



Health Care ADVISORY ■

OCTOBER 13, 2014

Proposed OIG Rules Would Expand Anti-Kickback Statute Safe Harbors

On October 2, 2014, the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General (OIG) published proposed rules to add new safe harbors to the federal Anti-Kickback Statute (AKS). The OIG's proposed rules would also codify certain revisions made to the federal Civil Monetary Penalty Law ("CMP Law") by the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

Overview

The proposed rule makes a technical correction to the AKS's referral services safe harbor and also proposes five new AKS safe harbors that would protect:

- Pharmacy cost-sharing waivers for financially needy Medicare Part D participants;
- Emergency ambulance service cost-sharing waivers when the services are furnished by state- or municipality-owned providers;
- Certain remuneration between federally qualified health centers and Medicare Advantage organizations;
- Discounts by manufacturers on drugs provided under the Medicare Covered Gap Discount Program; and
- Certain free or discounted local transportation.

The OIG also proposed adding four new exceptions to the CMP Law's definition of remuneration, allowing for certain:

- Remuneration that promotes access to care while posing a low risk of harm;
- Coupons, rebates or other retailer reward programs;
- Remuneration to financially needy individuals; and
- Copayment waivers for the first prescription fill of generic drugs.

Finally, the OIG would change regulatory definitions as they apply to gainsharing arrangements under the CMP Law to narrow the statute's application.

The OIG will accept comments on these proposed changes until December 2, 2014.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

Anti-Kickback Statute

Part D Cost-Sharing Waivers by Pharmacies: The OIG would protect certain cost-sharing waivers, including pharmacy waivers for financially needy Medicare Part D participants and emergency ambulance services furnished by providers owned by states or municipalities. Cost-sharing waivers are generally not allowed under the AKS. The OIG has stated its concern that such waivers present the opportunity for abuse and overutilization of health care resources. To meet the safe harbor, pharmacies would be required to satisfy three criteria: (1) the waiver/reduction is not advertised or part of a solicitation; (2) the pharmacy does not routinely waive cost sharing; and (3) before waiving a cost-sharing obligation, the pharmacy determines in good faith that either the beneficiary has a financial need or the pharmacy fails to collect cost-sharing amounts after making a reasonable effort to do so. The OIG specifically requests comment on whether the safe harbor should be extended to all federal payors, as the current safe harbor applies only to Medicare and state health care programs.

Cost-Sharing Waivers for Emergency Ambulance Services: The proposed rule would protect cost-sharing waivers for emergency ambulance services furnished by providers owned by states or municipalities. This new safe harbor would codify the favorable advisory opinions the OIG has issued regarding these waivers in the past. Ambulance providers would be required to offer the reduction/waiver on a uniform basis, without regard to patient-specific factors. Though generally items and services provided free of charge by a government entity are not reimbursable, the OIG and CMS have confirmed that they do not interpret such a reduction/waiver to mean that the government entity is providing free services. Thus, providers would be prohibited from claiming the reduction/waiver amount as bad debt.

Federally Qualified Health Centers and Medicare Advantage Organizations: The OIG's proposed rule would protect certain remuneration between federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) and Medicare Advantage organizations. Certain remuneration between the two is already protected under an AKS statutory exception created by the MMA. The OIG's proposed rule would add a similar regulatory safe harbor, providing protection for discounts on "applicable drugs" for "applicable beneficiaries" (i.e., Medicare Part D) while they are in the Medicare coverage gap or "donut hole."

Local Transportation: The OIG would protect free or discounted local transportation provided to federal health care program beneficiaries, stating its belief that previous policies have been overly restrictive in the context of complimentary local transportation. Among other terms, the OIG is seeking comments on how to define "local." The OIG has proposed definitions based on mileage, time travelled and/or provider location, but recognizes a one-size-fits-all approach may not be appropriate. The OIG also seeks comments on what types of providers should be eligible for this safe harbor.

Technical Correction: The proposed rule would make a technical correction to the AKS's referral services safe harbor, reverting back to language finalized in the 1999 rule that was inadvertently changed in a 2002 revision. Thus, it will again be clear that the referral services safe harbor precludes protection for payments from participants to referral services that are based on the volume or value of referrals to, or business otherwise generated by, either party for the other party.

Civil Monetary Penalties Authorities

The OIG also proposed amending the CMP Law's definitions of remuneration. The ACA expanded the definition of remuneration, and the OIG seeks to codify the changes as well as establish other exceptions. The new exceptions "are intended to protect certain arrangements that offer beneficiaries incentives to engage in their wellness or treatment regimens or that improve or increase beneficiary access to care, including better care coordination." The OIG has attempted to strike a balance between these potential benefits and the potential for abuses of the exceptions that could lead to unnecessary, expensive or poor quality services being billed to Medicare or Medicaid.

