

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 6

NUMBER 12

December 2020

Editor's Note: Guidance

Victoria Prussen Spears 407

Department of Defense Overhauls Contractor Information Security Requirements Through Its Interim Rule Implementing the CMMC and DoD NIST SP 800-171 Assessment Methodology

Thomas Pettit, Ronald D. Lee, Charles A. Blanchard, and Tom McSorley 410

Defense Department Guidance for Government Contractors on Additional COVID-19-Related Costs

Joseph R. Berger, Thomas O. Mason, and Francis E. Purcell, Jr. 419

Federal Contractors May Face Immigration-Related Hiring Requirements and Barriers

Paul R. Hurst, Elizabeth Laskey LaRocca, Dana J. Delott, and Caitlin Conroy 422

What the "Essential Medicines" Executive Order Means for Federal Contractors and the FDA

James W. Kim, Brian J. Malkin, Peter M. Routh, and Gagan Kaur 427

Federal Circuit Revives Key Case Addressing Contractor's Ability to Include Offsets in Measurement of CAS Change Impacts

Kevin J. Slattum, Aaron S. Ralph, and Dinesh Dharmadasa 433

Eleventh Circuit Rules on FCA Materiality and Litigation Funding Agreements

Matthew J. Oster 438

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at 516-771-2169
Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

ISSN: 2688-7290

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt).

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2015

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

DARWIN A. HINDMAN III

Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter

ERIC WHYTSELL

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Partner Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report is published 12 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

What the “Essential Medicines” Executive Order Means for Federal Contractors and the FDA

By James W. Kim, Brian J. Malkin, Peter M. Routh, and Gugan Kaur*

The Executive Order on Ensuring Essential Medicines, Medical Countermeasures, and Critical Inputs Are Made in the United States directs the Food and Drug Administration and other federal agencies to take actions that could expand future procurement opportunities for pharmaceutical manufacturers and members of the medical supply chain, while restricting opportunities for others. The authors of this article discuss the Order.

President Donald Trump has issued the Executive Order on Ensuring Essential Medicines, Medical Countermeasures, and Critical Inputs Are Made in the United States (the “Order”). The Order is aimed at ensuring that there is an adequate supply in the United States of Essential Medicines, Medical Countermeasures, and Critical Inputs (i.e., the ingredients and components used to make essential medicines and medical countermeasures) (collectively, “Products”) in the face of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats and public health emergencies, such as infectious disease outbreaks. The Order establishes a policy of decreasing reliance on foreign manufacturers for Products by:

- Increasing the development of domestic production of Products and developing an adequate redundancy in the domestic supply chain;
- Ensuring long-term demand for U.S.-made Products;
- Focusing on domestic production capabilities for critical inputs, finished drug products and finished devices essential for public safety and national defense; and
- Combating counterfeit Products on e-commerce platforms and third-party online sellers involved in government procurement.

* James W. Kim (jakim@mwe.com) is a partner at McDermott Will & Emery LLP representing clients in a wide variety of matters related to government contracting, with a particular focus on cases involving the healthcare industry. Brian J. Malkin (bjmalkin@mwe.com) is a partner at the firm counseling pharmaceutical and biologic clients on Food and Drug Administration regulatory matters and intellectual property law. Peter M. (Mac) Routh (mrouth@mwe.com) is an associate at the firm focusing his practice on litigation matters, congressional investigations, government contracts, and public policy. Gugan Kaur (gkaur@mwe.com) is an associate at the firm advising life sciences clients on Food and Drug Administration regulatory, compliance, and enforcement issues.

To achieve these goals, the Order sets forth requirements for executive departments and agencies involved in the procurement of Products, as described below.

WHAT DOES THE ORDER MEAN FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS?

The Order requires various federal agencies to take actions that could significantly boost future procurement opportunities for certain federal contractors, while restricting opportunities for others. While the Order is likely to have near-term impacts on federal contractors, its impact will likely continue to evolve as the relevant federal agencies carry out the Order's directives and issue the required recommendations and reports.

Federal contractors that are domestic producers of Products could see increased opportunities due to the Order's directive to federal agencies to limit competition to Products produced in the United States, as well as the Order's directive that agencies divide procurement requirements among two or more manufacturers. This could have significant competitive ramifications for existing contractors that can meet the Order's requirements related to domestic manufacturing. Further, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") Commissioner, is directed to accelerate FDA approval or clearance for such domestic producers of Products.

On the other hand, these same directives could significantly limit opportunities for contractors that do not produce Products domestically and have traditionally relied upon existing statutory guidance that permits compliance with ordinary Buy American Act requirements through the Trade Agreement Act. The Order's directive to the U.S. Trade Representative to exclude coverage of products from the U.S. federal procurement under all relevant Free Trade Agreements and the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement could further reduce opportunities for federal contractors that are not domestic producers.

Additionally, when considered necessary for national defense reasons, the Secretary of Defense is directed to use his authority under the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement ("DFARS") to restrict procurement of Products to domestic sources and reject otherwise acceptable offers from Qualifying Countries. A trend towards this activity has been evident in certain procurements and is worth examining when planning for manufacturing capabilities and engagement with subcontractors for manufacturing needs.

HOW WILL FDA MODIFY ITS PROCEDURES?

