

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

1. Type of Estimate and Analysis

Original Updated Corrected

2. Administrative Rule Chapter, Title and Number

CSB 2.39

3. Subject

Excluding Naloxegol from scheduling

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

On January 23, 2015, the United States Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration published its final rule in the Federal Register removing Naloxegol from schedule II of the federal Controlled Substances Act. The scheduling action was effective on January 23, 2015. The Wisconsin Controlled Substances Board took affirmative action on March 25, 2015 to similarly exclude Naloxegol under chapter 961, Stats. effective April 1, 2015 to allow for publication in the Administrative Register.

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.

This rule was posted for economic comments for 14 days and none were received.

11. Identify the local governmental units that participated in the development of this EIA.

None

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)

There is no economic or fiscal impact.

13. Benefits of Implementing the Rule and Alternative(s) to Implementing the Rule

The benefit is for the federal and state controlled substance act to be in conformity.

14. Long Range Implications of Implementing the Rule

Naloxegol will not be treated as a controlled substance.

15. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Federal Government

The federal government removed Naloxegol from scheduling on January 23, 2015.

16. Compare With Approaches Being Used by Neighboring States (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota)

Our surrounding states do not exclude Naloxegol from scheduling.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Fiscal Estimate & Economic Impact Analysis

17. Contact Name

Sharon Henes

18. Contact Phone Number

(608) 261-2377

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

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
-