Beneficiary Inducements: The OIG proposes codifying the exception to the definition of “remuneration” added by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 concerning reductions in copayment amounts for covered hospital outpatient department services.

Promotes Access to Care: The new rule would exclude certain remuneration that promotes access to care. The OIG is seeking comment on how broadly the definition of “access to care” should be interpreted. For example, the OIG has proposed crafting the definition to accommodate the growing rise of coordinated or integrated care arrangements that depend, in part, on patient engagement. The OIG also seeks comments on whether access to care should include nonclinical care that is reasonably related to the patient’s medical care. The OIG believes “giving items that are necessary to patients to record and report health data” can also promote access to care. The OIG also seeks comment on which providers should be eligible for this exception.

Retailer Rewards Program: The OIG seeks to establish an exception allowing for certain retailer rewards programs that are offered on equal terms, regardless of health insurance status. Generally, these rewards programs must consist of coupons, rebates or other rewards, including a discount on merchandise or services. While excluding individuals or entities that primarily provide services (e.g., hospitals, physicians) from the definition of “retailer,” the OIG is soliciting comments on whether entities that primarily sell items that require a prescription (e.g., medical equipment stores) should be considered retailers. The OIG also explained that the reward itself must not be conditioned on the purchase of goods or services reimbursed in whole or in part by a federal health care program, nor should a reward itself be an item or service reimbursed in whole or in part by a federal health care program.

Financially Needy Recipient: Under the proposed rule, the OIG would allow for the offer or transfer of items or services for less than fair market value after the provider has made a good faith effort to determine whether the recipient is financially needy. The OIG set forth numerous conditions, including: the protected items or services may not be offered as part of any advertisement or solicitation, there is a reasonable connection between the items or services and the medical care of the individual, and the items or services are not tied to the provision of other services reimbursed by a federal or state health care program. The OIG proposed a broad definition of “medical care” to include “the treatment and management of illness or injury and the preservation of health through services offered by the medical, dental, pharmacy, nursing, and allied health professions.” The OIG is seeking comments on whether it can (and should) identify specific conditions under which remuneration would be deemed to be “reasonably connected” to a patient’s medical care.

Waivers of Cost-Sharing for the First Fill of a Generic Drug: The OIG proposes including an exception for waivers of the cost for the first time a Medicare Part D or Medicare Advantage recipient fills a prescription for a generic drug. The OIG believes this exception could minimize drug costs for both private and federal insurers. Sponsors seeking this exception would have to register with CMS and disclose this incentive program in their benefit plan package submissions to CMS. The OIG noted that it will not exercise its enforcement authority against plans complying with the CMS requirements for these waivers prior to finalization of the proposed rule.

Gainsharing Civil Monetary Penalties

The OIG has repeatedly “recognized gainsharing can be beneficial” and has approved 16 gainsharing arrangements through advisory opinions. The OIG has expressed a desire to accommodate health care industry developments toward coordinated or integrated care arrangements and efforts by insurers to lower costs and improve care.

The gainsharing provision of the CMP Law prohibits a hospital from knowingly making a payment, directly or indirectly, to a physician as an inducement to reduce or limit services provided to Medicare or Medicaid beneficiaries who are under the direct care of the physician. Believing it could not read a “medically necessary” element in the

prohibition without a statutory change, the OIG instead narrowed its interpretation of “reduce or limit services.” The OIG states, “as hospitals move towards using objective quality metrics, we recognize that a change in practice does not necessarily constitute a limitation or reduction of services, but may in fact constitute an improvement in patient care or a reduction in cost without reducing patient care or diminishing its quality.” Note that the OIG interprets “reduce or limit services” to include payments to limit *items* used in providing services.

The OIG also proposed adding a definition of hospital and is soliciting comments on whether to include a definition of the term “reduce or limit services.” The OIG listed several other specific areas of concern for which it is soliciting comments.

If you would like to receive future *Health Care Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information to healthcare.advisory@alston.com. Be sure to put “**subscribe**” in the subject line.

If you have any questions, or would like additional information, please contact any of the following:

