STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R03/2012)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis
☒ Original ☐ Updated ☐ Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number
Ch. Phar 18, PRESCRIPTION DRUG MONITORING PROGRAM (PDMP)

3. Subject
Revise the rule too be consistent with 2013 Act 3, removing veterinarians from the definition of "practitioners" and the requirement to collect and submit data to the PDMP.

4. Fund Sources Affected
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☒ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S

5. Chapter 20, Stats. Appropriations Affected
20.165(1)(g)

6. Fiscal Effect of Implementing the Rule
☒ No Fiscal Effect ☐ Increase Existing Revenues ☐ Increase Costs
☐ Indeterminate ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues ☐ Could Absorb Within Agency's Budget
☐ Decrease Cost

7. The Rule Will Impact the Following (Check All That Apply)
☐ State's Economy ☐ Specific Businesses/Sectors
☐ Local Government Units ☐ Public Utility Rate Payers
☐ Small Businesses **(if checked, complete Attachment A)**

8. Would Implementation and Compliance Costs Be Greater Than $20 million?
☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Policy Problem Addressed by the Rule
The rule as it currently reads is not consistent with 2013 Act 3, which removed veterinarians from the definition of "practitioners" no longer requiring them to collect and submit data to the PDMP.

10. Summary of the businesses, business sectors, associations representing business, local governmental units, and individuals that may be affected by the proposed rule that were contacted for comments.
Veterinarians

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.
None identified.

12. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Specific Businesses, Business Sectors, Public Utility Rate Payers, Local Governmental Units and the State's Economy as a Whole (Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)
None known.

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule
The rule will be consistent with 2013 Act 3, which removed veterinarians from the definition of "practitioners" no longer requiring them to collect and submit data to the PDMP. Doing nothing with result in a rule not reflecting state statues.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule
None known.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government
There is no existing or proposed federal regulation.

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)
An Internet-based search for similar prescription drug monitoring programs revealed that the states of Illinois, Michigan, and Minnesota allow veterinarians to access their on-line reporting website or specifically require veterinarians to report dispensing through their statues or codes. The search did not reveal that Iowa codes or statutes require or exempt veterinarians from reporting to their prescription drug monitoring program.

17. Contact Name	18. Contact Phone Number
Jean MacCubbin	608-266-0955

This document can be made available in alternate formats to individuals with disabilities upon request.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R03/2012)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
DOA-2049 (R03/2012)

DIVISION OF EXECUTIVE BUDGET AND FINANCE
101 EAST WILSON STREET, 10TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 7864
MADISON, WI 53707-7864
FAX: (608) 267-0372

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

ATTACHMENT A

1. Summary of Rule's Economic and Fiscal Impact on Small Businesses (Separately for each Small Business Sector, Include Implementation and Compliance Costs Expected to be Incurred)

2. Summary of the data sources used to measure the Rule's impact on Small Businesses

3. Did the agency consider the following methods to reduce the impact of the Rule on Small Businesses?

☐ Less Stringent Compliance or Reporting Requirements
☐ Less Stringent Schedules or Deadlines for Compliance or Reporting
☐ Consolidation or Simplification of Reporting Requirements
☐ Establishment of performance standards in lieu of Design or Operational Standards
☐ Exemption of Small Businesses from some or all requirements
☐ Other, describe:

4. Describe the methods incorporated into the Rule that will reduce its impact on Small Businesses

5. Describe the Rule's Enforcement Provisions

6. Did the Agency prepare a Cost Benefit Analysis (if Yes, attach to form)

☐ Yes ☐ No