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This article is the fifth in a series on DMEPOS compliance issues by Foley & Lardner LLP published in Compliance Today.

In the September 2011 issue of Compliance Today, the authors discussed the HIPAA implications for DMEPOS supplier marketing arrangements and provided a sample marketing authorization form as a supplier tool. This month, the authors discuss hospital-DMEPOS supplier arrangements under the Anti-kickback Statute.

Subsequent articles will discuss strategies for DMEPOS promotions and arrangements with manufacturers and DMEPOS reimbursement compliance.

Most owners and operators by now recognize that durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) suppliers are a frequent target of government enforcement actions. One segment of the DMEPOS industry—the provision of DMEPOS items to hospital patients—has also received the attention of federal regulators. Indeed, the US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Office of Inspector General (OIG) considers arrangements under which DMEPOS suppliers have opportunities to access hospital patients as susceptible to problematic marketing schemes.1 Given the increasing level of government interest in DMEPOS compliance, DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals should take care to structure their arrangements in a manner to comply with these fraud and abuse laws.

DMEPOS suppliers use a variety of structures to collaborate with hospitals to deliver items to hospital patients. This article provides an overview of three models used by DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals, along with the compliance concerns for the parties attendant to those arrangements. The models are:

- DMEPOS suppliers operating as hospital affiliates;
- Independent DMEPOS suppliers that provide items to hospitals for inpatient use; and
- Independent DMEPOS suppliers that provide items to patients through convenience or consignment closets at hospitals.

By understanding how to implement these models in accordance with existing laws, DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals can explore new opportunities to deliver quality care to patients.

Overview of applicable laws

The primary federal fraud and abuse laws implicated by these arrangements include the Anti-kickback Statute (AKS) and the Civil Monetary Penalties Law (CMPL). Of course, DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals must comply with other applicable federal and state health care laws and regulations as well.

The AKS prohibits any person from knowingly and willfully
paying, offering, soliciting, or receiving any remuneration, directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, in cash or in kind, in exchange for or to induce the referral of any item or service covered by a federal health care program, or in exchange for arranging for or recommending purchasing, leasing, or ordering any good, facility, service or item covered by a federal health care program, including Medicare and Medicaid. A violation is punishable by a $25,000 fine or imprisonment, may subject a violator to civil monetary penalties, and is grounds for exclusion from participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. There are various statutory and regulatory exceptions and safe harbors to the AKS available to protect certain arrangements. Violations of the AKS may also trigger a violation of the False Claims Act, which can result in substantial monetary penalties.

The CMPL prohibits any person from offering or giving remuneration to any individual eligible for benefits under Medicare or Medicaid whom that person knows or should know is likely to influence such individual to order or receive from a particular provider, practitioner, or supplier any item or service for which payment may be made, in whole or in part, under Medicare or Medicaid. Violation of the CMPL is punishable by a $10,000 penalty per item or service, treble damages, and potential exclusion from Medicare. Similar to the AKS, there are several exceptions to the CMPL that, if met, can protect the arrangement.

**DMEPOS suppliers as hospital affiliates**

One arrangement DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals use is for a hospital to create its own DMEPOS company as a subsidiary or affiliate. This is often achieved by creating a separate corporate entity whose stock is owned by the hospital or the hospital’s parent company, or by creating a limited liability company in which the hospital is a sole member, or by creating a non-profit affiliate of which the hospital is the sole corporate member. In some cases, a hospital may joint venture with a third party, such as an existing DMEPOS company, to create the affiliated entity. Under that structure, the subsidiary DMEPOS supplier hires its own employees to operate the DMEPOS business or leases the employees (as well as certain administrative services) from the hospital. The subsidiary entity then enrolls in Medicare Part B and obtains its own National Provider Identifier (NPI) number. Although some states exempt hospitals from licensure, even if the supplier is a division, subsidiary, or affiliate of the licensed hospital.

**Compliance concerns and potential safeguards**

The advantage to hospitals of the DMEPOS subsidiary structure is that it allows the hospital to direct its charity care policy and provides an increased amount of control over the DMEPOS supplier’s operations and an opportunity to participate in the revenue. Given the alignment of the hospital’s and supplier’s financial incentives, the parties must be sure to structure the arrangement in a manner that complies with state and federal fraud and abuse laws. Although the AKS does not apply to divisions within a company, OIG has in the past contended that the statute does apply to affiliates that are separate corporate entities. Many health care law practitioners would conclude that a wholly-owned subsidiary is at low risk for an AKS violation in this scenario. However, hospitals can look to certain safeguards commonly employed by hospital discharge planners when referring patients to DMEPOS suppliers.

Overall, the hospital should not engage in conduct—whether through the discharge planning process or otherwise—that could be viewed as improperly
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steering patients to the affiliated DMEPOS supplier in return for unpermitted financial gain. For example, hospitals could consider providing patients with a list of alternate DMEPOS suppliers available to provide the necessary items for patients, and not to require that the hospital’s patients only use the hospital-affiliated DMEPOS supplier. Safeguards such as these were viewed favorably by OIG in Advisory Opinion No. 02-04, which involved a consignment closet arrangement between a DMEPOS supplier and a hospital. As additional safeguards, the hospital might consider disclosing to patients its ownership of the DMEPOS supplier and avoiding any improper contact between the DMEPOS supplier’s personnel and the hospital’s patients before the patients select the DMEPOS supplier.

Hospitals that joint venture with third parties to create a DMEPOS affiliate should attempt to structure the joint venture to comply with the AKS safe harbor for small entity investments. To qualify for the small entity investment safe harbor, no more than 40% of the value of the investment interests may be held by an investor that is a referral source, nor may more than 40% of the entity’s gross revenue related to the furnishing of health care items and services in the previous fiscal year or previous 12-month period come from referrals or business otherwise generated from investors. In other words, if a hospital (which is a potential referral source to the DMEPOS supplier) owns 40% or more of the joint venture, or if 40% or more of the revenues of the DMEPOS supplier are attributable to referrals from the hospital owner, the DMEPOS supplier joint venture will not qualify for safe harbor treatment. Because many of the referrals to a hospital-affiliated DMEPOS supplier will typically come from the hospital, and the hospital will likely want to own at least 40% of the joint venture, many DMEPOS joint ventures cannot be structured to meet every element of the small entity safe harbor.

Those joint ventures that do not fit within a safe harbor should take care to comply with the OIG’s published guidance regarding joint ventures, such as its 1989 Special Fraud Alert on Joint Venture Arrangements. Among other things, the OIG guidance emphasizes that the parties’ ownership interests in the joint venture should reflect their capital contributions, and that investors should not be targeted or rewarded based on referrals. In the context of a DMEPOS supplier joint venture, the non-hospital joint venture may not allow the hospital to own a higher percentage of the joint venture simply because the hospital may be in a position to generate business for the DMEPOS supplier through its existing patient base. OIG also cautions against certain “shell” joint ventures in which one joint venture partner owns the majority of the DMEPOS items and capital equipment and provides all of the day-to-day management of the DMEPOS supplier, and teams with the other entity as a joint venture partner simply because of the other entity’s referral base.

**DMEPOS suppliers that provide items to hospital patients**

Many independent DMEPOS suppliers have arrangements with hospitals where the supplier provides DMEPOS items to the hospital’s patients. In this scenario, there is no ownership of the DMEPOS supplier by the hospital, but rather a contractual relationship between the parties under which the DMEPOS supplier provides items to the hospital for inpatient use. The hospital directly pays the DMEPOS supplier and then the hospital bills for the item. In this respect, the DMEPOS supplier is acting more like a vendor of items for the hospital’s use; the DMEPOS supplier does not bill Medicare for the items.

The contract between the parties typically includes, among other provisions:
Representations and warranties regarding the DMEPOS supplier’s compliance with Medicare Supplier Standards and all other relevant federal and state laws;

- A requirement that the DMEPOS supplier not bill the patient, Medicare, Medicaid, and/or any other third party payor for the items; and

- A description of the items covered by the agreement.

Compliance concerns and potential safeguards

Under this arrangement, the primary concern would be compliance with the AKS’s regulatory discount safe harbor or the statutory discount exception, if the items are sold to the hospital with any sort of discount. Not only does the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) require the hospital to accurately report all such discounts, compliance with the discount safe harbor is important, because a sale of DMEPOS items at below market value, by itself, could be considered an inducement to buy the items or could also be considered an inducement for the hospital to direct its discharge planners to refer patients to that particular DMEPOS supplier.

In order for the regulatory discount safe harbor to apply to a buyer who submits cost reports, the following requirements must be met:

- The buyer is an entity which reports its costs on a cost report required by the DHHS or a state Medicaid program;

- The discount must be earned based on purchases of that same good or service bought within a single fiscal year of the buyer;

- The buyer must claim the benefit of the discount in the fiscal year in which the discount is earned or the following year;

- The buyer must fully and accurately report the discount in the applicable cost report;

- The buyer must provide, upon request by the Secretary of the DHHS or a state agency, a copy of the discount disclosure information the seller is required to provide the buyer; and

- The seller must fully and accurately report such discount on the invoice, coupon, or statement submitted to the buyer; inform the buyer of its obligations to report such discount and to provide information upon request; and refrain from doing anything that would impede the buyer from meeting its obligations.\textsuperscript{10}

Not all contractual arrangements with discounts qualify for the regulatory discount safe harbor. However, such arrangements may meet the statutory discount exception to the AKS.\textsuperscript{11} The statutory discount exception protects “a discount or other reduction in price obtained by a provider of services or other entity under a Federal health care program if the reduction in price is properly disclosed and appropriately reflected in the costs claimed or charges made by the provider or entity under a Federal health care program.”

Generally, it is easier to meet the statutory discount exception than the regulatory discount safe harbor. The statutory discount exception does not require all the specific procedures and provisions in the discount safe harbor. Unlike the discount safe harbor, the statutory exemption simply requires that the discount be “properly disclosed and appropriately reflected in the costs claimed or charges made by the provider or entity under a Federal health care program.” The statutory discount exception reflects Congress’ intent to encourage price competition that benefits the federal health care programs.

In addition, the DMEPOS supplier should be careful not to provide any items of value to the hospital’s patients or the hospital employees that may influence the selection of a DMEPOS supplier. The CMPL imposes a $10,000 fine per item or service (plus treble damages and potential exclusion from Medicare) for...
payments made in violation of the law’s patient inducement prohibition. Thus, gifts and other items of value provided by the DMEPOS supplier to patients or referral sources are problematic under the CMPL, if they are likely to influence the selection of a DMEPOS supplier. Note, there is an exception to this prohibition for non-cash items of nominal value, which has been interpreted as $10 per item per patient, and no more than $50 in the aggregate annually per patient.12

**DMEPOS supplier convenience and consignment closet arrangements**

A third model used by DMEPOS suppliers and hospitals is to store items on-site at hospitals for use by the hospital’s patients. This model is used at physician offices as well.13 These arrangements are referred to as convenience or consignment closets. Under this model, the hospital and its patients enjoy the benefit of immediate access to the items. Under the convenience closet model, the DMEPOS supplier retains title to the items and is the entity that bills the patients or payors for the items. Under the consignment closet model, the hospital bills the patients or payors for the items and then makes payment to the DMEPOS supplier. Under both models, the parties typically enter into a written agreement under which the hospital agrees to provide space for the DMEPOS supplier’s items, and the DMEPOS supplier agrees to sell to those patients who request the items. Under some arrangements, the DMEPOS supplier pays rent to the hospital for the use of the closet space.

**Compliance concerns and potential safeguards**

A primary concern with convenience or consignment closet arrangements is compliance with the AKS. Although OIG has issued Advisory Opinions in which it approved certain consignment closet arrangements, it has also identified a number of risk areas that should be addressed when structuring consignment closet arrangements.14 Key to the analysis of convenience or consignment closets is understanding the flow of the remuneration between the parties. Specifically, remuneration from a hospital to a DMEPOS supplier (e.g., use of hospital desks and telephones by the DMEPOS supplier) is likely not problematic, because the remuneration and referrals flow in the same direction (i.e., there is no remuneration from the DMEPOS supplier to the hospital in exchange for hospital referrals).15 In contrast, OIG views with greater suspicion payments made by a DMEPOS supplier to a hospital in connection with a consignment closet arrangement, noting that “[i]n general, payments for rent for of consignment closets in physicians’ offices are suspect.”16

To the extent a convenience or consignment closet arrangement does involve rental payments by the DMEPOS supplier to the hospital, the arrangement should be at fair market value and structured to comply with the space lease safe harbor and the OIG guidance in the February 2000 Special Fraud Alert. Of course, payment of fair market value rent, under a written lease for a term of one year of more is a requirement for meeting the space lease safe harbor. Ironically, then, attempting to meet the safe harbor appears to place these arrangements under greater OIG scrutiny, because remuneration (in the form of fair market value rent, but remuneration nonetheless) is flowing from the DMEPOS supplier to the hospital landlord.

CMS has also addressed convenience and consignment closet arrangements and flirted with guidance that would have limited many common features of consignment closets (at least those used in physician offices). In August 2009, CMS issued a change request to the Medicare Program Integrity Manual that would have permitted such closets only where the following requirements are met:

- Title to the item transfers to the physician at the time the item is furnished to the beneficiary;
The item is billed by the physician using his or her own DMEPOS billing number;

■ Fitting or other services related to the item are performed by individuals associated with the physician and not by the DMEPOS supplier; and

■ Beneficiaries are instructed to contact the physician and not the DMEPOS supplier for problems or questions regarding the item.17

Yet, soon after issuing the provision, CMS rescinded it.

DMEPOS suppliers should keep in mind that consignment closets are potentially an area of CMS concern. CMS has not issued any recent guidance prohibiting consignment closet arrangements and, during the January 19, 2010 Open Door Forum, stated that the updated DMEPOS Supplier Standards do not address consignment closet arrangements. Parties that enter into consignment closet arrangements should consider inserting jeopardy clauses into their agreements in case the laws affecting consignment closets (or the government’s interpretation of those laws) change.

Conclusion

DMEPOS suppliers must ensure their arrangements with hospitals, whether contractual or joint venture, comply with applicable health care fraud and abuse laws, including the AKS and CMPL. Maintaining compliant contractual relationships will help ensure that the needs of hospital patients can be met without presenting legal risk to the hospital or the DMEPOS supplier. ■

The authors wish to thank their colleagues at Foley & Lardner LLP who reviewed and commented on this article, including Lawrence Vernaglia and Lawrence Conn. All errors or omissions in this article are the authors’ alone.
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Among the many compliance concerns facing durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics and supplies (DMEPOS) suppliers, perhaps one of the most important is Medicare reimbursement and claims denials. After all, a well-developed referral network and satisfied patient base is of little value if the claims generated by those patients' orders do not get paid. With that in mind, DMEPOS suppliers should understand the levels of appeal available to challenge Medicare claim denials. Although the Medicare tiered appeals structure may at first seem intimidating, many DMEPOS suppliers are able to handle the first two levels of appeal in-house, drawing on outside legal counsel for those challenges that proceed to the third level of appeal and beyond.

Of particular benefit is when DMEPOS suppliers involve their compliance officer in the reimbursement appeals process. This involvement need not be extensive or significantly time-consuming. Simply by communicating with the Compliance department, suppliers can enjoy the resources of a subject matter expert on the pending appeals, while simultaneously keeping the Compliance department abreast of key claims denial areas. The compliance officer can use that information when conducting targeted audits and developing the supplier's annual compliance plan.

Hot reimbursement issues
In the current enforcement environment, DMEPOS suppliers face a seemingly endless barrage of reimbursement challenges on state and federal levels. A significant hot issue regarding Medicare reimbursement denials is how to meet the medical documentation requirements for claim submissions. One approach suppliers can use to help decrease their denial rate is to employ staff with clinical backgrounds who can reinforce on appeal the reasons why a claim should be paid by Medicare, if the claim is denied. Another approach suppliers can consider to improve documentation of medical
necessity is to educate their referral sources on 
the Medicare documentation requirements so 
the referral sources can better document medi-
cal necessity in the patient records, thereby 
improving the supplier’s chance of a clean 
claim submission and prompt reimbursement. 

Another hot button challenge currently 
faced by DMEPOS suppliers is the incon-
sistent interpretation and application of 
Medicare regulations across the four Durable 
Medical Equipment Medicare Administrative 
Contractors (DME MACs). Each DME MAC 
has an ability to issue its own rules or Local 
Coverage Determinations, but the DME MACs 
must also follow the CMS-issued rules appli-
cable to all DMEPOS suppliers nationwide. 
However, there are times when the four DME 
MACs differently interpret the same CMS-
issued rules, which results in inconsistency 
across the four jurisdictions. This challenge 
is more significant for suppliers operating 
nationwide and who must interact with mul-
tiple DME MACs.

An example of this challenge arises in 
medical necessity documentation and proof 
of delivery documentation. Some DME MACs 
adopt a narrow interpretation of the require-
ments, while others have slightly differing 
positions. For example, some DME MACs 
accept a download from mail carriers such 
as the United States Postal Service, whereas 
other DME MACs do not. As a result of 
regional inconsistencies, DMEPOS suppliers 
must create separate and unique processes to 
satisfy the requirements for each of the four 
DME MACs. A supplier’s compliance officer 
can play an integral part to help the supplier’s 
reimbursement personnel understand and 
coordinate among the varying interpretations 
across the DME MACs.

