**NCPA’s Targeted Analysis and Questions for Members**

**Regarding the Proposed Rebate Rule**

On February 6, 2019, The Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General (“HHS” and “OIG”) published a proposed rule titled, *Fraud and Abuse; Removal of Safe Harbor Protection for Rebates Involving Prescription Pharmaceuticals and Creation of New Safe Harbor Protection for Certain Point-of-Sale Reductions in Price on Prescription Pharmaceuticals and Certain Pharmacy Benefit Manager Service Fees* (the “Proposed Rebate Rule”).[[1]](#footnote-1) The Proposed Rebate Rule seeks to exclude rebates paid by manufacturers to plans under Medicare Part D and Medicaid MCOs from the discount safe harbor[[2]](#footnote-2) and creates a new safe harbor for point-of-sale price reductions from manufacturers to plans.[[3]](#footnote-3) By moving manufacturer rebates to the point of sale, this proposal intends to reduce list prices and lower patients’ out-of-pocket drug costs.[[4]](#footnote-4)

This proposal, however, will have far-reaching implications on the entire supply chain, including how and when pharmacies are reimbursed for dispensing product under the Medicare Part D and Medicaid managed care programs. Thus, NCPA has prepared this summary to outline the Proposed Rebate Rule.

Changing the pharmacy payment model is a top priority of NCPA and the Proposed Rebate Rule is an important component of changing the model. To this end, NCPA is analyzing the proposal and working with members and industry partners on our response to HHS.

***What are the main points of the proposal?***

The Anti-Kickback Statute (“AKS”) provides for criminal penalties for those who knowingly and willfully offer, pay, solicit, or receive remuneration to induce or reward the referral of business reimbursable under any federal healthcare program.[[5]](#footnote-5) Pursuant to legal authority, Congress and HHS have designated certain safe harbors for activities that might otherwise violate the AKS. The rebates currently paid by manufacturers to plans under Medicare Part D and Medicaid MCOs is a practice that falls under what is known as the discount safe harbor.[[6]](#footnote-6)

This Proposed Rebate Rule seeks to end the safe harbor protections for rebates paid by manufacturers to PBMs but would create a new safe harbor that would allow manufacturers to offer discounts to Part D plans and Medicaid MCOs in exchange for formulary placement so long as those discounts are applied at the point of sale. Once applied, these point-of-sale reductions would effectively base a patient’s out-of-pocket payments on the “net price” of a drug (the proposal states “net price” is industry jargon to mean the difference between the list price of a drug and the rebate amount).[[7]](#footnote-7) This net price becomes the benchmark for patients’ out-of-pocket spending as well as pharmacy reimbursement. Then, a pharmacy’s reimbursement would be subject to certain chargebacks from the manufacturer to the pharmacy, either directly or indirectly, to make the pharmacy whole.

Thus, under the new safe harbor a manufacturer can offer a reduction in price on a prescription pharmaceutical product to a Part D sponsor, Medicaid MCO, or PBM only if the following conditions are met[[8]](#footnote-8):

1. The reduction in price would have to be set in advance with the plan sponsor under Medicare Part D, a Medicaid MCO, or a PBM.
2. The reduction in price could not involve a rebate unless the full value of the reduction in price is provided to the dispensing pharmacy through a chargeback or series of chargebacks. A chargeback is a payment made directly or indirectly by a manufacturer to a dispensing pharmacy so that the total payment the pharmacy receives for the prescription pharmaceutical product is at least equal to the price agreed upon in writing between the Part D sponsor, the Medicaid MCO, or a PBM acting under contract with either, and the manufacturer of the prescription pharmaceutical product.

Example: When a pharmacy dispenses a drug to a beneficiary that is reimbursed by a particular Part D plan or Medicaid MCO, the total payment to the pharmacy will be at least equal to the price agreed upon between the manufacturer for that drug and the Part D plan of Medicaid MCO, or a PBM acting under contract with either.

1. The reduction in price must be completely reflected in the price the pharmacy charges to the beneficiary at the point of sale.

Example: If the discounted rate is set in advance, at the time of dispensing the pharmacy would have the necessary information to appropriately charge a beneficiary who owes coinsurance, even if the manufacturer ultimately tenders the dispensing pharmacy a payment through a chargeback to reflect this negotiated price with the payor.