David S. Abernethy
202.239.3987
david.abernethy@alston.com

Robert A. Bauman
202.239.3366
bob.bauman@alston.com

Joshua L. Becker
404.881.4732
josh.becker@alston.com

Saul Ben-Meyer
212.210.9545
saul.ben-meyer@alston.com

Donna P. Bergeson
404.881.7278
donna.bergeson@alston.com

Kristine McAlister Brown
404.881.7584
kristy.brown@alston.com

Michael L. Brown
404.881.7589
mike.brown@alston.com

Cathy L. Burgess
202.239.3648
cathy.burgess@alston.com

Angela T. Burnette
404.881.7665
angie.burnette@alston.com

Jennifer L. Butler
202.239.3326
jennifer.butler@alston.com

Mark Timothy Calloway
704.444.1089
mark.calloway@alston.com

Craig Carpenito
212.210.9582
craig.carpenito@alston.com

Stacy C. Clark
404.881.7897
stacy.clark@alston.com

Patrick C. DiCarlo
404.881.4512
pat.dicarlo@alston.com

Robert J. Dole
202.654.4848
bob.dole@alston.com

Theodore B. Eichelberger
404.881.4385
ted.eichelberger@alston.com

Dan Elling
202.239.3530
dan.elling@alston.com

Sarah Ernst
404.881.4940
sarah.ernst@alston.com

Larry Gage
202.239.3614
larry.gage@alston.com

Ashley Gillihan
404.881.7390
ashley.gillihan@alston.com

David R. Godofsky, F.S.A.
202.239.3392
david.godofsky@alston.com

James A. Harvey
404.881.7328
jim.harvey@alston.com

Katherine E. Hertel
213.576.2600
kate.hertel@alston.com

John R. Hickman
404.881.7885
john.hickman@alston.com

H. Douglas Hinson
404.881.7590
doug.hinson@alston.com

Sean C. Hyatt
404.881.4410
sean.hyatt@alston.com

Bill Jordan
404.881.7850
bill.jordan@alston.com

Ted Kang
202.239.3728
edward.kang@alston.com

Peter M. Kazon
202.239.3334
peter.kazon@alston.com

David Keating
404.881.7355
david.keating@alston.com

Johann Lee
202.239.3574
johann.lee@alston.com

Blake Calvin MacKay
404.881.4982
blake.mackay@alston.com

Emily W. Mao
202.239.3374
emily.mao@alston.com

Dawnmarie R. Matlock
404.881.4253
dawnmarie.matlock@alston.com

Wade Miller
404.881.4971
wade.miller@alston.com

Steven C. Mindy
202.239.3816
steven.mindy@alston.com

William (Mitch) R. Mitchelson, Jr.
404.881.7661
mitch.mitchelson@alston.com

Michael H. Park
202.239.3630
michael.park@alston.com

Kimberly Kiefer Peretti
202.239.3720
kimberly.peretti@alston.com

Craig R. Pett
404.881.7469
craig.pett@alston.com

Earl Pomeroy
202.239.3835
earl.pomeroy@alston.com

Steven L. Pottle
404.881.7554
steve.pottle@alston.com

T.C. Spencer Pryor
404.881.7978
spence.pryor@alston.com

J. Mark Ray
404.881.7739
mark.ray@alston.com

Mark H. Rayder
202.239.3562
mark.rayder@alston.com

Jonathan G. Rose
202.239.3693
jonathan.rose@alston.com

Colin Roskey
202.239.3436
colin.roskey@alston.com

Sam Rutherford
404.881.4454
sam.rutherford@alston.com

Karen M. Sanzaro
202.239.3719
karen.sanzaro@alston.com

Marc J. Scheineson
202.239.3465
marc.scheineson@alston.com

Thomas G. Schendt
202.239.3330
thomas.schendt@alston.com

Thomas A. Scully
202.239.3459
thomas.scully@alston.com

Donald E. Segal
202.239.3449
donald.segal@alston.com

John B. Shannon
404.881.7466
john.shannon@alston.com

Dominique Shelton
213.576.1170
dominique.shelton@alston.com

Robert G. Siggins
202.239.3836
bob.siggins@alston.com

Carolyn Smith
202.239.3566
carolyn.smith@alston.com

Perry D. Smith, Jr.
404.881.4401
perry.smith@alston.com

Paula M. Stannard
202.239.3626
paula.stannard@alston.com

Michael L. Stevens
404.881.7970
mike.stevens@alston.com

Brian Stimson
404.881.4972
brian.stimson@alston.com

Robert D. Stone
404.881.7270
rob.stone@alston.com

Daniel G. Taylor
404.881.7567
dan.taylor@alston.com

Julie K. Tibbets
202.239.3444
julie.tibbets@alston.com

Timothy P. Trysla
202.239.3420
tim.trysla@alston.com

Kenneth G. Weigel
202.239.3431
ken.weigel@alston.com

Kerry T. Wenzel
404.881.4983
kerry.wenzel@alston.com

Michelle A. Williams
404.881.7594
michelle.williams@alston.com

Marilyn K. Yager
202.239.3341
marilyn.yager@alston.com

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2014

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777

BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719

CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111

DALLAS: 2828 North Harwood Street ■ 18th Floor ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899

LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213.576.1100

NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 15th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444

RESEARCH TRIANGLE: 4721 Emperor Blvd. ■ Suite 400 ■ Durham, North Carolina, USA, 27703-8580 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260

SILICON VALLEY: 1950 University Avenue ■ 5th Floor ■ East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2282 ■ 650.838.2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001

WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.756.3300 ■ Fax: 202.756.3333