**DMEPOS claims appeals process**

Medicare uses a tiered appeals process, afford-
ing DMEPOS suppliers five levels of appeal to 
challenge denied claims. Each level has its 
own unique characteristics and requirements. 
Overall, once a DME MAC makes an initial 
determination to deny a claim, a supplier has 
the right to an appeal. All appeals must be 
made in writing. For most levels, the supplier 
can itself file the appeal, but many choose to 
retain legal counsel around the third or fourth 
level. Below is a brief description of the five 
levels of appeal.

**First level — Redetermination**
The first level of appeal is conducted by the 
DME MAC itself (but by a person other than 
the one who made the initial determination 
to deny the claim). A supplier must file the 
redetermination request within 120 days from 
the date of receipt of the initial determination. 
Suppliers can use form CMS-20027 to request 
the redetermination in writing, and should 
attach all supporting documentation to that 
request. The DME MAC will issue its deci-
sion within 30 days of receiving the supplier’s 
reconsideration request.

**Second level — Reconsideration**
The second level of appeal is conducted by 
the qualified independent contractor (QIC). 
The QIC for DMEPOS suppliers is RiverTrust 
Solutions. A supplier that wants to appeal an 
unfavorable redetermination must file the 
reconsideration request within 180 days from 
the date of receipt of the unfavorable Medicare 
redetermination notice. Suppliers can use form 
CMS-20033 to request the reconsideration 
in writing and should attach all supporting 
documentation to that request, including the 
unfavorable Medicare redetermination notice. 
It is particularly important to include all support-
ing documentation at the reconsideration level 
because, without good cause, a supplier will not 
be able to provide any additional documents 
for review at subsequent levels of appeal. (This 
rule does not apply to witness oral testimony
given at the third level of appeal.) Generally, the QIC will issue its decision within 60 days of receiving the supplier’s reconsideration request. If the QIC cannot complete the decision in that timeframe, the supplier may escalate the appeal to the third level.

**Third level — Administrative law judge**
The third level of appeal is a hearing before an administrative law judge (ALJ) in the Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals. If at least $130 remains in controversy, a supplier may seek an ALJ hearing by filing a written appeal using form CMS-20034A/B (and may also file supplemental legal briefs). A supplier that wants to appeal an unfavorable reconsideration decision must file the request for an ALJ hearing within 60 days from the date of receipt of the unfavorable reconsideration decision. A supplier can request an in-person hearing, but hearings typically occur by videoconference or telephone. Suppliers can also forgo a hearing and instead ask the ALJ to issue a decision on the written record. Generally, the ALJ will issue its decision within 90 days of receiving the supplier’s hearing request, but this deadline is often extended. If the ALJ does not issue a decision in that timeframe, the supplier may escalate the appeal to the fourth level.

**Fourth level — Medicare Appeals Council**
The fourth level of appeal is a review by the Medicare Appeals Council (MAC). There are no requirements regarding the amount in controversy. A supplier may seek MAC review by filing a written appeal using form DAB-101 and may also file supplemental legal briefs. A supplier that wants MAC review of an unfavorable ALJ decision must file the request within 60 days from the date of receipt of the unfavorable ALJ decision. Generally, the MAC will issue its decision within 90 days of receiving the supplier’s request, but this deadline may be extended. If the MAC does not issue a decision in that timeframe, the supplier may escalate the appeal to the fifth level.

**Fifth level — Judicial review in federal district court**
The fifth and final level of appeal is judicial review by a federal district court judge. If at least $1,350 remains in controversy (for calendar year 2012), a supplier may seek judicial review by filing a written request in federal district court. The amount-in-controversy requirement increases each year. A supplier that wants judicial review of an unfavorable MAC decision must file the request within 60 days from the date of receipt of the unfavorable MAC decision.

**Benefits of compliance officer involvement**
Not all compliance officers of DMEPOS suppliers are involved with the claims appeal process, but those suppliers that do involve their compliance officers can realize some additional benefits. For example, by making the compliance officer aware of the types of claims being denied (and the reasons therefor), the compliance officer can integrate those denials into the supplier’s annual compliance plan and compliance audits. In addition, the compliance officer can serve as a resource to
the reimbursement team on specific subject matter expertise. This is particularly useful to address rule inconsistencies across the four regional DME MACs.

The knowledge, experience, and ability of compliance officers to understand and interpret Medicare regulations allows them not only to highlight the hot Medicare reimbursement issues, but also to recommend solutions. In this manner, the compliance officer can serve as a bridge of communication between the organization, Medicare, and the DME MACs.

It is important that suppliers keep their compliance officers involved in the appeals process because compliance officers can track and trend claim denials and assist in efforts to demonstrate the frequency of the varying interpretations of Medicare regulations across the four DME MACs. By doing so, the compliance officer can align the supplier’s focus with that of Medicare, allowing the organization to react proactively to any issues that may arise.

Conclusion
For some DMEPOS suppliers, the Medicare appeals process may seem to be an impenetrable, confusing morass. For other suppliers, the appeals process may appear routine, mundane, and simply a cost of doing business. Whatever a supplier’s comfort level with the appeals process itself, suppliers who involve their Compliance department in the appeals process (at least to a degree), may reap some useful rewards in enhanced communication, reduced claim denial rates, and improved appeal success rates. Ultimately, this cooperation between the supplier’s Compliance and Reimbursement departments can be a win-win for everyone at the organization.

The HCCA HIPAA Training Handbook

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) has had lasting impact on U.S. health care providers since its passage in 1996. Now HIPAA, along with HITECH, affect health care professionals on a daily basis. This newly revised handbook is intended for anyone who needs a basic understanding of the privacy and security regulations governed by HIPAA and HITECH. Suitable for staff training courses, it covers:

- Who must comply with HIPAA and HITECH
- When and by whom is the use or disclosure of protected health information (PHI) permitted?
- What rights does an individual have regarding his or her PHI?
- What are the basic safeguards required to protect the security of e-PHI?
- What happens when a breach occurs?
- And much more

This handbook can prepare all health care professionals to help protect the privacy and security of their patients’ health information.

Order Now: visit www.hcca-info.org/books, or call 888-580-8373
On February 13, 2012, CMS issued a set of proposed regulations under the 60-day refund rule (the proposed rule). CMS’s proposed rule is responsive to industry concerns, but also opens up a significant amount of new liability. The 60-day refund rule, enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) and codified at 42 U.S.C. section 1320a-7k(d), requires Medicare or Medicaid participating providers, suppliers, and plans to report and refund known overpayments by the later of 60 days from the date the overpayment is identified or the date the corresponding cost report is due.

The 60-day refund rule created significant burdens for providers, suppliers, and affected health plans attempting to meet this short window. Regulatory guidance is lacking for a number of definitions, including when an overpayment is actually “identified” and when the 60-day clock starts to run. The proposed rule attempts to answer some of these important questions. An analysis of the proposed rule offers providers and suppliers some interpretive guidance and a preview of what they can expect when the final regulations are issued.

**Background**

Prior to the enactment of the 60-day refund rule, there was a long history of disagreement between the health care bar, regulators, prosecutors, and the industry regarding whether or not there was a duty to affirmatively disclose overpayments. Some providers argued there was no duty to refund innocent overpayments, but the government disagreed and made efforts to pursue *qui tam* cases and settlements on the reverse false claim theory (i.e., where an obligation to pay or transmit money to the government is fraudulently evaded).

Much of this debate was settled with the enactment of Section 1320a-7k(d) on March 23, 2010. Specific to overpayments, PPACA included the following three interrelated provisions:
Providers have an obligation under the False Claims Act (FCA), including an express duty to refund and report Medicare and Medicaid overpayments by the later of 60 days after the overpayment is identified or the date the corresponding cost report is due. Failure to report and return the overpayment is an obligation for purposes of the FCA.

Enhancements to the Civil Monetary Penalties (CMP) Law now provide CMPs for failing to report and return known overpayments within 60 days or when the cost report is due.

Expanded exclusion authority under the Medicaid program for failure to report and return known overpayments.

Section 1320a-7k(d) itself states, in pertinent part, as follows:

**(d) REPORTING AND RETURNING OF OVERPAYMENTS. —**

(1) IN GENERAL. — If a person has received an overpayment, the person shall —

(A) report and return the overpayment to the Secretary, the State, an intermediary, a carrier, or a contractor, as appropriate, at the correct address; and

(B) notify the Secretary, State, intermediary, carrier, or contractor to whom the overpayment was returned in writing of the reason for the overpayment.

(2) DEADLINE FOR REPORTING AND RETURNING OVERPAYMENTS. — An overpayment must be reported and returned under paragraph (1) by the later of —

(A) the date which is 60 days after the date on which the overpayment was identified; or

(B) the date any corresponding cost report is due, if applicable.

(3) ENFORCEMENT.—Any overpayment retained by a person after the deadline for reporting and returning the overpayment under paragraph (2) is an obligation (as defined in section 3729(b)(3) of title 31, United States Code) for purposes of section 3729 of such title.

(4) DEFINITIONS. — In this subsection:

(A) KNOWING AND KNOWINGLY. — The terms ‘knowing’ and ‘knowingly’ have the meaning given those terms in section 3729(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(B) OVERPAYMENT. — The term “overpayment” means any funds that a person receives or retains under title XVIII or XIX to which the person, after applicable reconciliation, is not entitled under such title.

(C) PERSON. —

(i) IN GENERAL. — The term ‘person’ means a provider of services, supplier, Medicaid managed care organization (as defined in section 1903(m)(1)(A)), Medicare Advantage organization (as defined in section 1859(a)(1)), or PDP sponsor (as defined in section 1860D–41(a)(13)).

(ii) EXCLUSION. — Such term does not include a beneficiary.

As can be seen from the statutory language, a number of important definitions are omitted and the statute leaves open the critical question of when the 60-day period commences. Prior to the issuance of the proposed rule, organizations were required to interpret and apply the statute as best they could within their existing compliance structure. This is because the 60-day refund rule is currently in effect and a provider that fails to meet the reporting deadline faces damages and penalties under the FCA, CMPs, and potential...
exclusion from participation in federal health care programs.

**Highlights of the CMS proposed rule**

CMS’s proposed rule explains when an overpayment is “identified” and how overpayments are to be reported and refunded. CMS’s position on those two issues is largely consistent with the statutory language of Section 1320a-7k(d). CMS interpreted the statutory language in two important ways:

- a “reasonable inquiry” principle offering a reasonable and measured approach to determining when the 60-day clock starts running; and
- a proposed 10-year look back period for retrospective overpayment reviews that significantly expands the potential liability of providers when refunding overpayments.

The proposed rule only applies to traditional Medicare Parts A and B, even though Section 1320a-7k(d) also includes Medicaid, managed care organizations, Medicare Advantage and Part D programs. The statutory 60-day refund rule with respect to those programs remains in effect, even without regulatory guidance, although health plans and Medicaid providers likely will look to the proposed rule and any final regulations for guidance as to how to apply the statutory requirements.

**When is an overpayment identified?**

Under the proposed rule, an overpayment is “identified” when a person has actual knowledge of the existence of an overpayment or acts in reckless disregard or deliberate ignorance of the overpayment. CMS acknowledged that the 60-day clock does not start running (i.e., an overpayment is not “identified”) until after the provider has an opportunity to undertake a “reasonable inquiry” into the basis of the alleged overpayment.

**Reasonable inquiry**

CMS did not detail what constitutes a “reasonable inquiry,” but clearly CMS will allow some flexibility in light of the different levels of review needed to address the wide variety of potential overpayments—ranging from simple claims issues to complex regulatory analyses. CMS did not propose the 60-day clock start running on the first mere allegation or suspicion of an overpayment. CMS appeared to recognize that many sophisticated reimbursement questions require significant use of internal and external resources, due diligence, and document review. These important steps often cannot be completed within 60 days of the initial allegation of the overpayment.

Although the reasonable inquiry rule affords greater flexibility regarding the timing of refunds, CMS balanced it against the concept that providers or suppliers have a duty to promptly conduct this reasonable inquiry upon receipt of information of a potential overpayment. If a provider fails to make any reasonable inquiry, it may be found to have acted in reckless disregard or deliberate ignorance of the overpayment. In many respects, this is consistent with the practices of providers with effective compliance plans even prior to the implementation of PPACA.

According to CMS, defining “identification” in this way gives providers and suppliers an incentive to exercise due diligence to determine whether an overpayment exists. Without such a principle, CMS believes some providers and suppliers might avoid performing activities to determine whether an overpayment exists, such as self-audits, compliance checks, and other additional research.

CMS also stated that when a government agency informs a provider or supplier of a potential overpayment, the provider or supplier has an obligation to accept the finding or make a reasonable inquiry. At this point, the legal authority for such an obligation seems
unclear at best, as does what sort of government agency notice may trigger this obligation (e.g., remittance advice, general provider alert, RAC audits, informal letter to specific provider, preliminary audit report, or formal letter).

10-year look back period
The most dramatic change proposed by CMS is an expansion of the look back period for overpayments to 10 years. CMS chose this period to parallel the outside statute of limitations under the False Claims Act, but current Medicare reopening regulations permit look back periods of only 3 or 4 years for most situations (i.e., when there is no fraud, provider integrity issue, or similar fault). The proposed requirement to report and refund overpayments received during the prior 10 years represents a significant change to current overpayment and refund practices. Should the proposed rule go into effect as drafted, this change would result in materially increased liability for providers and suppliers. Many providers and suppliers will find a 10-year look back period not viable, if only because that period extends beyond the current record retention rules and requirements under Medicare Conditions of Participation, Supplier Standards, and state laws on medical record retention (typically ranging from 5 to 7 years). The 10-year period represents a dramatic expansion of CMS’s authority and reach into retrospective claims reviews.

Self-reporting process
Under the proposed rule, the existing voluntary refund process in Chapter 4 of the Medicare Financial Management Manual will be renamed the “self-reported overpayment refund process.” This is the process providers and suppliers will use to effectuate refunds. Self-reporting should be made in accordance with the protocols of the local fiscal intermediary, carrier, or contractor. CMS contemplates a standardized form to be used for repayments, but has not yet created one.

If an overpayment is claims-related, and would not be impacted by reconciliation of the cost report, the refund should not be delayed (according to CMS) until reconciliation of a cost report. For example, issues involving upcoding must be reported and returned within 60 days of identification, because the upcoded claims for payment are not submitted to Medicare as “costs” in the form of cost reports.

On a related note, CMS explained that the CMS Stark Self-Referral Disclosure Protocol (SRDP) tolls the obligation to refund the overpayment, but does not toll the obligation to report it. The OIG Self-Disclosure Protocol (SDP) also tolls the refund obligation, and a timely report to OIG under the SDP satisfies the reporting requirements under the 60-day refund rule.

Drafting a policy and procedure on overpayments
Many organizations have already created policies and procedures on self-reporting of known overpayments. With the issuance of the proposed rule (and the eventual enactment of a final rule), those organizations will need to tweak their existing policies and procedures to conform to the new regulations. But for those organizations without any policy and procedure on overpayments, it is due time to start considering how to create such a policy (whether formally-promulgated or a well-designed guideline). Again, the proposed rule has not been finalized and it would be reasonable to commence work, but not publish a policy, until the regulations are final.

When drafting a policy on overpayments, it is important to acknowledge the legal requirements, but also properly balance competing duties, apply the law fairly, and mitigate risk. In connection with that, an organization should evaluate the following considerations:

- Develop a standard form to document an internal report of an alleged overpayment. Many of the elements on that form can...
mirror the required elements of the official reporting form.

- Consider whether the overpayment investigation should be conducted under attorney-client and work product privileges. The organization should have a policy and procedure to assist in these determinations.
- Conduct and document employee interviews.
- Collect evidence and document the methodology used to determine if the alleged overpayment is a credible concern.
- Assess and analyze the causes of the overpayment as well as any defenses to the overpayment or limitations on the amount of overpayment calculated.
- Determine the amount of overpayment to report and return, and determine to whom the refund should be made. Document the methodology of how the refund amount was calculated.
- Determine what corrective action is necessary to address the root cause of the overpayment and prevent its future recurrence.

Consider those cases where the “reasonable inquiry” period is anticipated to continue for such a length of time that filing some preliminary “holding statement” with the Fiscal Intermediary/Carrier/MAC may be prudent.

When drafting an overpayments policy, the organization should also keep in mind the following considerations:
- Don’t create a policy that requires an unworkable bureaucracy or over-complicated process. It should be nimble, clear, and easy to complete in a timely manner.
- Do create a policy that allows for flexibility when information changes/develops during the investigation.
- Do create a policy that demonstrates the effectiveness of the organization’s compliance plan.
- Do include in the policy any necessary internal approvals which are required for processing of the refund, and build in time for securing these approvals.
- Don’t create a policy that conflicts with the organization’s internal accounting policies without first getting input from auditors and legal counsel.
- Do implement robust training and education around the policy, how to spot overpayments, the requirements for internal (or external) reporting, and the organization’s commitment against retaliation for whistleblowers and reporters.