On its face, the Order is an unfunded mandate for the FDA, requiring the agency to engage in at least some activities that it normally does not, and which fall within the practice of medicine or more traditionally with other public

health agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or medicine manufacturers themselves. For instance, the FDA does not normally identify “essential” medicines and countermeasures, but it does identify products that would qualify for a priority review to fill an unmet treatment need.

The FDA can help accelerate the review or clearance of products by providing increased input during development and by placing priority on the review cycles, but it is not accustomed to prioritizing a “made in the USA” approach. Given that many medicines sold in the United States currently are made with ingredients or components from overseas, it will take time for companies to develop economically viable capacities to make all of those ingredients and components domestically. Just as the FDA does not normally identify products made solely with domestic ingredients and components, the agency does not usually identify supply chain issues for manufacturers. This responsibility is expected to fall to the manufacturers themselves.

The Order further requires the FDA to increase the frequency of foreign inspections, where the agency has been implementing a prioritization process to inspect facilities with more deficiencies more often. Together, these new requirements may place a further strain on the FDA’s tight resources, which have been constrained by COVID-19, and could reduce, or in many cases eliminate, the FDA’s ability to conduct routine or for-cause inspections. The FDA therefore will likely require more resources to take on these new responsibilities, a factor that the Order does not seem to have contemplated.

IMMEDIATE AGENCY ACTIONS REQUESTED

- *Agencies procuring products:* In consultation with the FDA, use procedures to limit competition to only those products produced in the United States and divide procurement requirements among two or more U.S. manufacturers.
- *The Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the FDA Commissioner:* Accelerate FDA approval or clearance. Issue guidance regarding the development of “Advanced Manufacturing” techniques. Negotiate with countries to increase site inspections of regulated facilities manufacturing Products and refuse to admit imports of Products if the manufacturing facilities refuse or unreasonably delay an inspection.
- *The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency:* Identify relevant requirements and guidance documents that can help in the development of Advanced Manufacturing facilities and increase domestic production of critical inputs.

**WITHIN 90 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ORDER
(BY NOVEMBER 4, 2020)**

- *The Director of the Office of Management and Budget*: “[R]eview the authority of each agency to limit online procurement of Essential Medicines and Medical Countermeasures” to e-commerce platforms that meet certain requirements and report findings to the president.
- *Each head of agency*: In consultation with the FDA, “develop and implement procurement strategies, including long-term contracts.”
- *FDA Commissioner*: In consultation with various offices and agencies identified in the Order, identify the list of medically necessary Products. After the FDA Commissioner has identified this list:
 - *No later than 30 days*, the *U.S. Trade Representative* must “modify United States Federal procurement product coverage under all relevant Free Trade Agreements and the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement” to exclude the listed Products and to reflect updates by the FDA Commissioner, must make any necessary corresponding modifications to relevant existing waivers, and must notify the president.
 - *No later than 60 days*, the *Secretary of Defense* must restrict the procurement of Products on the list to domestic sources and reject offers for these products from Qualified Countries, as defined in the DFARS, when considered necessary for national defense.

EXCEPTIONS

The requirements above do not apply where the head of agency determines the following:

- Their application would be inconsistent with the public interest.
- The relevant Products are not produced in the United States in sufficient quantities and of a satisfactory quality.
- Their application would cause cost of procurement to increase by more than 25 percent (unless applicable law requires a higher percentage, in which case that percentage would apply).

If the head of agency makes any of the determinations above, she must submit an annual report to the president describing the justification for the determination.

The requirements also do not apply if the Products are necessary to respond to any public health emergency, major disaster, or national emergency.

**WITHIN 180 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ORDER
(BY FEBRUARY 2, 2021)**

- *The Secretary of Health and Human Services, through the FDA Commissioner and in consultation with the Director of OMB*, must identify vulnerabilities in the supply chain for Products. They must also mitigate the vulnerabilities by:
 - Proposing regulations or revising guidelines on the collection of certain information from manufacturers of Products as part of the application and regulatory approval process;
 - Entering into written agreements with appropriate agencies to disclose records regarding the security and vulnerabilities of the supply chains for Products;
 - Recommending to the president any changes in applicable law that may be necessary to accomplish these objectives; and
 - Reviewing FDA regulations to determine whether any may be a barrier to the domestic production of these Products and advising the president about whether such regulations should be repealed or amended.
- *The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of OMB*, must identify vulnerabilities in the supply chain for Products necessary to meet the needs of the U.S. Armed Forces and to mitigate the vulnerabilities and prepare a list of defense-specific Products that are medically necessary.
- *The Secretary of Commerce* must submit a report to the agencies outlined in the Order describing any change in the status of the Public Health Industrial Base and providing recommendations for strengthening it.

**NO LATER THAN DECEMBER 15, 2021 AND ANNUALLY
THEREAFTER**

- *Each head of agency, through the Director of OMB and the Assistant to the President for Trade and Manufacturing Policy*, must submit a report to the president for the preceding three fiscal years containing the following information:
 - The Products procured by the agency;
 - The agency's annual itemized and aggregated expenditures for all Products;
 - The sources of the Products; and

- The agency's plan to support domestic production of the Products in the next fiscal year.