***If this proposal is finalized, when would the changes go into effect?***

The Proposed Rebate Rule states the proposal to end the safe harbor for rebates will go into effect as early as January 1, 2020. The creation of the new safe harbor for point-of-sale price reductions is slated to go into place 60 days after the publication of the final rule.[[9]](#footnote-9)

***Questions for the independent community pharmacy industry to consider:***

Below are a number of questions that are important for the independent community pharmacy industry to answer. NCPA seeks input on these questions by March 1, 2019.[[10]](#footnote-10) Please submit answers to NCPA’s Policy and Regulatory team at ronna.hauser@ncpanet.org .

* **Chargebacks**: Under this proposal, it appears that a pharmacy could still purchase product based on the WAC price, the benchmark used in the supply chain for most acquisition costs. Under this proposal, the pharmacy could be reimbursed initially on the payor side via the net price, which may not cover the pharmacy’s acquisition cost. However, under this scenario a pharmacy should be made whole for acquisition cost by submitting a chargeback to the manufacturer either directly or indirectly through their wholesaler or chargeback administrator (the chargeback would be patient and plan specific). The force of this chargeback is to ensure that the total payment to the pharmacy will be at least equal to the price agreed upon between the manufacturer for that drug and the Part D plan of Medicaid MCO, or a PBM acting under contract with either.[[11]](#footnote-11)
  + What is your experience with chargebacks under the current pharmacy payment system?
  + Do you have any concerns with timing and cashflow under this proposed chargeback system?
  + Are there systems in place at the wholesale, PBM, and pharmacy level to help assist in this chargeback model? Specifically, are there current ways to get the patient and plan specific information to the pharmacy at the point of sale as contemplated under this proposal?
  + Would such a chargeback system provide too much claims level data to manufacturers about your pharmacy? Is this any different than today’s relationship with manufacturers?
  + Would wholesalers and/or PBMs have too much access to your claims level data under this proposal? Are there ways to thwart the oversharing of this information with business partners?
  + Do you currently have systems or processes in place to challenge a manufacturer or wholesaler for not receiving certain chargebacks? Are there entities or processes that audit a manufacturer or wholesaler for providing accurate chargebacks?
* **The net price:** The proposal closely tracks NCPA’s recent policy suggestion to CMS to include all pharmacy price concessions in the negotiated price at the point of sale in the Medicare Part D program. The Proposed Rebate Rule, however, proposes to pass through all manufacturer “rebates” to the patient at the point of sale. Thus, the patient’s cost-share at the pharmacy counter will be based on the net price of a drug (that is, the manufacturers reduction in price that is negotiated up front with the Part D sponsor or Medicaid MCO). Thus, the lower the net price, the lower the patient’s cost-sharing. Pharmacies may also be reimbursed up front based on the net price with the pharmacy being made whole for the rest of their total costs based on a chargeback or series of chargebacks at a later date.
  + Are there alternatives that HHS should consider to this proposal to base cost-sharing and payment off the net price?
  + Are there additions to this proposal that HHS should consider to ensure that pharmacies receive an adequate reimbursement up front?
  + What other factors are your contract reimbursements with PBMs based upon today? Does your net revenue typically increase as WAC increases?
  + Should HHS consider implementing a professional dispensing fee much like the dispensing fees set in Medicaid fee-for-service?
* **Wholesaler rebates**: The proposal states that OIG “intends for the discount safe harbor to continue to protect discounts on prescription pharmaceutical products offered to other entities, including but not limited to, wholesalers, hospitals, physicians, pharmacies, and third-party payors in other Federal health care programs.”[[12]](#footnote-12) The OIG also states that it seeks comment on whether this proposal hinders other types of discounts (including volume or prompt pay discounts to wholesalers) that are currently permissible discounts under the discount safe harbor.
  + Would you support this proposed chargeback system if the new system made it unlikely for you to receive rebates from your wholesale distributors in the same manner as today?
  + Does the chargeback system in the Proposed Rebate Rule complicate your rebates from wholesalers for product dispensed for different payers in commercial and federal programs?
* **Timing**:
  + What are your thoughts on having this system operating 60 days after the finalization of the Proposed Rebate Rule?
  + Would this system be able to be operating by January 1, 2020?
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