Conclusion

In light of the ambitious changes in the proposed rule, particularly the significant expansion of potential liability associated with a 10-year look back period, health care organizations need to understand the consequences of the 60-day refund rule and how to meet its requirements. A first step is to create and implement an appropriate policy and procedure for reporting and refunding identified overpayments. Organizations must currently meet the 60-day requirements already in place under Section 1320a-7k(d), even though the proposed rule is not finalized. Organizations that draw on the guidance in the proposed rule to create a viable policy for reporting and refunding overpayments should find themselves well-positioned when the final rule is issued.
DMEPOS supplier marketing arrangements and HIPAA compliance

By Nathaniel Lacktman, Esq., CCEP; and Leeann Habte, Esq., CIPP

This month, the authors discuss the HIPAA implications for DMEPOS supplier marketing arrangements and provide a sample marketing authorization form as a supplier tool. Subsequent articles will discuss hospital-DMEPOS supplier arrangements under the Anti-kickback Statute; strategies for DMEPOS promotions and arrangements with manufacturers; and DMEPOS reimbursement compliance.

S uppliers of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, and orthotics supplies (DMEPOS) play an essential role in the spectrum of patient care, particularly for a medically-fragile patient population seeking greater independence. The lifeblood of a DMEPOS supplier’s business is its customer base—the patients. Motivated suppliers continue to seek out new ways to promote their items and services to customers, and rightly so. In addition, many established suppliers are exploring cross-promotional arrangements with other companies as a means to obtain additional revenue and expand their footprint by tapping into other companies’ customer bases.

Although such marketing strategies can offer significant benefits, they also present particular compliance risks in the health care context. DMEPOS suppliers interested in exploring collaborative or cross-promotional arrangements with other businesses must take time to understand the contours of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and other applicable rules, because they affect the scope and terms of such cross-promotional arrangements. For purposes of this article and all the examples contained herein, the DMEPOS supplier is assumed to be a HIPAA covered entity (as would be the case in the vast majority of retailer DMEPOS suppliers).

HIPAA marketing rules and restrictions

DMEPOS suppliers that plan to implement marketing or promotional arrangements should keep in mind that the HIPAA Privacy Rule restricts both the disclosure and use of protected health information (PHI) for marketing purposes.¹ With certain important exceptions, the Privacy Rule requires an individual’s written authorization before his/her protected health information can be disclosed or used for any...
communication that meets the definition of marketing.5

Definition of marketing
Under HIPAA, a communication is considered to be marketing if the supplier makes “a communication about a product or service that encourages recipients of the communication to purchase or use the product or service.”3 Generally, if a communication meets the definition of marketing, the supplier may make that communication to a patient only if it first obtains the patient’s express written authorization. An example of a marketing communication requiring patient authorization is a letter sent from the supplier to its former patients, informing them about a special promotion from a local fitness center that is offering discounts to the general public on new workout memberships, when the communication is not for the purpose of providing treatment advice.4 However, if a communication that otherwise meets the definition of marketing falls within one of the following three exceptions and does not involve direct or indirect payment for making such communication, an authorization will not be required.5

Exceptions to HIPAA definition of marketing
The three exceptions below fall under the definitions of treatment and/or health care operations, and use or disclosure of PHI for these purposes is permissible without written authorization.

1. Supplier’s own health-related items or services
Under the first exception, a communication is not considered marketing if it describes a health-related product or service provided by the supplier making the communication.6 Among other things, this exception permits communications by a supplier about products or services “provided by” the supplier to its clients. For example, it would not be marketing for a supplier that has added a new anti-snoring device to its product supply catalog to send a flyer describing it to the supplier’s patients (whether or not each patient has actually previously sought treatment for snoring).

2. Supplier’s treatment communications
Under the second exception, a communication is not considered marketing if it is made for treatment of the individual and for the purpose of furthering the treatment of that individual.7 For example, under this exception, it is not marketing when a supplier mails refill reminders to patients, or contracts with a mailing house to do so.8

3. Coordination of care and recommendation of alternative treatments
Under the third exception, a communication is not considered marketing if it is made for “case management or care coordination for the individual, or to direct or recommend alternative treatments, therapies, health care providers, or settings of care to the individual.”9 For example, under this exception, it is not marketing when an endocrinologist shares a patient’s medical record with several behavior management programs to determine which program best suits the ongoing needs of the individual patient.10 This exception is less frequently utilized in the DMEPOS supplier context, because the supplier commonly fills the orders issued by the patient’s treating physician, and the supplier does not independently offer its own treatment recommendations.

Marketing and the sale of health information
HIPAA also has a second definition of marketing, under which a communication is considered marketing if the supplier enters into an arrangement with another entity whereby the supplier:

...discloses protected health information to the other entity, in exchange for direct or indirect remuneration, for the other entity or its affiliate to make a communication about its own product or service that encourages recipients of the communication to purchase or use that product or service.11
This type of marketing has no exceptions under the current HIPAA Privacy Rule. In other words, a supplier may not sell the PHI or names of its patients to a business associate or any third party without first obtaining express written authorization from each patient. A valid authorization must state that such remuneration is involved.

When are HIPAA authorizations for marketing not required?
Even if a communication falls within the definition of marketing, there are certain situations where an authorization is not required. The HIPAA Privacy Rule provides an exception if the marketing communication is in the form of either a face-to-face communication made by the supplier to an individual, or a promotional gift of nominal value provided by the supplier. This provision permits a supplier to discuss any services and products, including those of a third-party, during a face-to-face communication. The supplier could also give the patient sample products or other information in this setting (subject to other restrictions, such as the Anti-kickback Statute, Civil Monetary Penalties Law, and other laws not discussed in this article). From a HIPAA perspective, no written authorization is necessary when, for example, a supplier provides a free package of formula and other baby products to new mothers as they leave the maternity ward.

Effective February 18, 2010, the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act revised the framework for the HIPAA exceptions to marketing communications. Under these changes, even if remuneration is involved, certain communications are considered health care operations and not marketing:
- if the communication is for treatment purposes; or
- if the communication only describes a drug or biologic that has been previously prescribed or administered, provided that the amount of the remuneration to the supplier is reasonable.

For uses or disclosures other than these exceptions, a valid authorization from the patient is required.

Intersection of HIPAA marketing rules and DMEPOS Supplier Standards
When marketing items and services, Medicare-participating DMEPOS suppliers must not only comply with HIPAA marketing restrictions, they must also comply with the Medicare DMEPOS Supplier Standards for marketing to beneficiaries. Although both sets of rules govern marketing communications, they differ in how they restrict such communications.

Marketing your own DMEPOS items or services
The HIPAA Privacy Rule makes clear that certain activities, such as communications made by a supplier for the purpose of describing the products and services it provides, do not constitute marketing. Under HIPAA’s marketing rules, a DMEPOS supplier may freely market its own products and services to its own patients, and may use its patients’ health information for such purposes without authorization. This is also allowed under the Medicare DMEPOS Supplier Standards.

Cross-promoting products or services of other companies
Under the Privacy Rule, a DMEPOS supplier may not use its patients’ PHI to promote the products and services of other businesses (i.e., products and services not offered by the DMEPOS supplier itself) unless it meets one of the exceptions. When a supplier sends another business’s marketing materials to the supplier’s patients and such communication is not for the treatment of an individual, the supplier would be using its patients’ PHI. It matters not if the supplier does not actually disclose any PHI to the other business, because the
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Privacy Rule restricts both the disclosure and the use of PHI.

In this situation, none of the HIPAA marketing exceptions apply. The supplier is not marketing its own product or service. The supplier is not making a recommendation regarding treatment of an individual patient’s medical condition. And, the supplier is not likely to be considered to be in a position to make specific medical treatment recommendations regarding alternative treatments to patients (as might a physician or hospital). Therefore, the supplier must obtain the authorization of its clients before sending those marketing materials. If the cross-promotion activities involve direct or indirect remuneration to the supplier from the third party, the patient authorization form must state that such remuneration is involved.\textsuperscript{16}

**Selling customer health information**

Likewise, if a supplier discloses PHI to the other entity, in exchange for direct or indirect remuneration so that the other entity may send marketing materials to the supplier’s patients, the supplier must obtain a valid authorization from its patients. The authorization must expressly state that remuneration is involved.\textsuperscript{17} For example, a supplier cannot, without authorization, sell a list of patients to a pharmaceutical company so the pharmaceutical company can directly market its own products to the individuals on the list.

**DMEPOS companies with multiple subsidiaries or sister suppliers**

Under HIPAA, legally separate but affiliated covered entities, such as subsidiaries or sister companies, may designate themselves as a single covered entity for purposes of HIPAA, as long as all the covered entities designated are under common ownership or control.\textsuperscript{18} If designated as a single covered entity, the sharing of PHI among sister companies or subsidiaries within the same covered entity does not constitute a use or disclosure for which authorization is required.

Despite the fact that HIPAA allows multiple subsidiaries or sister companies to be deemed a single covered entity, CMS has stated that it considers each subsidiary to be a separate supplier.\textsuperscript{19} Under DMEPOS Supplier Standard No. 11, CMS stated that the affiliated suppliers may not “reach out to” each other’s Medicare beneficiaries for marketing (or at least, telemarketing) purposes. This means that a DMEPOS company with multiple subsidiary suppliers should take caution when implementing marketing endeavors to promote products and services to its own patients. Such activities are not impossible, but require planning on how to execute them in compliance with both HIPAA and the Medicare supplier standards.

**Obtaining authorization for marketing purposes**

One approach to permit broad marketing communications is for the supplier to obtain written authorization from its patients where the patients would consent, in advance, to receive marketing materials. The supplier could send its patients an authorization form. For those patients who sign and return the authorization, the supplier would then send those patients marketing materials, including marketing materials of other companies (assuming the scope of the authorization covered the intended marketing activities). Alternately, the supplier could include the marketing authorization in its patient welcome package. A third approach would be to place the authorization form online to obtain and track patient consent. Suppliers with multiple subsidiaries or sister companies should consider creating a master authorization, under which the patient would authorize marketing activities for the entire family of related suppliers, as well as the supplier’s business partners.

Suppliers should note that HIPAA also imposes certain restrictions
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on the scope, content, and duration of marketing authorizations.\textsuperscript{20} The marketing authorization may not be combined with another type of authorization (so-called “compound authorizations”).\textsuperscript{21}

In addition, certain state laws impose further restrictions on the disclosure and use of PHI for marketing purposes. When state law is more restrictive than HIPAA, the state law governs. If a supplier plans to distribute marketing materials to patients in various states, the authorization form must comply with the corresponding state law. See figure 1 on page 59 for a sample marketing authorization form.

Of course, different approaches present different logistical and operational challenges, such as time and expense, online capabilities, a system to track authorization forms, and patient preferences. Suppliers need to determine what approach is most cost-effective and feasible for their needs.

**Practical compliance advice**

When drafting, reviewing and revising their written policies and procedures on marketing, suppliers should ensure the policies and procedures are current with the recent HIPAA developments and changes. The rules and regulations have undergone significant change as a result of amendments made by the HITECH Act.

New proposed regulations implementing the HITECH Act were published on July 14, 2010. The final regulations have not yet been issued, but are expected to be released soon. Suppliers will need to review these regulations and comply with them when they become effective.

When examining policies for HIPAA marketing compliance, suppliers should consider the following sample questions (by no means an exhaustive list):

- **Does the supplier have a marketing authorization form?**
- **Does it meet current federal and state requirements? Is the form translated into other languages?**
- **What is the supplier’s process for a patient to opt out of receiving marketing communications?**
- **Does the supplier identify the specific marketing uses and disclosures for which an authorization is not required?**
- **How does the supplier document patient authorization to receive marketing materials?**

In addition to the written procedures, suppliers should verify that their actual marketing practices correspond with the expectations set forth in their policies and procedures. The marketing staff should be periodically trained and educated on relevant marketing rules under federal and state law.

The supplier’s Notice of Privacy Practices should be current and accurate and its authorization form should be proper in scope and content.

**Conclusion**

Marketing activities are integral to the continued growth of nearly any business, including DMEPOS suppliers. Given the regulatory environment and the intersection of HIPAA rules and the Medicare Supplier Standards, suppliers should implement—and adhere to—a framework of safeguards designed to allow robust marketing efforts while maintaining high levels of compliance.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. 45 C.F.R. Part 160 and Part 164, Subparts A and E.
  \item 2. See 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(a)(3).
  \item 3. 45 C.F.R. § 164.501.
  \item 4. See Marketing FAQ at p. 1, Office of Civil Rights, HIPAA Privacy (April 3, 2003).
  \item 5. 42 U.S.C. § 17936(a)(2).
  \item 6. 45 C.F.R. § 164.501.
  \item 7. 45 C.F.R. §§ 164.501; 164.506(c)(1).
  \item 8. See Marketing FAQ, supra, at p. 3.
  \item 9. 45 C.F.R. § 164.501.
  \item 10. See Marketing FAQ, supra, at p. 3.
  \item 11. 45 C.F.R. § 164.501.
  \item 12. See Marketing FAQ, supra, at p. 2.
  \item 13. 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(a)(3)(ii).
  \item 14. 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(3)(i).
  \item 15. 42 U.S.C. § 17936(a)(2).
  \item 16. See 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(3)(ii).
  \item 17. 45 C.F.R. 164.105(b).
  \item 18. 45 C.F.R. 164.508(a)(3)(ii).
  \item 19. See 42 C.F.R. § 424.57(c)(11); “CMS FAQ Concerning the Revised Standards for DMEPOS Suppliers,” CMS-6036-F (Feb. 16, 2011).
  \item 20. See 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(c).
  \item 21. See 45 C.F.R. § 164.508(b)(3).
\end{itemize}
Figure 1: Authorization For Use And Disclosure Of Health Information*

---

Name __________________________  Date of Birth __________________

Street Address ___________________  City __________________  State  ____________  Zip ____________

Phone __________________________  Email ____________________

I hereby authorize ABC DMEPOS Supplier, Inc. to use and/or disclose my health information specifically [identify nature of information that would be used or disclosed for DMEPOS marketing purposes] for the specific purposes of informing me about new products and services, and for ABC’s marketing, promotions and advertising activities. ABC’s use and/or disclosure will result in the disclosure of such health information among and between [identify entities that will receive the information]. ABC may receive direct or indirect remuneration (payment) from these third parties as a result of health information obtained and shared with those business partners pursuant to this Authorization. Health information disclosed pursuant to this Authorization may be subject to redisclosure and no longer protected by federal health care privacy laws.

- You have the right to inspect or copy the health information authorized to be used and/or disclosed by this Authorization.
- You have a right to receive a copy of this signed Authorization and ABC will provide you with a copy, should you choose to sign it.
- This Authorization is voluntary and you do not have to sign it. Your refusal to sign this Authorization will not affect your ability to obtain treatment, payment, health plan enrollment, or eligibility for benefits.
- You may revoke this Authorization at any time. To revoke this Authorization, notify ABC in writing at: [insert address]. Additional information may be found in ABC’s Notice of Privacy Practices at [insert website].
- This Authorization is valid for five (5) years from the date signed below.

I have had an opportunity to review and understand the content of this Authorization. By signing this Authorization, I am confirming that it accurately reflects my wishes.

Signature: __________________________  Date: ____________

* This form is for sample educational purposes only. Suppliers should not rely solely on this form and are advised to seek input from legal counsel to comply with all applicable federal and state laws, rules and regulations.
Cold calls, hot lines: DMEPOS telemarketing and beneficiary contact
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This article is the first in a series on DMEPOS marketing compliance by Foley & Lardner published in Compliance Today. Next month, the authors will develop this topic by providing a practical summary of the various telemarketing rules, strategic advice for DMEPOS telemarketing, and guidelines for applying the rules to real-world situations. Subsequent articles will discuss DMEPOS marketing arrangements under the Anti-kickback Statute, HIPAA, practical solutions for obtaining beneficiary consent to marketing, and strategies for allowable co-promotion and co-promotion of DMEPOS items.

Suppliers of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, and orthotic supplies (DMEPOS), whether home care companies, mail-order suppliers, or manufacturers, provide an important service to a medically-fragile group of people. The Medicare population, in particular, constitutes an important customer base and a significant source of revenue for DMEPOS suppliers. Understandably, suppliers continue to seek new ways to reach out to Medicare beneficiaries and grow their customer base. However, agencies such as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and the Office of Inspector General (OIG) have announced new restrictions on how DMEPOS suppliers can conduct telemarketing activities and solicit beneficiaries.

The Telemarketing Statute
The Telemarketing Statute1 prohibits suppliers from making unsolicited telephone calls to Medicare beneficiaries regarding the furnishing of covered DMEPOS items unless one of three exceptions apply. The statute does not apply if:
- the beneficiary has given the supplier written permission to contact him/her by telephone;
- the supplier has already furnished a covered item to the beneficiary and the supplier is contacting the beneficiary regarding the furnishing of that item; or
- the supplier has furnished at least one covered item to the beneficiary during the preceding 15 months, in which case the supplier may discuss or promote other covered items with the beneficiary.

A point of caution: a supplier cannot avoid application of the statute by contracting with a third-party vendor or telemarketing company. The statute also applies to vendors or agents working on the supplier’s behalf. If the vendor violates the telemarketing statute, both the vendor and the supplier can be held responsible.

The penalties for violating the statute can be severe. If a supplier knowingly submits a claim for an item in violation of the statute, CMS must deny payment. Violations of the statute, particularly a pattern of violations, can expose suppliers to potential civil, criminal, and administrative penalties, including exclusion from participation in federal health care programs.

