have purchased utilization data it did not need so that it could refund payments to Cigna and Pacificare.
    - 2) In exchange, alleged to have obtained inclusion of Claritin in formularies.
    - 3) Also charged with provision of health management services at below fmv, interest free loans in the form of "prebates", and other discounted services.
    - 4) Value of items not included in best price calculations.



- 2. Settlements (cont.)
  - b. AstraZeneca (June, 2003)
    - 1) Allegations of under-reporting rebates.
    - 2) Supposed provision of "grants", services, and free goods in exchange for purchases of Zoladex.
    - 3) Value not included in best price calculations.
  - c. Bayer and GlaxoSmithKline (April, 2003)
    - 1) Allegations of "private labeling" affixing customer's label and NDC to drug to avoid best price obligations.



- 2. Settlements (cont.)
  - d. Pfizer (October, 2002)
    - 1) Related to Warner-Lambert and Parke-Davis subsidiaries.
    - 2) Supposed provision of educational grants to an HMO to remain on formulary.
    - 3) Value not included in best price calculations.
  - e. In each case, manufacturer entered into a CIA that required review of pricing by IRO.



- 3. Compliance lessons
  - a. Safe harbors don't protect against allegations of best price violations.
  - b. Scrutinize all items of value to determine if there is any implicit "quid pro quo" involving purchase of drugs.
  - c. Services offered and services purchased should be at fair market value and serve legitimate business purposes unrelated to the sale of product.



- 3. Compliance lessons
  - d. Try to comply with OIG Compliance Program Guidance.
    - 1) For instance, separate grant-making functions from sales and marketing functions, and use objective criteria unrelated to purchases.
    - 2) Further, separate research from sales and marketing. Make sure that there is a bona fide need for the research.

# Average Sales Price Compliance



#### A. In General

- 1. New payment methodology that applies to drugs covered under Part B
  - a. Must meet certain criteria to be covered, including:
    - 1) Comport with definition of "drug or biological";
    - 2) Must not be usually self-administered; and
    - 3) Must be furnished incident to a physician's service.
  - b. Exceptions to ASP include:
    - 1) certain vaccines;
    - 2) certain infusion therapies; and
    - 3) blood and blood products.
- 2. Goes into effect for CY 2005



#### B. ASP Calculation

- 1. Measured with respect to each individual NDC code.
- 2. Divide total amount in sales for a quarter by the total number of units for that quarter.
- 3. Deduct from sales:
  - a. Discounts, including prompt pay, volume, etc.;
  - b. Free goods in exchange for purchases; and
  - c. Chargebacks and rebates.



# B. ASP Calculation (cont.)

- 4. Must use estimates when there are timing of recognition issues.
  - a. Sum all price concessions per NDC over most recent 12-month period and divide by total sales for same period.
  - b. Multiply this percentage by the total sales in quarter.
  - c. Subtract this amount from total sales for quarter, which is then divided by number of units sold in quarter.

# Vinson&Elkins

#### B. ASP Calculation (cont.)

- Example. The total price concessions over the most recent 12-month period available for a given NDC equal \$200,000. The total in dollars for the same period equals \$600,000. The price concessions percentage for this period equals .33333 (i.e., 200,000/600,000). The total in dollars for the sales subject to the average sales price reporting requirement for the quarter being reported equals \$50,000 for 10,000 units sold. The ASP price calculation for this NDC for this quarter is: \$50,000 - $(0.33333 \times \$50,000) = \$33,334$  (net total sales amount); ASP = \$3.33 (\$33,334/10,000).
- 6. Exempt from inclusion are all sales that are exempt from best price calculations.



#### C. Reporting

- 1. Must be submitted within 30 days of the close of every calendar quarter.
- 2. Must be certified by either the:
  - a. CIO;
  - b. CFO; or
  - c. Someone delegated by one of the above and reports directly to one of the above.

#### D. Penalties

- 1. CMP of \$10,000 per misrepresentation per day.
- 2. CMP of \$10,000 per day for late filing and "suspension" after 90 days.



#### E. Calculation of reimbursement amount

- 1. Sole source drugs
  - a. 106% of the ASP; or
  - b. If lower, wholesale acquisition cost (WAC).
    - l) List price for drugs reported in wholesale price guides.
- 2. Multi-source drugs
  - a. 106% of ASP of weighted average of all drugs described by same HCPCS code.



#### E. Calculation of reimbursement amount

- 3. Can be reduced if the widely available market price (WAMP) or AMP is lower by at least a threshold amount.
  - a. WAMP is the price a prudent physician or supplier would pay.
  - b. Threshold is 5% in 2005.
  - c. Determined by OIG.
  - d. Can substitute WAMP or 103% of AMP if meets criteria.



#### F. Financial modeling issues

- 1. Increase prices gradually.
- 2. Minimize range of price differentials.
- 3. Avoid getting WAMPed.

#### G. Compliance issues

- 1. OIG Workplan
  - a. Identifies that it will be monitoring ASP data, which is a statutory requirement.
- 2. Consider enforcement actions involving Medicaid drug rebates and incorporate into compliance with respect to ASP.

343077