

21 October 2010

The Honorable Dave Camp
Ranking Member
Committee on Ways and Means
341 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Ranking Member Camp:

We are economists, computer scientists, and operation researchers with expertise in the theory and practice of auctions.¹ We write to express our concerns with the Medicare Competitive Bidding Program for Durable Medical Equipment operated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. We believe that competitive bidding can be an effective method of controlling Medicare costs without sacrificing quality. However, the current auction program has flaws that need to be fixed before it can achieve the objectives of low cost and high quality.

We applaud your leadership in opposing the implementation of this flawed program and for insisting that the program be fixed. The flaws discussed below will lead to a “race to the bottom” fostering fraud and corruption, which is especially harmful to the millions of Medicare beneficiaries around the country. A program that pushes aside low-cost and high-quality providers cannot be tolerated.

Yesterday, 14 October 2010, CMS acknowledged problems with the Round 1 bidding results in their explanation for delaying the announcement of winners: “We wanted to provide an update on all the current information we have at this time concerning the announcement of the final list of the contract suppliers. In testing a new program integrity tool on the list of potential competitive bidding suppliers, a number of red flags were raised that require further examination before CMS announces the final list.” Unfortunately, while acknowledging the history of fraud under the program, CMS went on to announce: “We expect to move forward with the implementation of the program very soon, beginning with the announcement of the contract suppliers and continuing our aggressive education and outreach activities for beneficiaries and other stakeholders.” This haste to implement results that raised many red flags with respect to program integrity seems contrary to the public interest and common sense.

Four main problems

The first problem is that the auction rules violate a basic principle of auction design: *bids must be binding commitments*. In the Medicare auction, bidders are not bound by their bids. Any auction winner can decline to sign a supply contract following the auction. This undermines the credibility of bids, and encourages low-ball bids in which the supplier acquires at no cost the option to sign a supply contract.

The second problem is a flawed pricing rule. As is standard in multi-unit procurement auctions, bids are sorted from lowest to highest, and winners are selected, lowest bid first, until the cumulative supply quantity equals the estimated demand. What is odd is that rather than paying winners the clearing price

¹ The views expressed here are our own and do not represent the views of any organization. For additional information please contact [Peter Cramton](mailto:peter.cramton@umd.edu), University of Maryland, pcramton@gmail.com.

(the last-accepted bid), the auction pays winners the unweighted median among the winning bids. This is unique in our collective experience. The result is that fifty percent of the winning bidders are offered a contract price *less than* their bids. This median pricing rule further encourages low-ball bids, since a low bid guarantees winning, has a negligible effect on the price and gives the supplier a free option to sign a supply contract. Even if suppliers bid their true costs, up to one-half of the winning suppliers would reject the supply contract and the government would be left with insufficient supply. Others may accept the contract and cross-subsidize public patients with the revenue from private patients, or just take a loss. This pricing rule does not develop a sustainable competitive bidding process or healthy supplier pool.

The third problem arises from the use of composite bids, an average of a bidder's bids across many products weighted by government estimated demand. This provides strong incentives to distort bids away from costs—the problem of bid skewing. Bidders bid low on products where the government overestimated demand and high on products where the government underestimated demand. As a result, prices for individual products are not closely related to costs. Bid skewing is especially problematic in this setting, since the divergence between costs and prices likely will result in selective fulfillment of customer orders. Orders for low-priced products are apt to go unfilled.

The fourth problem is a lack of transparency. It is unclear how quantities associated with each bidder are determined. These quantities are set in a non-transparent way in advance of the auction. Bids from the last auction event were taken in November 2009, and now more than ten months later, we still do not know who won contracts. Both quality standards and performance obligations are unclear. This lack of transparency is unacceptable in a government auction and is in sharp contrast to well-run government auctions such as the Federal Communications Commission spectrum auctions.

This collection of problems suggests that the program over time may degenerate into a “race to the bottom” in which suppliers become increasingly unreliable, product and service quality deteriorates, and supply shortages become common. Contract enforcement would become increasingly difficult and fraud and abuse would grow.

Key features of a good auction design

Competitive bidding techniques have improved dramatically over the past twenty years and especially in recent years. Complex auctions like the Medicare competitive bidding program can be designed to achieve the objectives of low cost and high quality with little implementation risk. Successful government auctions emphasize transparency, good price and assignment discovery, and strategic simplicity. The result is sustainable long-term competition among suppliers which reduces costs while maintaining quality.

We recommend that the government fix the flaws in the current auction program and develop a new design that emphasizes the key features of successful designs. Implementation of the current design will result in a failed government program. There is no need for a bad outcome. With state-of-the-art auction methods and careful implementation, the auction program can succeed in reducing costs while maintaining quality—a win-win for both taxpayers and Medicare beneficiaries.

Respectfully submitted,

[The following are economists, computer scientists, and operation researchers with expertise in the design of auctions and market mechanisms. Information on each of us, including our auction-related research, can be found with an Internet search of name and affiliation.]