OIG Guidance and Updated Special Fraud Alert
OIG has long cautioned suppliers against improper telemarketing practices and noted, in its DMEPOS Compliance Program Guidance,2 that suppliers are prohibited from making unsolicited telephone contact to Medicare beneficiaries. OIG also issued a 2003 Special Fraud Alert3 reiterating the prohibition on unsolicited telemarketing. Both publications reference the Telemarketing Statute but do not expand on the scope of the statutory language.

In 2010, OIG issued an Updated Special Fraud Alert on DMEPOS telemarketing, drawing attention to the telemarketing activities of independent marketing firms that make unsolicited telephone calls on behalf of suppliers to Medicare beneficiaries to market the suppliers’ products.4 In the updated alert, OIG explained that the practice violates the Telemarketing Statute because “suppliers cannot do indirectly that which they are prohibited from doing directly.” OIG has indicated that the need for the Special Fraud Alert grew directly out of ongoing enforcement activities.
it was undertaking in conjunction with the Department of Justice (DOJ).

The updated alert took the position that, when a physician sends a supplier the written or verbal order for a beneficiary, and the supplier calls the beneficiary regarding that order, such telephone contact is a violation of the Telemarketing Statute. OIG reasoned that “a physician's preliminary written or verbal order is not a substitute for the requisite written consent of a Medicare beneficiary.”

A number of industry representatives criticized the OIG’s position, because it is common practice for physicians to send orders directly to the supplier. Requiring physicians to obtain a beneficiary’s written consent for each new patient could be a challenging task, particularly because the already busy physicians have no incentive to add this step to their paperwork process. It would be similarly challenging to require the supplier to obtain the written consent. For example, it would be impractical, costly, and inefficient for a supplier, after receiving the physician order, to then mail a written authorization card to the new patient and wait for a signed response before contacting the patient by telephone to arrange for delivery of the ordered item.

From a legal perspective, it is unclear whether the OIG’s expanded interpretation is adequately rooted in the language of the Telemarketing Statute and, at the time the updated alert was issued, no regulations were in place. From an operational perspective, the OIG’s interpretation would likely result in significant delays before patients could receive their prescribed items, thereby limiting beneficiary access to essential Medicare-covered items.

**CMS response to Updated Special Fraud Alert**

A month after the OIG released its updated alert, CMS responded by issuing Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) regarding telemarketing. The CMS FAQs differed from the OIG alert, and many believed CMS took a more reasonable interpretation consistent with how the DMEPOS industry operates. The fact that CMS responded with differing guidance so quickly after the OIG’s release of the Updated Special Fraud Alert suggests that OIG and CMS did not coordinate prior to the OIG release. The CMS FAQs included the following guidance:

- If a supplier returns a beneficiary’s phone call, the supplier’s contact is not unsolicited.
- If a physician contacts a supplier on behalf of a beneficiary and with the beneficiary’s knowledge, and a supplier then calls the beneficiary to confirm or gather information needed to provide that particular covered item (including delivery and billing information), then that contact is not unsolicited. The beneficiary need only be aware that a supplier will be calling him/her regarding the covered item, recognizing that the appropriate supplier might not be identified at the time of the physician’s consultation. This guidance provided flexibility, because the physician need not inform the patient that a specific supplier will call the patient. It also did not require a physician to obtain the beneficiary’s written consent.
- If a supplier makes solicited contact with a new customer, it is not a substitute for the requisite written documentation for their records.
- If a supplier makes solicited contact with a beneficiary for a particular covered item, the supplier cannot speak with the beneficiary about other covered items during that same contact. This generally applies to new customers because, after the supplier has provided a covered item to the beneficiary, the supplier may then subsequently contact the beneficiary to offer other covered items in accordance with the exceptions in the Telemarketing Statute.

The CMS FAQs elucidated a reasonable position consistent with existing business practices and the Telemarketing Statute, and provided useful and practical guidance to DMEPOS suppliers. OIG indicated both informally, and through a cover letter distributing the FAQs to suppliers that it would defer to these interpretations by CMS. However, the CMS FAQs differed from the OIG’s published position and, moreover, CMS continued to change its position in the regulations and a second set of FAQs, as discussed in detail below.

**New regulations and Preamble commentary**

In August, 2010, CMS released final regulations updating the DMEPOS supplier enrollment standards. The regulations introduced new telemarketing rules, imposed stricter program standards for suppliers, and implemented many of the standards in CMS’ 2008 proposed regulations. The regulations took effect on September 27, 2010 and all suppliers must meet these standards.

The Preamble to the regulations contains twelve comments regarding telemarketing and beneficiary contact. CMS’s comments in the Preamble are consistent with its FAQs,
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namely, while a Medicare beneficiary must know that a supplier will be contacting him/her, nowhere did CMS state that the referring physician must obtain the beneficiary’s written permission. For example, CMS stated:

[A] supplier may contact a beneficiary if a physician contacts a DMEPOS supplier on behalf of a beneficiary with the beneficiary’s knowledge, and then a supplier contacts the beneficiary to confirm or gather information needed to provide that particular covered item (including delivery and billing information). In that instance, the contact would not be considered a direct solicitation and therefore, would not implicate [the Telemarketing Statute].

However, CMS also stated it considers the Telemarketing Statute to apply not only to solicitation by telephone, but also by “e-mail, instant messaging, or in-person contact.” That position represented a significant expansion on the statutory language. Although e-mail and instant messaging may arguably be sufficiently similar to telephone calls to be a reasonable extension of the statute, CMS offered no basis to support its position that the prohibition on telephone contact would also ban in-person contact. OIG has previously expressed concerns with in-person direct marketing, but that OIG position cannot serve as the basis for expanding the statute.

In addition, the regulation required that a referring physician obtain written permission before the supplier may contact the beneficiary. It required that “[t]he individual has given written permission to the supplier or the ordering physician or non-physician practitioner to contact them concerning the furnishing of a Medicare-covered item that is to be rented or purchased.” (emphasis added)

Yet, the Telemarketing Statute has always held that if a beneficiary gives written permission to a supplier, the supplier may contact that beneficiary. It seemed to many that the language “or the ordering physician or non-physician practitioner” was misplaced and did not belong in the regulation because it meant a physician must obtain written permission (not simply inform the beneficiary) before the supplier could contact the beneficiary.

CMS could have expressed a more consistent position by deleting the language “or the ordering physician or non-physician practitioner.” Suppliers could then refer to the Preamble to understand that the beneficiary must know that a supplier will contact him/her. This approach would have remedied the inconsistency between the regulations and the FAQs and Preamble, and provided clear instruction to suppliers who receive orders from referring physicians. This approach would also have been also consistent with current industry practices and standards. Instead, the regulation triggered the same concerns as the OIG’s Updated Special Fraud Alert, and suppliers were concerned that a requirement for written permission would be burdensome, costly, and cause potential delays for Medicare beneficiaries.

**CMS 2011 FAQs**

CMS received a number of critical responses to the regulations and, in January 2011, issued updated FAQs addressing the industry queries. For suppliers, these 2011 FAQs were even more problematic than the regulations. CMS seemed to take some inexplicable and highly unfavorable positions regarding telemarketing and beneficiary contacts, including:

- The 2011 FAQs expanded telephone contact to include mailings made through the US Post Office. The 2011 FAQs prohibit “targeted mailings to specific beneficiaries,” although “general mass advertising” is allowed. CMS offered no explanation of what those terms mean or how the Telemarketing Statute could apply to direct mail.

- A supplier may not contact a beneficiary based solely on a physician order unless the physician obtains the beneficiary’s written permission. This position is consistent with the language of the regulation, but differs from the guidance in CMS’ previous FAQs.

- If a supplier makes solicited contact with a beneficiary for a particular covered item, the supplier cannot speak with the beneficiary about other covered items during that same contact. This position is largely consistent with CMS’ previous FAQs.

- For companies with multiple subsidiaries, if one subsidiary is permitted to contact a beneficiary (e.g., by written permission or by previously providing covered items), a related company under the same parent corporation may not make contact without separately meeting one of the exceptions in the Telemarketing Statute. Even if all the subsidiaries are enrolled DMEPOS suppliers, CMS seems to view each as a separate entity and require each to meet an exception to the Telemarketing Statute in order to contact beneficiaries.

Rather than providing clarity, the 2011 FAQs served to increase confusion about CMS’ restrictions on telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation.

**Revised regulations**

On April 4, 2011, CMS released a proposed rule revising supplier standards, particularly supplier standard 11. CMS acknowledged that its expanded interpretation had been criticized as overly broad and prohibited marketing activities in a manner that would be unfeasible for DMEPOS suppliers to...
implement. CMS indicated that it will further investigate how to address its concerns of abusive DMEPOS marketing practices. In the interim, CMS will instruct its contractors to apply the restrictions on telephone solicitation that were in effect prior to the August 2010 regulations (rather than all types of beneficiary solicitation and contact).

The current proposed rule deletes the reference to direct solicitation and instead focuses on telemarketing, tracking the exceptions under the Telemarketing Statute. It also deletes the language that requires a referring physician to obtain the beneficiary’s written permission. CMS did not include any comments regarding its 2010 or 2011 FAQs, nor how suppliers should interpret the proposed regulations in light of those FAQs, nor which FAQs still remain in effect.

Conclusion

The changing landscape and conflicting guidance has led to much confusion among DMEPOS suppliers regarding telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation. Penalties for failing to comply with the telemarketing rules are severe. Because these rule changes have a significant impact on suppliers’ business operations and marketing efforts, it is imperative for suppliers that serve Medicare beneficiaries to be aware of the restrictions. Despite the confusion, the various guidance can be boiled down into a manageable set of practical rules suppliers can use in their marketing activities, particularly as new communication technologies and marketing approaches change these activities. Next month’s article will set forth those practical rules, apply them to a series of real-world DMEPOS marketing situations, and highlight key opportunities and approaches suppliers can take while still complying with the telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation rules.

2. 64 FR 36368, 36380 (July 6, 1999).
4. 75 FR 2105 (Jan. 14, 2010).
7. 73 Fed. Reg. 4503 (January 25, 2008) (proposed rules); 42 C.F.R. § 424.57(c) (supplier standards).
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This article is the second in a series on DMEPOS marketing compliance by Foley & Lardner LLP published in Compliance Today. This month, the authors provide a practical summary of the Medicare DMEPOS telemarketing rules, offer strategic advice and opportunities regarding DMEPOS telemarketing, and apply the rules to real-world situations. Subsequent articles will discuss marketing arrangements under the Anti-kickback Statute and HIPAA; practical solutions for obtaining beneficiary consent to marketing; and strategies for allowable cross-promotion and co-promotion of DMEPOS items.

Part 1 of this series (published in the May 2011 issue of Compliance Today) explained the statutory and regulatory requirements relating to durable medical equipment, prosthetics and orthotics supplies (DMEPOS) telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation under the Medicare regulations and guidance. This article covers how that guidance is transformed into a manageable set of rules and applied to a number of real-world DMEPOS marketing situations. Suppliers will learn: (1) what is allowed and prohibited under the telemarketing and beneficiary contact rules; (2) advice to ensure compliance with these rules; (3) strategic marketing opportunities for suppliers; and (4) practical solutions and real-world examples of permissible telemarketing and beneficiary contact activities.

Enforcement of telemarketing rules

Complaints about telemarketing practices filter into a number of different regulators and law enforcement agencies. We are aware of criminal investigations by the Department of Justice (DOJ) of some suppliers and their marketing vendors related to allegations of cold-calling Medicare beneficiaries. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) settled a Civil Monetary Penalties case in 2009 with Matrix Diabetics, Inc., a Florida distributor of blood glucose testing supplies. The former owners and officers of the DMEPOS company agreed to pay $260,000 for allegedly paying telemarketing firms to make unsolicited telephone calls to beneficiaries to market DMEPOS items on behalf of the company. The company in turn submitted claims for these items for Medicare reimbursement.1

Medicare’s Zone Program Integrity Contractors (ZPICs) have also made outreach through letters to suppliers alerting them to complaints of violations of the Telemarketing Statute. The volume of these enforcement activities and the number of different agencies involved highlight that the risk to suppliers who violate the Anti-kickback Statute is real, not hypothetical.
**Rules for DMEPOS telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation**

DMEPOS suppliers may not make unsolicited telephone calls to Medicare beneficiaries regarding the furnishing of covered items, unless:

- the beneficiary first calls the supplier or initiates contact, and the supplier is responding to that contact;
- the beneficiary gave the supplier written permission to contact the beneficiary;
- the supplier has already furnished a covered item to the beneficiary and the supplier is contacting the beneficiary regarding the furnishing of that same item; or
- the supplier has furnished at least one covered item to the beneficiary during the preceding 15 months, in which case the supplier may discuss or promote other covered items with the beneficiary.²

Although these summarized rules may seem simple enough, they can become complicated and nuanced when applied to real-world DMEPOS marketing situations. The table on page 56 applies the telemarketing rules to a number of DMEPOS situations.

Suppliers should keep in mind, however, there are a number of other federal and state laws that impose restrictions on telemarketing in general (e.g., the Federal Trade Commission’s Telemarketing Sales Rule and state restrictions on telemarketing) and to Medicare beneficiaries in particular (e.g., HIPAA, the Anti-kickback Statute, and the Civil Monetary Penalties Law, including the provisions on beneficiary inducements). Those laws intersect with DMEPOS marketing and must also be considered, but the scope of this article is limited to the Medicare rules on telemarketing and beneficiary solicitation.

**Contracting with third-party vendors and telemarkers**

Third-party vendors and telemarketing companies are commonly used vehicles for marketing and customer outreach. DMEPOS suppliers may engage these vendors, but should understand that if the vendor violates the Telemarketing Statute, the supplier can be held responsible and face severe sanctions for the vendor’s conduct. For this reason, suppliers who choose to contract with these vendors should include oversight provisions in their vendor contracts, under which the vendor agrees to adhere to the telemarketing rules applied to Medicare beneficiaries and patients in general. This is important because many vendors, particularly those who deal with a broad spectrum of customers beyond solely Medicare beneficiaries, are unaccustomed to these restrictions. In addition to the contractual language, suppliers should be diligent in ensuring the vendor is complying with those restrictions.

**Written policies and procedures**

Suppliers should have written policies and procedures in place to delineate the steps the supplier will take to promote compliance with the Medicare supplier standards and the Telemarketing Statute. The written policy should clearly state that the supplier’s employees, as well as individuals and entities working on the supplier’s behalf, are prohibited from making unsolicited contact with Medicare beneficiaries unless one of the statutory exceptions apply. The written procedure should include a step-by-step process for contacting current and prospective customers. It should be written in a manner employees can easily understand and follow, and should be tailored to the supplier’s specific business practices. As with all compliance policies and procedures, it should be reviewed periodically and updated as needed to comply with changes in the law and the supplier’s operational requirements.

**Documentation advice and approaches**

The original Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) took the position that a supplier need not collect and maintain documentation from the physician reflecting that the
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Table 1: DMEPOS Medicare Telemarketing and Beneficiary Solicitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telemarketing Situation</th>
<th>Allowed Under Telemarketing Rules?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A physician sends the supplier a work order for a new patient. The patient is informed that a supplier will contact him, but does not sign a written permission form. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>No, because the current regulations require the beneficiary’s written permission. Under the proposed rule, this would be allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A physician sends the supplier a work order for a new patient and checks a box attesting that the patient has given written permission to contact. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>Yes, but only if the beneficiary actually gave written permission. Because the supplier does not know whether or not the beneficiary actually gave written permission, this situation presents a high level of risk and is not recommended. Under the proposed rule, this would be allowed, but the proposed rule does not require the patient to give written permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A physician sends the supplier a work order for a new patient, along with the patient’s signed written permission to contact. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>Yes, because the beneficiary gave written permission. Under the proposed rule, this would be allowed, but the proposed rule does not require the patient to give written permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A physician sends the supplier a work order for a new patient, along with the patient’s signed written permission to contact. The order is for home oxygen equipment. The supplier calls the customer and promotes/discusses other items (e.g., ventilator or respiratory assist devices).</td>
<td>No, because the scope of consent was limited only to those items in the physician order. If this is the first contact ever made by the supplier to the beneficiary, the supplier may not attempt to solicit the purchase of additional covered items. After the supplier provides the covered items to the beneficiary, the supplier may then promote additional products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hospital care coordinator sends the supplier an enrollment form for the patient to coordinate the patient’s discharge orders. The patient previously gave the hospital written permission or the patient signs the form to give permission for a supplier to contact him. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>Yes, because the beneficiary gave written permission. Under the proposed rule, this would be allowed, but the proposed rule does not require the patient to give written permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telemarketing Situation</th>
<th>Allowed Under Telemarketing Rules?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A hospital care coordinator sends the supplier an enrollment form for the patient to coordinate the patient’s discharge orders. The patient is informed that his care is being coordinated through the supplier, but has not given any written permission. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>No, because the current regulations require the beneficiary’s written permission. The Preamble to the regulations explains that, if hospital staff obtain a patient’s written consent, the hospital may order supplies on the patient’s behalf. The patient’s written permission need not be on the enrollment form itself, but could be on another document. Under the proposed rule, this would be allowed because the proposed rule does not require the patient to give written permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DMEPOS manufacturer receives an order from a physician, with the proper patient written permission. After calling the patient, the manufacturer determines it does not provide the items directly to patients, so the manufacturer sends the order to the supplier. The supplier then calls the patient.</td>
<td>Yes, this is potentially allowed because the beneficiary gave written permission. However, it depends on the scope of that permission. If the permission form allows phone contact by “a supplier,” it is probably acceptable. If the permission form allows a call only by the particular manufacturer, the supplier should not call the patient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DMEPOS manufacturer receives a call from a patient asking about how to get the manufacturer’s DMEPOS supplies. The manufacturer then transfers the patient to the supplier (i.e., a warm transfer).</td>
<td>Yes, because the beneficiary initiated contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supplier hosts a health fair or community event. A potential customer visits the event and gives his information on a written card, giving permission for the supplier to contact him. After the event, the supplier calls the customer.</td>
<td>Yes, because the beneficiary gave written permission. In addition, health fairs and community events are permissible methods of beneficiary contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supplier hires a third-party vendor to use door-to-door salespeople to reach out to beneficiaries.</td>
<td>No, because under the current regulations, CMS expanded the telemarketing and beneficiary contact restrictions to include in-person contact. The proposed rule deletes this restriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supplier mails a card to a large number of potential customers who are Medicare beneficiaries. After receiving the card, a potential customer places a call to the supplier.</td>
<td>Yes, this is probably allowed because the beneficiary initiated contact and the supplier’s contact was sent by mail to a large number of customers. CMS’ 2011 FAQs state that “targeted mailings to specific beneficiaries are prohibited,” but that “general mass advertising through the post office” is allowed.” However, neither the regulation nor the statute expressly encompass direct mail and CMS has not explained the basis for its authority to expand the Telemarketing Statute into direct mailings. There are arguments that the telemarketing rules should not apply to direct mailings. The proposed rule deletes this restriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supplier mails cards to a group of potential customers who are Medicare beneficiaries. A potential customer fills in his phone number and mails back the card, indicating his interest in being contacted about the supplier’s services. The supplier then calls the customer.</td>
<td>Yes, this is probably allowed because the beneficiary initiated contact and the supplier’s contact was sent by mail. A customer signature field on the card, if not per se required, is a best practice and the recommended approach. The supplier should ensure the customer signed the card before telephoning the customer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
physician contacted the supplier with the beneficiary’s knowledge. CMS stated “it would be a business decision on the part of the supplier whether to collect and obtain such documentation for their records.” Even if it is not per se required that a supplier collect and maintain a copy of that documentation, the compliance risks are too high for a supplier not to take steps to ensure the beneficiaries gave their written permission (under the current regulation) or were made aware that a supplier would be contacting them (under the proposed rule).3

However, deciding to collect the documents is a far easier task than actually doing so, and suppliers understandably face a challenge in operationalizing this documentation requirement. One approach might be to build it into the supplier’s physician work order. The revised work order would include a check box where the physician affirms he or she has obtained the patient’s written permission for the supplier to contact the patient. This alone is likely not adequate under the current regulations, but it can serve as a reminder to the physician that he or she must obtain the beneficiary’s written permission (or inform the beneficiary, under the proposed rule). The check box represents an affirmative effort by the supplier to help ensure compliance with the Telemarketing Statute and supplier standard number 11. This is a beneficial tool designed to protect the supplier in the event a patient complains that the supplier violated the Telemarketing Statute. On the other hand, if the physician submits a work order without checking the box, it might suggest the patient did not give permission, and could require additional back-and-forth with the physician to obtain such.

Another approach would be to update the existing physician work order to include a signature portion where the patient authorizes the supplier to contact him/her. The patient would sign that portion in the physician’s office. This approach allows the supplier to obtain the beneficiary’s explicit written permission in accordance with the current regulations. But, having a patient sign a physician work order is very unusual, and the same risks apply if the physician forgets to have the patient sign the work order. Moreover, under the proposed rule, the patient is not required to give his or her written permission.

A third approach would be to create an authorization form and mail it to the supplier’s referring physicians. The physician would have the patient review and sign the form during the office visit. The physician would then send the signed authorization form along with the work order. Once the supplier receives the signed authorization form, the supplier could contact the patient.

A fourth approach would be to create a complete authorization form and provide it to the supplier’s referring physicians. The physician would have the patient review and sign the form during the office visit. The physician would then send the signed authorization form along with the work order. Once the supplier receives the signed authorization form, the supplier could contact the patient.

This approach imposes the greatest operational burden on suppliers and physicians, because it requires a separate document in addition to the existing paperwork physicians must send to suppliers. However, it is probably the most comprehensive practice because it most clearly satisfies the current regulations (though this should not be necessary under the proposed rule).
DMEPOS advertisements in Internet, television, and new media

Although the current regulations and guidance purport to restrict communications through certain new technologies such as e-mail, instant messaging, and text messages, the Internet remains—at least to a certain degree—fair game. In 2008, CMS drafted a proposed prohibition on “coercive Internet advertising,” but did not include it in the 2010 final regulations. The revised DMEPOS supplier standards do not prohibit television, radio, or Internet advertisements, or advertisements at health fairs, community events, or the supplier’s own website.4 Implementing and enforcing a restriction on Internet advertising might be (for the time being) too difficult and costly for CMS or the OIG to manage. In addition, media such as television and the Internet can be considered advertisements to the public or to Medicare beneficiaries generally.

The fact that the Telemarketing Statute does not apply to Internet advertisements may potentially open some opportunities for savvy suppliers who are interested in using social media tools to promote their products. For example, a supplier might consider using Google’s sponsored searches so their website appears at the top when someone enters a search for “Medicare prosthetic arm.” Sponsored searches are not new, and are permitted under the new regulation. But, for something more cutting-edge, suppliers might consider other Internet advertising methods, such as Facebook.

The Facebook advertisement tool allows someone to publish their advertisement to a certain segment of Facebook users, narrowed by the users’ demographics and stated interests. For example, a diabetes supplier might want to place a Facebook advertisement, requesting that the advertisement only be displayed to Facebook users who are over 65 years old and who have an interest in diabetes or who “like” the American Diabetes Association. New Internet advertising approaches such as these can potentially pose a higher level of compliance risk, because the advertisements are targeted toward a specific group of people, rather than Medicare beneficiaries generally. The more specific and targeted the advertisement, the more likely CMS or OIG will find it objectionable. And yet, the Facebook advertising tool is still a “passive” advertisement in that it is placed on a webpage and not directly sent to a beneficiary by telephone, e-mail, instant messaging, or in-person contact (the four CMS-defined methods of direct solicitation). Unless and until CMS issues further guidelines on Internet advertising, the landscape of opportunities and risk remains largely uncharted.

Conclusion

The telemarketing and beneficiary contact rules have a significant impact on a DMEPOS supplier’s operations because the restrictions go to the lifeline of a supplier’s business: the customers. The April 4, 2011 proposed rule helps to make these restrictions more workable and better reflect industry practices. Yet, it remains essential for DMEPOS suppliers to understand the applicable restrictions and build operational and procedural safeguards to promote compliance, while also having a keen knowledge of the marketing opportunities that can be pursued.

1 See www.oig.hhs.gov/fraud/enforcement/cmp/false_claims.asp.
2 As explained in the previous article, John Spiegel, Director of CMS’ Program Integrity Group, stated on January 19, 2011 that CMS “does not intend to instruct Medicare contractors to implement the expanded provision of the telemarketing regulations. The telemarketing rules may change depending on CMS’ subsequent actions.
3 The differences between the current regulation and the proposed rule were discussed in last month’s issue, particularly the proposed change in the written permission requirement. See also 76 Fed. Reg. 18472 (Apr. 4, 2011).
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This article is the third in a series on DMEPOS compliance issues by Foley & Lardner LLP published in Compliance Today. In the June issue of Compliance Today, the authors provided practical tips and compliance advice regarding DMEPOS telemarketing and beneficiary contact. This month, the authors discuss the Medicare DMEPOS supplier standards, liability under the False Claims Act, and strategic approaches to limiting damages in whistleblower lawsuits.

Suppliers of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, and orthotic supplies (DMEPOS) face increasing scrutiny and oversight from federal agencies such as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and the Office of Inspector General (OIG). In order to obtain and maintain Medicare billing privileges, DMEPOS suppliers need to meet the Medicare supplier standards. Late in 2010, CMS expanded the supplier standards and imposed significant new burdens on DMEPOS suppliers. The industry opposed many of these changes, but it remains likely that the government will continue to argue in the appropriate cases that failure to comply with the supplier standards not only exposes DMEPOS suppliers to administrative sanctions, but also creates False Claims Act liability. DMEPOS suppliers should understand the supplier standards and the enforcement implications, both to ensure compliance going forward, and, if necessary, to effectively defend past conduct in the event of an enforcement action, government investigation, or False Claims Act litigation.

Medicare has strict guidelines and standards that DMEPOS suppliers must meet to establish and maintain Medicare billing privileges. Among these rules is the set of federal regulations known as the Medicare DMEPOS supplier standards.1 The supplier standards apply to all Medicare-participating DMEPOS suppliers and set forth the minimum operational requirements suppliers are asked to follow. First introduced in 1992, the supplier standards have expanded, and currently there are 30 standards.

New supplier standards and proposed revisions

In August 2010, CMS released a final rule that added four new DMEPOS supplier standards and made the existing standards more onerous. In response to significant backlash from the DMEPOS industry, CMS issued a proposed rule in April 2011, relaxing some of the standards introduced in the August 2010 final rule. When this article went to press, the April 2011 proposed rules had not been finalized.

DMEPOS supplier standards and Medicare enrollment

The National Supplier Clearinghouse (NSC) processes DMEPOS
supplier applications for Medicare, oversees the enrollment process, and with CMS is responsible for oversight of compliance with the supplier standards. Effective March 2011, new DMEPOS suppliers are now classified by the government as a “high risk” category for fraud, waste, and abuse and are subject to more stringent enrollment screening and oversight controls.

Generally, the Medicare DMEPOS supplier enrollment process is as follows. First, the applicant submits the CMS 855S enrollment application and supporting documentation to the NSC. In the application, the DMEPOS supplier certifies that it meets and will continue to meet the supplier standards. The NSC reviews the application and conducts a site visit to verify compliance with all DMEPOS supplier standards. After completing its review, the NSC notifies the applicant in writing of the enrollment decision. After enrollment, a DMEPOS supplier must maintain compliance with the supplier standards.

Implications of failure to comply
DMEPOS suppliers can face severe penalties for failing to comply, at least in material respects, with the supplier standards. From the government’s perspective, all deviations from the black letter standards are material and require sanctions, including administrative penalties, billing revocation, Medicare recoupment, potential criminal liability, and potential liability under the False Claims Act. But, there are limits. Understanding the contours and limits of these potential penalties—and the issues and arguments that typically arise—is essential for a DMEPOS supplier to effectively position itself to avoid scrutiny by maintaining an effective compliance program and, if necessary, to respond to a regulatory or False Claims Act action.

Administrative penalties
If a DMEPOS supplier is found to not meet the supplier standards, CMS may revoke the supplier's billing privileges. The revocation is effective within 15 or 30 days of the notice of revocation, depending on the standard violated.

The new DMEPOS regulations also allow CMS to attempt recoupment of payments as of the date of certain final adverse actions:
- Revocation of Medicare billing privileges
- Suspension or revocation of a state license
- Conviction of a felony
- Exclusion from participation in a state or federal health care program
- Revocation for failure to meet DMEPOS quality standards

Under this rule, CMS is authorized to assess and collect Medicare overpayments back to the date of the final adverse action. This means that all funds received by a DMEPOS supplier subject to one of the adverse actions can potentially be deemed an overpayment. This rule strengthens CMS’ view that when a DMEPOS supplier is not allowed to participate in Medicare, funds the supplier receives are deemed to be overpayments.

However, the new regulations do not contain a provision authorizing recoupment retroactive to the date of the DMEPOS supplier’s non-compliance—only to the date of the final adverse action. The lack of a retroactive recoupment provision benefits DMEPOS suppliers significantly, because it limits the potential overpayment liability for non-compliance with certain supplier standards. Moreover, a DMEPOS supplier who is assessed an overpayment under this provision has administrative appeal rights. Given the current regulatory environment and the new 60-day overpayment rule, DMEPOS suppliers should develop a thoughtful approach for determining how overpayments are identified and potentially reported and refunded.

Potential liability under the False Claims Act
Of potentially even greater concern than the possible administrative sanctions is the potential for False
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Claims Act liability. Given the current enforcement environment, government scrutiny and *qui tam* whistleblowers are a reality for DMEPOS suppliers. The supplier standards have been considered a hybrid between the Medicare conditions of participation and the conditions for payment. Whereas a violation of Medicare conditions for payment is generally considered grounds for a False Claims Act violation, some courts have ruled that a violation of Medicare conditions of participation does not necessarily give rise to a False Claims Act violation. In some recent cases in the DMEPOS industry, the government has taken a more aggressive position that the supplier standards are conditions for payment. The good news for DMEPOS suppliers is that at least one recent court ruling held that a violation of the supplier standards does not necessarily trigger a false claim.3

Supplier standards as conditions of participation or conditions for payment

The vast majority of courts that have examined the issue have held that False Claims Act liability does not arise simply by virtue of a violation of an underlying Medicare rule or regulation.4 Rather, one of two conditions must exist:

- The supplier expressly certified compliance with the standards when submitting a claim; or
- Compliance with the standards is written into the regulation as a condition for payment, rather than simply a condition of participation, in the Medicare program.

The issue of Medicare conditions of participation versus conditions for payment is more complicated for DMEPOS suppliers than for other providers, such as hospitals. This is largely due to the nature of the supplier standards. The government has pointed to some characteristics of the supplier standards to support its argument that the supplier standards are conditions for payment. For example, the supplier standards are contained under the regulatory section titled “Conditions for Medicare Payment.” The payment regulations require that certain conditions be met “as a basis for Medicare payment,” including, among other things, conditions regarding the source of services.5 The “source of services” category includes the requirement that services must have been furnished by a provider, nonparticipating hospital, or supplier that was qualified to have payment made for the services at the time it furnished them. Under the government’s argument, these payment regulations can and should be interpreted to mean that compliance with the supplier standards is a condition for payment.6

However, DMEPOS suppliers can identify other aspects of the supplier standards to refute the government’s argument, and instead demonstrate that the supplier standards are simply conditions of eligibility that afford the DMEPOS supplier the privilege to prospectively bill the Medicare program. The regulatory subsection titled “Special payment rules for items furnished by DMEPOS suppliers and issuance of DMEPOS supplier billing privileges” sets forth several conditions that a DMEPOS supplier must meet “in order to be eligible to receive payment for a Medicare-covered item.” One of those conditions is listed as “CMS has not revoked or excluded the DMEPOS supplier’s privileges during the period which the item was furnished.”7 The 30 supplier standards are listed thereafter as standards “the supplier must meet and must certify in its application for billing privileges.” As noted above, there is no provision for retroactive recoupment, only recoupment following actual revocation. These aspects make the supplier standards akin to conditions of participation.

No appellate court has opined on this issue. However, in examining the interplay between these regulatory provisions, at least one court clearly held that the supplier standards are conditions of participation and not payment,
concluding that “proper redress for violations of the standards established therein is not the denial of payment, but the revocation of the supplier’s billing privileges.” Case law continues to evolve and DMEPOS suppliers—and their legal counsel—should stay attuned to new developments on this issue.

**Falsity, knowledge, and limits on damages**

If a DMEPOS supplier is facing a False Claims Act investigation or lawsuit that alleges liability based on noncompliance with the supplier standards, the supplier should articulate several reasons why key elements of False Claims Act liability cannot be met. This is because alleged violations of the supplier standards may bear little-to-no relation to the core elements of False Claims Act liability, namely the knowing submission of a false or fraudulent claim or statement that is material to the government’s payment of a claim. A DMEPOS supplier will want to be familiar, in particular, with the legal elements of falsity and knowledge, and how damages are to be measured under the False Claims Act.

Regarding falsity, obviously, if no supplier standard has been violated, no false claim or statement can be predicated on noncompliance with the supplier standards. Yet, the government can, and sometimes does, interpret a standard in a manner unsupported by the regulatory language itself. Further, compliance with the supplier standards can sometimes be unclear, particularly where the regulations are vague or complicated. A recent court ruling lends support to the argument that lack of clarity alone may undermine the ability of the government or a private litigant to satisfy the “falsity” element of the False Claims Act.9

By that same token, courts have held that even if a claim is technically false, a sufficiently high level of uncertainty and vagueness in the regulations will undermine the knowledge element of False Claims Act liability. Under the same court’s opinion noted above, it was noted that a defendant cannot have knowingly submitted a false claim if the regulations are thoroughly unclear (i.e., where there are legitimate grounds for disagreement over the scope of the regulatory provisions) or if CMS actually knows and approves of the facts surrounding the supplier’s conduct before the challenged claims for payment are submitted, upon which conduct the supplier relies.