Dilip Abreu Princeton University	James Bushnell Iowa State University	Itay Fainmesser Brown University
Itai Ashlagi MIT	Estelle Cantillon Université Libre de Bruxelles	Emel Filiz-Ozbay University of Maryland
Susan Athey Harvard University	Andrew Caplin New York University	Dan Friedman University of California Santa Cruz
Lawrence M. Ausubel University of Maryland	Marco Celentani Universidad Carlos III	Douglas Gale New York University
Chris Avery Harvard University	Kalyan Chatterjee Pennsylvania State University	Lawrence R. Gosten Columbia University
Ian Ayres Yale University	Yeon-Koo Che Columbia University	Theodore Groves University of California San Diego
Kerry Back Rice University	In-Koo Cho University of Illinois	Philip A. Haile Yale University
Patrick L. Bajari University of Minnesota	Peter Coles Harvard University	Milton Harris University of Chicago
Sandeep Baliga Northwestern University	Peter Cramton University of Maryland	Ronald M. Harstad University of Missouri
Michael Ball University of Maryland	Vincent Crawford University of Oxford	Oliver Hart Harvard University
David Baron Stanford University	Jacques Cremer Toulouse School of Economics	Jason Hartline Northwestern University
Michael Baye Indiana University	Robert Day University of Connecticut	John Hatfield Stanford University
Coleman Bazelon Brattle Group	Luciano I. de Castro Northwestern University	Donald Hausch University of Wisconsin
Dirk Bergemann Yale University	Francesco Decarolis University of Wisconsin	Robert Hauswald American University
Gary A. Biglaiser University of North Carolina	George Deltas University of Illinois	Thomas W. Hazlett George Mason University
Sushil Bikhchandani UCLA	Peter DeMarzo Stanford University	Kenneth Hendricks University of Wisconsin
Kenneth Binmore University College London	Raymond J. Deneckere University of Wisconsin-Madison	Karla Hoffman George Mason University
Andreas Blume University of Pittsburgh	Nicola Dimitri University of Siena	William W. Hogan Harvard University
Simon Board UCLA	David Dranove Northwestern University	Charles A. Holt University of Virginia
Gary Bolton Pennsylvania State University	Marc Dudey Rice University	Ali Hortacsu University of Chicago
Tilman Borgers University of Michigan	Gregory M. Duncan Brattle Group	Daniel Houser George Mason University
Eric Budish University of Chicago	Jeffrey Ely Northwestern University	Nicole Immorlica Northwestern University

R. Mark Isaac Florida State University	David McAdams Duke University	David Porter Chapman University
Philippe Jehiel Paris School of Economics	Mark J. McCabe University of Michigan	Robert Porter Northwestern University
Thomas D. Jeitschko Michigan State University	Flavio Menezes University of Queensland	Andrew Postlewaite University of Pennsylvania
John Kagel Ohio State University	Paul Milgrom Stanford University	Marek Pycia UCLA
Charles Kahn University of Illinois	Eugenio J. Miravete University of Texas	S. Raghavan University of Maryland
Ehud Kalai Northwestern University	John Morgan University of California Berkeley	Eric Rasmusen Indiana University
Michael L. Katz University of California Berkeley	Stephen Morris Princeton University	Stephen J. Rassenti Chapman University
Brett E. Katzman Kennesaw State University	Herve Moulin Rice University	Philip J. Reny University of Chicago
Paul R. Kleindorfer University of Pennsylvania	Roger Myerson University of Chicago	John Riley UCLA
Kala Krishna Pennsylvania State University	Dana S. Nau University of Maryland	Michael Riordan Columbia University
Michael Landsberger University of Haifa	Axel Ockenfels University of Cologne	Jacques Robert HEC Montreal
John Ledyard California Institute of Technology	Shmuel Oren University of California Berkeley	Donald John Roberts Stanford University
Jonathan D. Levin Stanford University	Michael Ostrovsky Stanford University	Gregory Rosston Stanford University
David K. Levine Washington University in St. Louis	Erkut Ozbay University of Maryland	Al Roth Harvard University
Gregory Lewis Harvard University	Marco Pagnozzi University of Naples	John Rust University of Maryland
Tracy R. Lewis Duke University	Mallesh Pai University of Pennsylvania	Maher Said Washington University in St. Louis
Kevin Leyton-Brown University of British Columbia	Ariel Pakes Harvard University	Larry Samuelson Yale University
Yuanchuan Lien Hong Kong Univ. of Science & Tech.	Thomas Palfrey California Institute of Technology	William Samuelson Boston University
Barton L. Lipman Boston University	David Parkes Harvard University	Tuomas W. Sandholm Carnegie Mellon University
John List University of Chicago	David Pearce New York University	Mark A. Satterthwaite Northwestern University
Jeffrey K. MacKie-Mason University of Michigan	Motty Perry University of Warwick	Thomas C. Schelling University of Maryland
W. Bentley MacLeod Columbia University	Nicola Persico New York University	William Schulze Cornell University
George J. Mailath University of Pennsylvania	Martin Pesendorfer London School of Economics	Alan Schwartz Yale University
Timothy Mathews Kennesaw State University	Michael Peters University of British Columbia	Jesse Schwartz Kennesaw State University
Steven A. Matthews University of Pennsylvania	Charles R. Plott California Institute of Technology	Michael Schwarz Yahoo! Labs

Ilya Segal
Stanford University

Jaime Zender
University of Colorado

Yoav Shoham
Stanford University

Martin Shubik
Yale University

Matthew Shum
California Institute of Technology

Andrzej Skrzypacz
Stanford University

Joel Sobel
University of California San Diego

Tayfun Sonmez
Boston College

Richard Steinberg
London School of Economics

Steven Stoft
Global Energy Policy Center

Jeroen M. Swinkels
Northwestern University

Robert J. Thomas
Cornell University

Utku Unver
Boston College

Eric Van Damme
Tilburg University

Timonthy van Zandt
INSEAD

S. Viswanathan
Duke University

Rakesh Vohra
Northwestern University

Michael Waldman
Cornell University

Mark Walker
University of Arizona

Ruqu Wang
Queen's University

Steven R. Williams
University of Illinois

Bart Wilson
Chapman University

Robert Wilson
Stanford University

Catherine Wolfram
University of California Berkeley

Dennis Yao
Harvard University

Pai-Ling Yin
MIT