Beyond the issue of liability, DMEPOS suppliers should further seek to limit the amount of damages by arguing that damages are to be calculated not as the full amount of the Medicare payment, but instead according to a benefit-of-the-bargain analysis. Under that approach, damages are measured by the difference between the value of what Medicare paid for the item and the value of what the beneficiary actually received. This concept is increasingly being applied by courts in False Claims Act cases.10

This methodology does not apply to actions under the Civil Monetary Penalties Law because that statute fixes damages as the full value of the claims improperly made. There is also some authority holding that a Medicare regulatory violation demands full repayment of the Medicare payments, because Medicare would not have paid any funds without the false claims, and Medicare does not actually receive any direct benefit from the supply of covered items.11 But, that ignores the fact that beneficiaries are the true recipients of the covered items, as well as the Medicare funds to pay for those items. Therefore, DMEPOS suppliers may find success with courts recognizing that the government receives a benefit from the provision of covered items to beneficiaries, and the courts may apply the benefit-of-the-bargain rule in the Medicare context to limit the damages in DMEPOS supplier False Claims Act lawsuits.12

**Practical compliance advice for future conduct**

DMEPOS suppliers should carefully review the existing supplier
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standards to ensure they understand all the rules and requirements for Medicare participation. In addition to the regulations, DMEPOS suppliers should review the preambles to the 2010 final rule and the 2011 proposed rule. That will help DMEPOS suppliers understand CMS’ purpose in issuing the rules, as well as give additional detail on how CMS interprets the regulatory language. CMS and NSC have also published FAQs on the new supplier standards and DMEPOS suppliers should read them to help answer any additional questions on how to interpret the regulations.13 (Note: These FAQs have been revised, so be certain to obtain a copy of the most current version.) DMEPOS suppliers will also find a wealth of information in Chapter 15 of the Medicare Program Integrity Manual, as well as the supplier manuals issued by each of the four regional DME Medicare Administrative Contractors.

Using these materials, as well as the regulations themselves, DMEPOS suppliers can create and tailor risk assessment tools specific to their company’s compliance needs on a going forward basis. Certainly, DMEPOS suppliers should address key risk areas, such as accreditation compliance, billing and documentation, medical necessity of items ordered, state licensure and Medicaid requirements, referral relationships and contracting, and marketing to beneficiaries. DMEPOS suppliers should also ensure their compliance program policies and procedures are current with the recent changes to the supplier standards, keeping in mind the relaxed rules contained in the recent proposed rule. DMEPOS suppliers should then verify that their actual practices regarding the supplier standards match up with the expectations set forth in their written policies and procedures. Staff should be periodically trained and educated on relevant requirements under the supplier standards and related state law rules (e.g., licensure and contracting).

Responding to an investigation of past conduct
Once the foundation has been built for an effective compliance program, DMEPOS suppliers should also be aware of the various legal arguments and strategies to defend against a CMS administrative action or a False Claims Act lawsuit regarding past conduct. Suppliers should not assume the government’s informal interpretation of a standard is the only interpretation or even the correct interpretation, nor should suppliers assume that any and every violation of the supplier standards is of equal materiality or significance. Suppliers should recognize that CMS may only try to recoup funds paid after a formal adverse action, not before. Suppliers should be able to articulate why a particular violation of a supplier standard may not give rise to a false claim (e.g., the standard may not be a condition for payment) and why the government or a litigant cannot prove the other elements of False Claims Act liability. Suppliers should be able to articulate how the regulations or previous government conduct might have been overly vague or confusing and how that uncertainty might have contributed to the suppliers’ past conduct in reliance thereon. Finally, suppliers should understand how to argue for a proper measure of damages based on the benefit-of-the-bargain approach.

Conclusion
DMEPOS suppliers can look to the supplier standards as the cornerstone of their operational compliance concerns. The supplier standards can serve as the framework for risk assessments and proactive compliance reviews as part of an overall effective compliance program. In the unfortunate event of an administrative enforcement action or a whistleblower lawsuit under the False Claims Act, DMEPOS suppliers should be certain their legal counsel understands and takes full advantage of the various defenses they can raise in such litigation. ■

1 42 C.F.R. § 424.57(c).
2 J. Gresko, M. McCollum, H. Sorensen, L. Noller: “A Reasoned Approach to Identify-
DMEPOS and the False Claims Act: Compliance and litigation strategies  ...continued from page 47


5 42 C.F.R. § 424.5.


7 42 C.F.R. § 424.57(b)(3).


12 See, e.g., United States of America ex rel. Williams v. Renal Care Group, 2010 WL 1062634 *10 (M.D. Tenn. (March 22, 2010) (calculating government’s recovery to be the difference between more expensive rate for home-provision of dialysis equipment and less expensive rate for equipment provided at facilities).
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I. INTRODUCTION

As corporate responsibility issues fill the headlines, corporate directors are coming under greater scrutiny. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act, state legislation, agency pronouncements, court cases and scholarly writings offer a myriad of rules, regulations, prohibitions, and interpretations in this area. While all Boards of Directors must address these issues, directors of health care organizations also have important responsibilities that need to be met relating to corporate compliance requirements unique to the health care industry. The expansion of health care regulatory enforcement and compliance activities and the heightened attention being given to the responsibilities of corporate directors are critically important to all health care organizations. In this context, enhanced oversight of corporate compliance programs is widely viewed as consistent with and essential to ongoing federal and state corporate responsibility initiatives.

Our complex health care system needs dedicated and knowledgeable directors at the helm of both for-profit and non-profit corporations. This educational resource, co-sponsored by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the American Health Lawyers Association, the leading health law educational organization, seeks to assist directors of health care organizations in carrying out their important oversight responsibilities in the current challenging health care environment. Improving the knowledge base and effectiveness of those serving on health care organization boards will help to achieve the important goal of continuously improving the U.S. health care system.

Fiduciary Responsibilities

The fiduciary duties of directors reflect the expectation of corporate stakeholders regarding oversight of corporate affairs. The basic fiduciary duty of care principle, which requires a director to act in good faith with the care an ordinarily prudent person would exercise under similar circumstances, is being tested in the current corporate climate. Personal liability for directors, including removal, civil damages, and tax liability, as well as damage to reputation, appears not so far from reality as once widely believed. Accordingly, a basic understanding of the director’s fiduciary obligations and how the duty of care may be exercised in overseeing the company’s compliance systems has become essential.

Embedded within the duty of care is the concept of reasonable inquiry. In other words, directors should make inquiries to management to obtain information necessary to satisfy their duty of care. Although in the Caremark case, also discussed later in this educational resource, the court found that the Caremark board did not breach its fiduciary duty, the court’s opinion also stated the following: “[A] director’s obligation includes a duty to attempt in good faith to assure that a corporate information and reporting system, which the Board concludes is adequate, exists, and that failure to do so under some circumstances, may, in theory at least, render a director liable for losses caused by non-compliance with applicable legal standards.” Clearly, the organization may be at risk and directors, under extreme circumstances, also may be at risk if they fail to reasonably oversee the organization’s compliance program or act as mere passive recipients of information.

On the other hand, courts traditionally have been loath to second-guess Boards of Directors that have followed a careful and thoughtful process in their deliberations, even where ultimate outcomes for the corporation have been negative. Similarly, courts have consistently upheld the distinction between the duties of Boards of Directors and the duties of management. The responsibility of directors is to provide oversight, not manage day-to-day affairs. It is the process the Board follows in establishing that it had access to sufficient information and that it has asked appropriate questions that is most critical to meeting its duty of care.

Purpose of this Document

This educational resource is designed to help health care organization directors ask knowledgeable and appropriate questions related to health care corporate compliance. These questions are not intended to set forth any specific standard of care. Rather, this resource will help corporate directors to establish, and affirmatively demonstrate, that they have followed a reasonable compliance oversight process.

Of course, the circumstances of each organization differ and application of the duty of care and consequent reasonable inquiry will need to be tailored to each specific set of facts and circumstances. However, compliance with the fraud and abuse laws and other federal and state regulatory laws applicable to health care organizations is essential for the lawful behavior and corporate success of such organizations. While these laws can be complex, effective compliance is an asset for both the organization and the health care delivery system. It is hoped that this educational resource is useful to health care organization directors in exercising their oversight responsibilities and supports their ongoing efforts to promote effective corporate compliance.
II. DUTY OF CARE

Of the principal fiduciary obligations/duties owed by directors to their corporations, the one duty specifically implicated by corporate compliance programs is the duty of care.\(^1\)

As the name implies, the duty of care refers to the obligation of corporate directors to exercise the proper amount of care in their decision-making process. State statutes that create the duty of care and court cases that interpret it usually are identical for both for-profit and non-profit corporations.

In most states, duty of care involves determining whether the directors acted (1) in “good faith,” (2) with that level of due diligence to allow them to make an informed decision. In other words, directors must be aware of what is going on about them in the corporate business and must in appropriate circumstances make such reasonable inquiry, as would an ordinarily prudent person under similar circumstances. And, finally, directors are obligated to act in a manner that they reasonably believe is in the best interest of the corporation. In analyzing whether directors have complied with this duty, it is necessary to address each of these elements separately.

The “good faith” analysis usually focuses upon whether the matter or transaction at hand involves any improper financial benefit to an individual, and/or whether any intent exists to take advantage of the corporation (a corollary to the duty of loyalty). The “reasonable inquiry” test asks whether the directors conducted the appropriate level of due diligence to allow them to make an informed decision. In other words, directors must be aware of what is going on about them in the corporate business and must in appropriate circumstances make such reasonable inquiry, as would an ordinarily prudent person under similar circumstances. And, finally, directors are obligated to act in a manner that they reasonably believe is in the best interests of the corporation. This normally relates to the directors’ state of mind with respect to the issues at hand.

In considering directors’ fiduciary obligations, it is important to recognize that the appropriate standard of care is not “perfection.” Directors are not required to know everything about a topic they are asked to consider. They may, where justified, rely on the advice of management and of outside advisors.

Furthermore, many courts apply the “business judgment rule” to determine whether a director’s duty of care has been met with respect to corporate decisions. The rule provides, in essence, that a director will not be held liable for a decision made in good faith, where the director is disinterested, reasonably informed under the circumstances, and rationally believes the decision to be in the best interest of the corporation.

Director obligations with respect to the duty of care arise in two distinct contexts:

- The decision-making function: The application of duty of care principles to a specific decision or a particular board action; and

- The oversight function: The application of duty of care principles with respect to the general activity of the board in overseeing the day-to-day business operations of the corporation; i.e., the exercise of reasonable care to assure that corporate executives carry out their management responsibilities and comply with the law.

Directors’ obligations with respect to corporate compliance programs arise within the context of that oversight function. The leading case in this area, viewed as applicable to all health care organizations, provides that a director has two principal obligations with respect to the oversight function. A director has a duty to attempt in good faith to assure that (1) a corporate information and reporting system exists, and (2) this reporting system is adequate to assure the board that appropriate information as to compliance with applicable laws will come to its attention in a timely manner as a matter of ordinary operations.\(^2\) In *Caremark*, the court addressed the circumstances in which corporate directors may be held liable for breach of the duty of care by failing to adequately supervise corporate employees whose misconduct caused the corporation to violate the law.

In its opinion, the *Caremark* court observed that the level of detail that is appropriate for such an information system is a matter of business judgment. The court also acknowledged that no rationally designed information and reporting system will remove the possibility that the corporation will violate applicable laws or otherwise fail to identify corporate acts potentially inconsistent with relevant law.

Under these circumstances, a director’s failure to reasonably oversee the implementation of a compliance program may put the organization at risk and, under extraordinary circumstances, expose individual directors to personal liability for losses caused by the corporate non-

---

1 The other two core fiduciary duty principals are the duty of loyalty and the duty of obedience to purpose.
2 *In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996). A shareholder sued the Board of Directors of Caremark for breach of the fiduciary duty of care. The lawsuit followed a multi-million dollar civil settlement and criminal plea relating to the payment of kickbacks to physicians and improper billing to federal health care programs.
compliance. Of course, crucial to the oversight function is the fundamental principle that a director is entitled to rely, in good faith, on officers and employees as well as corporate professional experts/advisors in whom the director believes such confidence is merited. A director, however, may be viewed as not acting in good faith if he/she is aware of facts suggesting that such reliance is unwarranted.

In addition, the duty of care test involving reasonable inquiry has not been interpreted to require the director to exercise “proactive vigilance” or to “ferret out” corporate wrongdoing absent a particular warning or a “red flag.” Rather, the duty to make reasonable inquiry increases when “suspicions are aroused or should be aroused;” that is, when the director is presented with extraordinary facts or circumstances of a material nature (e.g., indications of financial improprieties, self-dealing, or fraud) or a major governmental investigation. Absent the presence of suspicious conduct or events, directors are entitled to rely on the senior leadership team in the performance of its duties. Directors are not otherwise obligated to anticipate future problems of the corporation.

Thus, in exercising his/her duty of care, the director is obligated to exercise general supervision and control with respect to corporate officers. However, once presented (through the compliance program or otherwise) with information that causes (or should cause) concerns to be aroused, the director is then obligated to make further inquiry until such time as his/her concerns are satisfactorily addressed and favorably resolved. Thus, while the corporate director is not expected to serve as a compliance officer, he/she is expected to oversee senior management’s operation of the compliance program.

III. THE UNIQUE CHALLENGES OF HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATION DIRECTORS

The health care industry operates in a heavily regulated environment with a variety of identifiable risk areas. An effective compliance program helps mitigate those risks. In addition to the challenges associated with patient care, health care providers are subject to voluminous and sometimes complex sets of rules governing the coverage and reimbursement of medical services. Because federal and state-sponsored health care programs play such a significant role in paying for health care, material non-compliance with these rules can present substantial risks to the health care provider. In addition to recoupment of improper payments, the Medicare, Medicaid and other government health care programs can impose a range of sanctions against health care businesses that engage in fraudulent practices.

Particularly given the current “corporate responsibility” environment, health care organization directors should be concerned with the manner in which they carry out their duty to oversee corporate compliance programs. Depending upon the nature of the corporation, there are a variety of parties that might in extreme circumstances seek to hold corporate directors personally liable for allegedly breaching the duty of oversight with respect to corporate compliance. With respect to for-profit corporations, the most likely individuals to bring a case against the directors are corporate shareholders in a derivative suit, or to a limited degree, a regulatory agency such as the Securities and Exchange Commission. With respect to non-profit corporations, the most likely person to initiate such action is the state attorney general, who may seek equitable relief against the director (e.g., removal) or damages. It is also possible (depending upon state law) that a dissenting director, or the corporate member, could assert a derivative-type action against the directors allegedly responsible for the “inattention,” seeking removal or damages.

Over the last decade, the risks associated with non-compliance have grown dramatically. The government has dedicated substantial resources, including the addition of criminal investigators and prosecutors, to respond to health care fraud and abuse. In addition to government investigators and auditors, private whistleblowers play an important role in identifying allegedly fraudulent billing schemes and other abusive practices. Health care providers can be found liable for submitting claims for reimbursement in reckless disregard or deliberate ignorance of the truth, as well as for intentional fraud. Because the False Claims Act authorizes the imposition of damages of up to three times the amount of the fraud and civil monetary penalties of $11,000 per false claim, record level fines and penalties have been imposed against individuals and health care organizations that have violated the law.

In addition to criminal and civil monetary penalties, health care providers that are found to have defrauded the federal health care programs may be excluded from participation in these programs. The effect of an exclusion can be profound because those excluded will not

---

3 Law is not static, and different states will have different legal developments and standards. Standards may also vary depending on whether an entity is for profit or non-profit. Boards of public health care entities may have additional statutory obligations and should be aware of state and federal statutory requirements applicable to them.
receive payment under Medicare, Medicaid or other federal health care programs for items or services provided to program beneficiaries. The authorities of the OIG provide for mandatory exclusion for a minimum of five years for a conviction with respect to the delivery of a health care item or service. The presence of aggravating circumstances in a case can lead to a lengthier period of exclusion. Of perhaps equal concern to board members, the OIG also has the discretion to exclude providers for certain conduct even absent a criminal conviction. Such conduct includes participation in a fraud scheme, the payment or receipt of kickbacks, and failing to provide services of a quality that meets professionally recognized standards. In lieu of imposing exclusion in these instances, the OIG may require an organization to implement a comprehensive compliance program, requiring independent audits, OIG oversight and annual reporting requirements, commonly referred to as a Corporate Integrity Agreement.

IV. THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

In light of the substantial adverse consequences that may befall an organization that has been found to have committed health care fraud, the health care industry has embraced efforts to improve compliance with federal and state health care program requirements. As a result, many health care providers have developed active compliance programs tailored to their particular circumstances. A recent survey by the Health Care Compliance Association, for example, has found that in just three years, health care organizations with active compliance programs have grown from 55 percent in 1999 to 87 percent in 2002. In support of these efforts, the OIG has developed a series of provider-specific compliance guidances. These voluntary guidelines identify risk areas and offer concrete suggestions to improve and enhance an organization’s internal controls so that its billing practices and other business arrangements are in compliance with Medicare’s rules and regulations.

As compliance programs have matured and new challenges have been identified, health care organization boards of directors have sought ways to help their organization’s compliance program accomplish its objectives. Although health care organization directors may come from diverse backgrounds and business experiences, an individual director can make a valuable contribution toward the compliance objective by asking practical questions of management and contributing his/her experiences from other industries. While the opinion in Caremark established a Board’s duty to oversee a compliance program, it did not enumerate a specific methodology for doing so. It is therefore important that directors participate in the development of this process. This educational resource is designed to assist health care organization directors in exercising that responsibility.

V. SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR DIRECTORS

Periodic consideration of the following questions and commentary may be helpful to a health care organization’s Board of Directors. The structural questions explore the Board’s understanding of the scope of the organization’s compliance program. The remaining questions, addressing operational issues, are directed to the operations of the compliance program and may facilitate the Board’s understanding of the vitality of its compliance program.

STRUCTURAL QUESTIONS

1. How is the compliance program structured and who are the key employees responsible for its implementation and operation? How is the Board structured to oversee compliance issues?

The success of a compliance program relies upon assigning high-level personnel to oversee its implementation and operations. The Board may wish as well to establish a committee or other subset of the Board to monitor compliance program operations and regularly report to the Board.

2. How does the organization’s compliance reporting system work? How frequently does the Board receive reports about compliance issues?

Although the frequency of reports on the status of the compliance program will depend on many circumstances, health care organization Boards should receive reports on a regular basis. Issues that are frequently addressed include (1) what the organization has done in the past with respect to the program and (2) what steps are planned for the future and why those steps are being taken.

3. What are the goals of the organization’s compliance program? What are the inherent limitations in the compliance program? How does the organization address these limitations?

The adoption of a corporate compliance program by an organization creates standards and processes that it should be able to rely upon and against which it may be held accountable. A solid understanding of the rationale and objectives of the compliance program, as well as its goals and inherent limitations, is essential if the Board is to evaluate the reasonableness of its design and the effectiveness of its operation. If the Board has unrealistic expectations of its compliance program, it may place undue reliance...
on its ability to detect vulnerabilities. Furthermore, com-
pliance programs will not prevent all wrongful conduct
and the Board should be satisfied that there are mecha-
nisms to ensure timely reporting of suspected violations
and to evaluate and implement remedial measures.

4. Does the compliance program address the
significant risks of the organization? How were
those risks determined and how are new
compliance risks identified and incorporated
into the program?

Health care organizations operate in a highly regulated
industry and must address various standards, government
program conditions of participation and reimbursement,
and other standards applicable to corporate citizens irre-
spective of industry. A comprehensive ongoing process
of compliance risk assessment is important to the Board’s
awareness of new challenges to the organization and its
evaluation of management’s priorities and program
resource allocation.

5. What will be the level of resources necessary
to implement the compliance program as
envisioned by the Board? How has management
determined the adequacy of the resources
dedicated to implementing and sustaining
the compliance program?

From the outset, it is important to have a realistic under-
standing of the resources necessary to implement and sus-
tain the compliance program as adopted by the Board.
The initial investment in establishing a compliance infra-
structure and training the organization’s employees can be
significant. With the adoption of a compliance program,
the organization is making a long term commitment of
resources because effective compliance systems are not
static programs but instead embrace continuous improve-
ment. Quantifying the organization’s investment in com-
pliance efforts gives the Board the ability to consider the
feasibility of implementation plans against compliance
program goals. Such investment may include annual
budgetary commitments as well as direct and indirect
human resources dedicated to compliance. To help
ensure that the organization is realizing a return on its
compliance investment, the Board also should consider
how management intends to measure the effectiveness
of its compliance program. One measure of effectiveness
may be the Board’s heightened sensitivity to compliance
risk areas.

OPERATIONAL QUESTIONS

The following questions are suggested to assist the Board
in its periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the organi-
zation’s compliance program and the sufficiency of its
reporting systems.

A. Code of Conduct

How has the Code of Conduct or its equivalent been
incorporated into corporate policies across the organiza-
tion? How do we know that the Code is understood and
accepted across the organization? Has management
taken affirmative steps to publicize the importance of
the Code to all of its employees?

Regardless of its title, a Code of Conduct is fundamental
to a successful compliance program because it articulates
the organization’s commitment to ethical behavior. The
Code should function in the same way as a constitution,
i.e., as a document that details the fundamental principles,
values, and framework for action within the organization.
The Code of Conduct helps define the organization’s cul-
ture; all relevant operating policies are derivative of its prin-
ciples. As such, codes are of real benefit only if meaningfully
communicated and accepted throughout the organization.

B. Policies and Procedures

Has the organization implemented policies and
procedures that address compliance risk areas and estab-
lished internal controls to counter those
vulnerabilities?

If the Code of Conduct reflects the organization’s ethical
philosophy, then its policies and procedures represent the
organization’s response to the day-to-day risks that it con-
fronts while operating in the current health care system.
These policies and procedures help reduce the prospect
of erroneous claims, as well as fraudulent activity by identi-
fying and responding to risk areas. Because compliance
risk areas evolve with the changing reimbursement rules
and enforcement climate, the organization’s policies and
procedures also need periodic review and, where appro-
priate, revision.1 Regular consultation with counsel,
including reports to the Board, can assist the Board in its
oversight responsibilities in this changing environment.

1 There are a variety of materials available to assist health care organizations in this regard. For example, both sponsoring organizations of this educational
resource offer various materials and guidance, accessible through their web sites.
C. Compliance Infrastructure

1. Does the Compliance Officer have sufficient authority to implement the compliance program? Has management provided the Compliance Officer with the autonomy and sufficient resources necessary to perform assessments and respond appropriately to misconduct?

Designating and delegating appropriate authority to a compliance officer is essential to the success of the organization’s compliance program. For example, the Compliance Officer must have the authority to review all documents and other information that are relevant to compliance activities. Boards should ensure that lines of reporting within management and to the Board, and from the Compliance Officer and consultants, are sufficient to ensure timely and candid reports for those responsible for the compliance program. In addition, the Compliance Officer must have sufficient personnel and financial resources to implement fully all aspects of the compliance program.

2. Have compliance-related responsibilities been assigned across the appropriate levels of the organization? Are employees held accountable for meeting these compliance-related objectives during performance reviews?

The successful implementation of a compliance program requires the distribution throughout the organization of compliance-related responsibilities. The Board should satisfy itself that management has developed a system that establishes accountability for proper implementation of the compliance program. The experience of many organizations is that program implementation lags where there is poor distribution of responsibility, authority and accountability beyond the Compliance Officer.

D. Measures to Prevent Violations

1. What is the scope of compliance-related education and training across the organization? Has the effectiveness of such training been assessed? What policies/measures have been developed to enforce training requirements and to provide remedial training as warranted?

A critical element of an effective compliance program is a system of effective organization-wide training on compliance standards and procedures. In addition, there should be specific training on identified risk areas, such as claims development and submission, and marketing practices.

Because it can represent a significant commitment of resources, the Board should understand the scope and effectiveness of the educational program to assess the return on that investment.

2. How is the Board kept apprised of significant regulatory and industry developments affecting the organization’s risk? How is the compliance program structured to address such risks?

The Board’s oversight of its compliance program occurs in the context of significant regulatory and industry developments that impact the organization not only as a health care organization but more broadly as a corporate entity. Without such information, it cannot reasonably assess the steps being taken by management to mitigate such risks and reasonably rely on management’s judgment.

3. How are “at risk” operations assessed from a compliance perspective? Is conformance with the organization’s compliance program periodically evaluated? Does the organization periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the compliance program?

Compliance risk is further mitigated through internal review processes. Monitoring and auditing provide early identification of program or operational weaknesses and may substantially reduce exposure to government or whistleblower claims. Although many assessment techniques are available, one effective tool is the performance of regular, periodic compliance audits by internal or external auditors. In addition to evaluating the organization’s conformance with reimbursement or other regulatory rules, or the legality of its business arrangements, an effective compliance program periodically reviews whether the compliance program’s elements have been satisfied.

4. What processes are in place to ensure that appropriate remedial measures are taken in response to identified weaknesses?

Responding appropriately to deficiencies or suspected non-compliance is essential. Failure to comply with the organization’s compliance program, or violation of applicable laws and other types of misconduct, can threaten the organization’s status as a reliable and trustworthy provider of health care. Moreover, failure to respond to a known deficiency may be considered an aggravating circumstance in evaluating the organization’s potential liability for the underlying problem.
E. Measures to Respond to Violations

1. What is the process by which the organization evaluates and responds to suspected compliance violations? How are reporting systems, such as the compliance hotline, monitored to verify appropriate resolution of reported matters?

Compliance issues may range from simple overpayments to be returned to the payor to possible criminal violations. The Board’s duty of care requires that it explore whether procedures are in place to respond to credible allegations of misconduct and whether management promptly initiates corrective measures. Many organizations take disciplinary actions when a responsible employee’s conduct violates the organization’s Code of Conduct and policies. Disciplinary measures should be enforced consistently.

2. Does the organization have policies that address the appropriate protection of “whistleblowers” and those accused of misconduct?

For a compliance program to work, employees must be able to ask questions and report problems. In its fulfillment of its duty of care, the Board should determine that the organization has a process in place to encourage such constructive communication.

3. What is the process by which the organization evaluates and responds to suspected compliance violations? What policies address the protection of employees and the preservation of relevant documents and information?

Legal risk may exist based not only on the conduct under scrutiny, but also on the actions taken by the organization in response to the investigation. In addition to a potential obstruction of a government investigation, the organization may face charges by employees that it has unlawfully retaliated or otherwise violated employee rights. It is important, therefore, that organizations respond appropriately to a suspected compliance violation and, more critically, to a government investigation without damaging the corporation or the individuals involved. The Board should confirm that processes and policies for such responses have been developed in consultation with legal counsel and are well communicated and understood across the organization.

4. What guidelines have been established for reporting compliance violations to the Board?

As discussed, the Board should fully understand management’s process for evaluating and responding to identified violations of the organization’s policies, as well as applicable federal and state laws. In addition, the Board should receive sufficient information to evaluate the appropriateness of the organization’s response.

5. What policies govern the reporting to government authorities of probable violations of law?

Different organizations will have various policies for investigating probable violations of law. Federal law encourages organizations to self-disclose wrongdoing to the federal government. Health care organizations and their counsel have taken varied approaches to making such disclosures. Boards may want to inquire as to whether the organization has developed a policy on when to consider such disclosures.

VI. Conclusion

The corporate director, whether voluntary or compensated, is a bedrock of the health care delivery system. The oversight activities provided by the director help form the corporate vision, and at the same time promote an environment of corporate responsibility that protects the mission of the corporation and the health care consumers it serves.

Even in this “corporate responsibility” environment, the health care corporate director who is mindful of his/her fundamental duties and obligations, and sensitive to the premises of corporate responsibility, should be confident in the knowledge that he/she can pursue governance service without needless concern about personal liability for breach of fiduciary duty and without creating an adversarial relationship with management.

The perspectives shared in this educational resource are intended to assist the health care director in performing the important and necessary service of oversight of the corporate compliance program. In so doing, it is hoped that fiduciary service will appear less daunting, and provide a greater opportunity to “make a difference” in the delivery of health care.
SELECTED FACT SHEETS

DMEPOS COMPLIANCE ISSUES
LACKTMAN / FLETCHER
In accordance with §414.422(d)(1), a DMEPOS supplier participating in the competitive bidding program that is negotiating a change of ownership (CHOW) must notify the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) at least 60 days before the anticipated date of the change.

A CHOW does not, however, automatically grant contract supplier status to the new owner. CMS may permit the transfer of a competitive bidding contract to an entity that merges with or acquires a competitive bidding contract supplier if the new owner assumes all rights, obligations, and liabilities of the competitive bidding contract. A competitive bidding contract cannot be subdivided. For the transfer of the contract to be considered, the CHOW must include the assumption of the entire Medicare competitive bidding contract, including all competitive bidding areas (CBAs) and product categories awarded under the contract. CMS may allow the transfer of a competitive bidding contract to a new owner only if that entity meets all requirements applicable to a contract supplier. Contract suppliers that do not notify CMS of a CHOW will be considered in breach of contract.

Please use the Change of Ownership – Contract Supplier Notification Form, which is available on the Competitive Bidding Implementation Contractor (CBIC) website at www.dmecompetitivebid.com, to notify CMS at least 60 days before the anticipated date of a CHOW.

New Entity vs. Successor Entity

A change of ownership results in a “new entity” or a “successor entity.” A new entity is an entity that is formed as a result of a merger or acquisition and that did not exist prior to the transaction. For example, company A merges with or acquires company B to form company C, a brand new company. Company C is considered a new entity.

A successor entity is an existing entity that merges with or acquires a contract supplier and continues to exist after the CHOW as it existed before the transaction. For example, company A merges with or acquires company B (a contract supplier). Company A remains in existence after the CHOW and wants to assume the obligations of company B’s competitive bidding contract. Company A is considered a successor entity. (See Figure 1 on page 3 for additional examples and required documents.)

Transactions That Do Not Constitute a Change of Ownership for Competitive Bidding

A merger of a non-contract supplier with a contract supplier does not constitute a change of ownership for competitive bidding purposes provided the contract supplier continues to exist and remains the supplier performing the competitive bidding contract. For example, company A (a contract supplier) merges with company B (a non-contract supplier), and company A assumes ownership and continues as the contract supplier. This does not constitute a change of ownership, and no novation agreement is required. However, the successor entity (company A in this example) should notify the CBIC and the National Supplier Clearinghouse (NSC) regarding any change of ownership regardless of contract status. Company A should complete the Contract Supplier Change of Information Form or the Contract Supplier Location Update Form, both of which are available on the CBIC website, to identify any changes in authorized officials or changes in new locations. All new locations should meet applicable competitive bidding requirements before they can furnish items under the competitive bidding program.

A sale of corporate stock (as in shares possessed by a stockholder) does not constitute a change of ownership, and no novation agreement is required. However, a stock purchase involving the purchase of assets and liabilities is considered a CHOW, and the CHOW requirements must be followed. In the event that a proprietorship incorporates and becomes a new corporation, then a new entity is formed, a change of ownership takes place, and a novation agreement is required.
Novation Agreement

A novation agreement is a legal document that is signed by the successor entity or new entity and CMS. For a new or successor entity to be designated as a contract supplier, it must submit a signed novation agreement acceptable to CMS stating that it will assume all competitive bidding rights, obligations, and liabilities according to the contract, including serving all CBAs and providing all product categories included in the contract.

A supplier cannot divide a competitive bidding contract by CBAs or product categories for purposes of mergers or acquisitions. For example, company A (a contract supplier) sells its business to or merges with company B. Company B must agree to assume all obligations under company A’s competitive bidding contract with CMS. In essence, company B ”steps into the shoes” of company A with respect to all of the contract obligations as of the beginning of the competitive bidding contract. CMS will review all novation agreements and will only accept those that assign all contract supplier obligations to the successor or new entity.

An acceptable novation agreement should include the following:

1. The agreement should clearly delineate the parties involved and must be between the transferee (purchaser) and CMS.
2. CMS shall not incur any costs associated with the contract transfer.
3. The transferee should agree to purchase all assets necessary to perform the terms of the contract.
4. The transferee must assume all rights, obligations, and liabilities of the competitive bidding contract that may have occurred from the transferor (seller) of the competitive bidding contract from the effective date of the contract as if the transferee were the original party to the contract.
5. The agreement must state that CMS does not waive its rights against the transferor insofar as the transferor may have violated federal law with respect to the DMEPOS contract.
6. The transferee must assume the entire competitive bidding contract from the transferor, which includes all of the CBAs and product categories awarded under the contract.
7. The transferee should ensure the efficient transfer of services to Medicare beneficiaries required under the competitive bidding contract, such that Medicare beneficiaries continue to receive uninterrupted services.
8. The agreement must be signed by the appropriate representatives of the respective companies with certification and warranty by each party that it has full power and authority to enter into a novation agreement.

Required Information and Documentation

The following CHOW documents should be submitted to the CBIC within 30 days of the effective date of the CHOW. Suppliers must also make available any additional documentation requested by CMS in order to effect the transfer of competitive bidding contract obligations.

1. One signed copy of the required novation agreement.
   • Successor entities must submit a signed novation agreement within 30 days prior to the effective date of the sale.
   • New entities must submit a final draft of a novation agreement at least 30 days prior to the effective date of the CHOW and an executed novation agreement within 30 days after the effective date of the CHOW.
2. One copy of a document describing the nature of the CHOW transaction, such as an authenticated copy of the instrument effecting the transfer of assets (e.g., bill of sale, certificate of merger, contract, deed, agreement, or court decree), unless the information is provided in the novation agreement.
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3 Sufficient information about the contract being purchased, such as the seller’s legal business name, Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), National Provider Identification (NPI) number (if applicable), authorized official name, telephone number, and e-mail address. Please use the Change of Ownership – Purchaser Form, which is available on the CBIC website, to provide this information.

4 A list of all locations that will be furnishing the product category(s) for the CBA(s) under the contract. Each location must meet all competitive bidding program eligibility, accreditation, state licensure, and financial requirements. All locations that service the CBA(s) and furnish items within the product category(s) must be included on this list. Please use the Change of Ownership – Purchaser Form to provide this information. This information is for CHOW evaluation purposes only. If CMS determines the CHOW is acceptable, the purchasing supplier should then add or remove locations using the Contract Supplier Location Update Form, which is available on the CBIC website.

5 If the transferee is a corporation, it should submit a copy of its certificate and articles of incorporation.

Other Document Requirements

To assume a competitive bidding contract, the successor or new entity may have to submit new or additional documents to demonstrate compliance with §414.414(b) through (d), the supplier eligibility, accreditation, quality, and financial standards. A successor entity must submit these documents if it has not previously submitted them or the documents are no longer current. The following chart provides guidance on when a novation agreement is necessary and when to submit financial documents.

**Figure 1: Change of Ownership Summary Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Change of Ownership</th>
<th>Novation</th>
<th>CMS Notification*</th>
<th>Financial Documents Required**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company A (CB Contract)</td>
<td>Company B (Non-Contract)</td>
<td>Company A (No CHOW)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company A (Non-Contract)</td>
<td>Company B (CB Contract)</td>
<td>Company A (Successor)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company A (CB Contract)</td>
<td>Company B (CB Contract)</td>
<td>Company A (Successor)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company A (CB Contract)</td>
<td>Company B (Non-Contract)</td>
<td>Company C (New)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information should be submitted to the CBIC by one of two methods:

** Fax: 803-264-6228

** Mail: Palmetto GBA
Competitive Bidding Implementation Contractor
2743 Perimeter Pkwy Ste 200-400
Augusta, GA 30909-6499

** Please refer to the Request for Bids (RFB) Instructions on the CBIC website for required financial documents.
The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) recompetes competitive bidding contracts at least once every three years and announces the specific contract periods in the Request for Bids (RFB). Contract suppliers are responsible for fulfilling all terms of their contracts, starting on the very first day of the contract period, for the duration of the contract period. Here are key contract terms suppliers should consider when preparing their bids:

• Contract suppliers must maintain Medicare billing privileges, state licensure, and accreditation throughout the contract period. Contract suppliers must also comply with all other competitive bidding program requirements. For example, contract suppliers must accept assignment on all items under their contracts. Payment for items under the contract will be based on the single payment amount.

• Contract suppliers cannot discriminate against Medicare beneficiaries. The items a contract supplier makes available to Medicare beneficiaries under its contract must be the same items furnished to other customers.

• A contract supplier must agree to furnish covered items under its contract to any beneficiary who maintains a permanent residence in or visits a competitive bidding area (CBA) and requests those items from the contract supplier. The only exception to this rule is a skilled nursing facility (SNF) or nursing facility (NF) that has been awarded a contract as a specialty supplier. SNFs and NFs that are specialty suppliers may only furnish contract items to their own residents. For more information on specialty suppliers, please see the Specialty Suppliers fact sheet.

• If a physician or other treating practitioner orders a specific brand or mode of delivery to avoid an adverse medical outcome for a beneficiary, the contract supplier must either provide that specific item, consult with the physician for a suitable alternative and obtain a revised written prescription, or assist the beneficiary with locating a contract supplier that will furnish the item. For more information, please see the Prescription for Specific Brand or Mode of Delivery fact sheet.

• Under the national mail-order competition, contract suppliers must furnish the brand of diabetic testing supplies that works with the home blood glucose monitor selected by the beneficiary. Contract suppliers are prohibited from influencing or incentivizing beneficiaries by persuading, pressuring, or advising them to switch from their current brand (or, for new beneficiaries, from their preferred brand) of glucose monitor and testing supplies. Contract suppliers may not furnish unsolicited information about alternative brands. For more information, please see the National Mail-Order Competition for Diabetic Supplies fact sheet.

• The sale of a competitive bidding contract is prohibited. If CMS determines that a contract supplier sold its competitive bidding contract, that contract will be terminated. This rule does not prevent a contract supplier from entering into a change of ownership (CHOW) transaction. For example, a contract supplier could merge with or acquire a non-contract supplier if it chooses to do so. The merger or acquisition must be reported to CMS for its review, must be in compliance with all supplier standards and accreditation requirements, and comply with all competitive bidding program requirements. A contract supplier has specific obligations to notify CMS when it is negotiating a change of ownership.

CMS may award a contract to an entity that merges with or acquires a contract supplier under specific circumstances. When a change of ownership is reported, CMS will evaluate whether the new owner complies with the appropriate quality standards and accreditation requirements, supplier enrollment requirements, financial standards, and all other applicable program requirements. Please see the RFB instructions and Change of Ownership fact sheet for more information.
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Contract suppliers are responsible for the items and services they provide directly or through the use of subcontractors. The only permissible subcontracting arrangements are those that comply with the DMEPOS Supplier Standards and applicable accreditation requirements. If a contract supplier decides to use a subcontractor for those services permitted by the supplier standards, the contract supplier as well as the subcontractor must have the applicable state licenses.

Contract suppliers must notify CMS of any subcontracting relationships that they have entered into for purposes of furnishing items and services under the program. They must also disclose whether the subcontractor meets accreditation requirements necessary to furnish these services. After the award of contracts, suppliers must notify CMS within 10 business days of entering into an agreement with subcontractors. A Subcontractor Disclosure form is available on the Competitive Bidding Implementation Contractor (CBIC) website (www.dmecompetitivebid.com). If a subcontractor does not perform in compliance with the terms of the contract, the contract supplier will be in breach of the contract. For more information about subcontractors, please see the Subcontracting fact sheet and Frequently Asked Questions.

Contract suppliers are not guaranteed a minimum amount of business. Contract suppliers will compete among themselves for Medicare beneficiaries' business on factors such as quality and customer service.

Each contract supplier must submit a quarterly report (Form C) indicating the manufacturer and model of the items it offers to all customers. The supplier is also expected to review the information in the Supplier Directory posted on the Medicare website (www.medicare.gov) to determine if the information is current. Current information must be submitted to the CBIC within 10 calendar days of the close of each quarter. Any deviation from the contract requirements, including failure to comply with governmental agency or licensing organization requirements, constitutes a breach of contract. If a supplier breaches the contract, CMS has the right to take corrective action. For example, CMS could require a corrective action plan, suspend or terminate the contract, preclude the contract supplier from participating in the competitive bidding program, or revoke the contract supplier’s billing number.
The “primary supplier” of an item of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) is the enrolled DMEPOS supplier that bills Medicare for reimbursement of the item for which it furnishes. As part of furnishing the item, the primary supplier is responsible for the overall service of furnishing the item and coordinating the care for the beneficiary in compliance with the physician’s order and Medicare rules and guidelines, but the primary supplier may subcontract certain services.

Consistent with the DMEPOS Supplier Standards, a subcontractor may perform the following services:

- **Purchase of inventory**: 42 CFR 424.57 (c)(4) Fills orders, fabricates, or fits items from its own inventory or by contracting with other companies for the purchase of items necessary to fill the order. If it does, it must provide, upon request, copies of contracts or other documentation showing compliance with this standard. A supplier may not contract with any entity that is currently excluded from the Medicare program, any state healthcare programs, or from any other federal government executive branch procurement or non-procurement program or activity. A subcontractor that performs only this service does not need to be accredited.

- **Delivery and instruction on use of Medicare-covered item**: 42 CFR 424.57 (c)(12) Must be responsible for the delivery of Medicare-covered items to beneficiaries and maintain proof of delivery. (The supplier must document that it or another qualified party has, at an appropriate time, provided beneficiaries with necessary information and instructions on how to use Medicare-covered items safely and effectively). A subcontractor that only delivers the item does not need to be accredited. If the subcontractor provides more than the delivery by setting up the equipment or giving instructions on the use of the item, then the subcontractor needs to be accredited, unless a professional exemption or the pharmacy exemption applies.

- **Repair of rented equipment**: 42 CFR 424.57 (c)(14) Must maintain and replace at no charge or repair directly, or through a service contract with another company, Medicare-covered items it has rented to beneficiaries. The item must function as required and intended after being repaired or replaced. A subcontractor that only repairs equipment that a supplier is renting to a beneficiary does not need to be accredited. If the subcontractor provides more than the repair of the equipment by setting up the repaired item or giving instructions on the use of the repaired item, then the subcontractor needs to be accredited, unless a professional exemption or the pharmacy exemption applies.

In addition to complying with the supplier standards, DMEPOS suppliers must meet the quality standards, which have been issued consistent with the mandate in section 1834(a)(20) of the Social Security Act. The quality standards delineate the services that a supplier is required to perform in the course of furnishing quality items and services. While the quality standards are not meant to be an exhaustive list of services a supplier performs when furnishing DMEPOS, they do highlight many of the services that a primary supplier performs in the course of furnishing the item and coordinating the care for the beneficiary. Services such as intake and assessment, coordination of care with the physician, submitting claims on behalf of the beneficiary, ownership and responsibility for equipment furnished to the beneficiary, ensuring product safety, etc., are all services for which the primary supplier is responsible.
The quality standards document many of the primary supplier services or functions and are, therefore, a good reference tool for distinguishing the role of the primary supplier versus the role of a subcontractor as described in the DMEPOS Supplier Standards. The primary suppliers are accountable for ensuring that all of the services associated with furnishing the item, including subcontracted services, are performed in compliance with the physician’s order and Medicare rules and guidelines. All suppliers, including those that perform subcontracted services, must be accredited, unless they qualify for one of the professional exemptions provided in section 1834(a)(20)(F)(ii) of the Social Security Act (the Act) or they are pharmacies that are exempt from accreditation because they satisfy the criteria described in 1834 (a)(20)(G) of the Act. (Please note that, while the pharmacy accreditation exemption applies to pharmacies that are subcontractors, it does not apply to pharmacies that want to bid.)

In accordance with the requirements in the quality standards and the supplier standards, it is expected that referral agents and Medicare beneficiaries will communicate with the primary supplier to arrange for furnishing of DMEPOS items and services.
As a contract supplier in the Medicare Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies (DMEPOS) competitive bidding program, you may lawfully refer to yourself as a “Medicare Contract Supplier” when providing information about items included in your contract to beneficiaries. However, it is important to understand that all of the existing rules and regulations regarding marketing DMEPOS to beneficiaries under the fee-for-service program also apply to DMEPOS contract suppliers under competitive bidding. Failure to comply with these standards is a breach of contract and may result in contract termination, the revocation of Medicare billing privileges, civil money penalties, and other significant penalties.

Here are key requirements applicable to all DMEPOS suppliers that contract suppliers should remember when marketing to beneficiaries:

- DMEPOS suppliers must not use symbols, emblems or names in reference to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), the Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security, or Medicare in a manner creating the false impression of endorsement or approval or in a manner otherwise prohibited by section 1140(a) of the Social Security Act. See 42 U.S.C section 1320b-10 for the entire text of Section 1140(a).

- DMEPOS suppliers are prohibited from making unsolicited contact by telephone to Medicare beneficiaries. There are three circumstances (exceptions) under which a supplier may contact beneficiaries:
  - The beneficiary has given written permission to the supplier to contact him or her about furnishing a Medicare-covered item that is to be rented or purchased.
  - The supplier has furnished a Medicare-covered item to the beneficiary, and the supplier is contacting the beneficiary about such item.
  - If the contact concerns the furnishing of a Medicare-covered item other than a covered item already furnished to the individual, the supplier must have furnished at least one covered item to the individual during the 15-month period preceding the date on which the supplier makes such contact.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has posted additional information about telemarketing requirements on its website at: https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Provider-Enrollment-and-Certification/MedicareProviderSupEnroll/Downloads/DMEPOSTelemarketingFAQs.pdf.

The Office of Inspector General has also provided information on telemarketing requirements on its website at: http://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/docs/alertsandbulletins/fraudalert_telemarketing.pdf.

If anyone has knowledge of a potential marketing violation by a DMEPOS supplier, he or she may call and report the violation to 1-800-MEDICARE or 1-800-HHS-TIPS. Additionally, persons receiving any written materials which were used to promote this violation should be prepared to make the material available to the government.
## Competitive Bidding Area (CBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield-Delano, CA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore-Towson, MD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham-Hoover, AL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City-Nampa, ID</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx-Manhattan, NY CBA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-Chicago Metro CBA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, TN-GA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
El Paso, TX  5
Flint, MI  5
Fresno, CA  5
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI  5
Greensboro-High Point, NC  5
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC  6
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT  6
Honolulu, HI  6
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX  6
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH  6
Indiana-Chicago Metro CBA  6
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN  6
Jackson, MS  6
Jacksonville, FL  6
Knoxville, TN  6
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL  6
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV  6
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR  6
Los Angeles County CBA  6
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN  6
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX  6
Memphis, TN-MS-AR  6
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI  6
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI  7
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN  7
Nassau-Brooklyn-Queens-Richmond County Metro CBA  7
New Haven-Milford, CT  7
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA  7
North East NY CBA Metro  7
North Port-Bradenton-Sarasota, FL  7
Northern NJ Metro CBA  7
Northern-Chicago Metro CBA  7
Ocala, FL  7
Oklahoma City, OK  7
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA  7
Orange County CBA  7
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA  7
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL  7
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD
Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA
Raleigh-Cary, NC
Richmond, VA
Rochester, NY
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA
Salt Lake City, UT
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA
South-West-Chicago-Metro CBA
Southern NY Metro CBA
Springfield, MA
St. Louis, MO-IL
Stockton, CA
Suffolk County CBA
Syracuse, NY
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL
Toledo, OH
Tucson, AZ
Tulsa, OK
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC
Visalia-Porterville, CA
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV
Wichita, KS
Worcester, MA
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA
## Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies (DMEPOS) Competitive Bidding Program

### Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</th>
<th>CPAP/RAD Related Supplies &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>Enteral Nutrients, Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Hospital Beds &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>NPWT</th>
<th>Oxygen Supplies &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Standard Wheelchairs, Scooters, and Accessories</th>
<th>Support Surfaces</th>
<th>Walkers &amp; Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>Bidders 23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY</td>
<td>Bidders 21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Bidders 22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ</td>
<td>Bidders 28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
<td>Bidders 22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA</td>
<td>Bidders 34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC</td>
<td>Bidders 22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos, TX</td>
<td>Bidders 30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield-Delano, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore-Towson, MD</td>
<td>Bidders 32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA</td>
<td>Bidders 19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX</td>
<td>Bidders 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham-Hoover, AL</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City-Nampa, ID</td>
<td>Bidders 25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH</td>
<td>Bidders 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT</td>
<td>Bidders 23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx-Manhattan NY CBA</td>
<td>Bidders 23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY</td>
<td>Bidders 26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</th>
<th>PRODUCT CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP/RAD Related Supplies &amp; Accessories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-Chicago Metro CBA</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga, TN-GA</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, SC</td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint, MI</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro-High Point, NC</td>
<td><strong>Bidders</strong> 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong> 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</th>
<th>PRODUCT CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPAP/RAD Enteral Hospital NPWT Oxygen Standard Support Walkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related Nutrients, Beds &amp; Supplies Supplies &amp; Wheelchairs, Surfaces &amp; Accessories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment &amp; Equipment &amp; Equipment Scooters, and Accessories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford-West Hartford-East</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, HI</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana-Chicago Metro CBA</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis-Carmel, IN</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas-Paradise, NV</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County CBA</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN-MS-AR</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</th>
<th>CPAP/RAD Related Supplies &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>Enteral Nutrients, Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Hospital Beds &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>NPWT</th>
<th>Oxygen Supplies &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Standard Wheelchairs, Scooters, and Accessories</th>
<th>Support Surfaces</th>
<th>Walkers &amp; Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-</td>
<td>Bidders 29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington, MN-WI</td>
<td>Locations 47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville-Davidson--</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murfreesboro--Franklin,</td>
<td>Locations 49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau-Brooklyn-Queens-</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond County Metro CBA</td>
<td>Locations 33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven-Milford, CT</td>
<td>Bidders 21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East NY CBA Metro</td>
<td>Bidders 22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Port-Bradenton-</td>
<td>Bidders 25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, FL</td>
<td>Locations 37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern NJ Metro CBA</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern-Chicago Metro CBA</td>
<td>Locations 36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala, FL</td>
<td>Bidders 26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td>Locations 37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA</td>
<td>Bidders 24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County CBA</td>
<td>Locations 36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL</td>
<td>Locations 33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-</td>
<td>Bidders 35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>Locations 67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ</td>
<td>Bidders 28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA</td>
<td>Locations 43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD</td>
<td>Bidders 28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ</td>
<td>Locations 43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA</td>
<td>Locations 39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</th>
<th>CPAP/RAD Related Supplies &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>Enteral Nutrients, Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Hospital Beds &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>NPWT</th>
<th>Oxygen Supplies &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Standard Wheelchairs, Scooters, and Accessories</th>
<th>Support Surfaces</th>
<th>Walkers &amp; Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY</td>
<td>Bidders 21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA</td>
<td>Bidders 24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Cary, NC</td>
<td>Bidders 31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>Bidders 28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, NY</td>
<td>Bidders 20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Bidders 27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX</td>
<td>Bidders 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA</td>
<td>Bidders 19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Bidders 29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West-Chicago-Metro CBA</td>
<td>Bidders 23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern NY Metro CBA</td>
<td>Bidders 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>Bidders 19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL</td>
<td>Bidders 32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>Bidders 26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County CBA</td>
<td>Bidders 24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contract Offers by Competitive Bidding Area and Product Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>CPAP/RAD Related Supplies &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>Enteral Nutrients, Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Hospital Beds &amp; Accessories</th>
<th>NPWT</th>
<th>Oxygen Supplies &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Standard Wheelchairs, Scooters, and Accessories</th>
<th>Support Surfaces</th>
<th>Walkers &amp; Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETITIVE BIDDING AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia-Porterville, CA</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locations</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>