Healthcare exchanges have become an important and visible element of the healthcare delivery system. From the public exchanges (now known as the Health Insurance Marketplace), which are a critical element of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), to the private exchanges that regularly make headlines, savvy plan sponsors are going to need to understand the purpose and mechanics of the different exchanges in order to evaluate whether they provide opportunities for better or more efficient healthcare delivery to their participants.

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR PUBLIC EXCHANGES**

Until January 1, 2017, only individuals without employer-sponsored insurance (ESI) or who are employed by a business that has fewer than 100 employees can access the public exchanges to purchase healthcare coverage. Employees of large employers (those with 50 or more employees) can purchase healthcare coverage on the public exchanges and access federal subsidy only if their employers do not offer healthcare coverage to them. In many circumstances, these large employers opting out of offering healthcare coverage must pay a *shared responsibility* penalty (the *pay or play* rule) of $2,000 per full-time employee (excluding the first 30 employees). Employers who are considering elimination of employer-sponsored insurance should address the following issues:

- The role of healthcare benefits as an element of total compensation—Are healthcare benefits part of a culture of wellness, and/or an important tool to ensure that employees are at work, focused and productive? Or are they simply a tax-effective element of the compensation package?

- How important are healthcare benefits in attracting and retaining high-quality employees?

- What is the relative cost and value of providing employer-sponsored healthcare?

- What is the compensation level of employees and how will they fare financially on the public exchanges?

**KEY PLAN SPONSOR CONSIDERATIONS FOR PRIVATE EXCHANGES**

In general, the private exchange strategy revolves around the following key elements—efficient purchasing, limiting employer cost through defined contribution healthcare, and participant choice. In evaluating a private exchange proposal by a vendor, it is critical for an employer to understand exactly what value it is receiving from the private exchange, particularly with respect to the price of the coverage it offers to employees.

Specifically, an exchange’s value should be analyzed separately from the cost shifting to employees that often happens with this approach. The private exchange should provide plan options that are available at lower cost than comparable plan options obtained directly from insurance carriers. It is critical in the financial analysis of private exchanges to understand how the exchange sponsors are paid, particularly with respect to commissions. The selection of an exchange provider should include an analysis of the quality and network access of insurers, the ease of utilization by employees, the mechanics of the flow of employer subsidy, and the value provided by the exchange.

We note that a few large, well-known employers have opted for private exchanges for their employees or their retirees. Some factors involved in the decision include:

- A desire to manage the cost of offering healthcare through potentially favorable pricing

- A revitalized approach to flexible benefits plan designs (where the employer defines a fixed contribution to healthcare, and employees select from a range of plan cost-sharing options) that takes advantage of the exchange model

- A more palatable approach for employees facing a reduction in employer benefit spending

- A glide pattern toward elimination of ESI and movement to health exchanges in 2017
MEDICARE EXCHANGES

It is important for a plan sponsor to understand the differences between the individual market and the group market, including the underwriting, enrollment, and pricing requirements of individual Medicare supplemental and Medicare Advantage products relative to group products. It is critical to recognize the age-driven pricing associated with the Medicare supplemental market, as well as the different requirements for movement between Medicare supplemental and Medicare Advantage products. Some illustrations of impact describe premium rates for retirees based on the average age of the group, rather than on the range of ages of the retirees in the group. Additionally, many illustrations assume that the rate of trend in the individual market is lower than in the employer-sponsored market. While this may be true in the aggregate, it may not be true for an individual retiree over time. Figure 1 illustrates sample individual market rates in Indiana for a Medicare Supplement Plan F and a Medicare Part D prescription drug plan.

As with the group private exchanges, it is important to understand cost shifting to retirees through cost savings so as to assess the impact of the exchange relative to design changes that could be made outside of it. For example, most Medicare Part D prescription drug plans have increased cost sharing in the coverage gap (donut hole) relative to the cost sharing under employer retiree medical plans. Even though the coverage gap “closes” by 2020, there is still significant potential exposure for the retiree. As well, plan sponsors who receive subsidies under the Medicare Part D Retiree Drug Subsidy need to take those dollars into account when comparing drug benefits under the individual market, where Part D subsidies are included in the lower premium.

Plan sponsors should understand the commission structure of individual products relative to group products to be clear on how dollars are being spent, relative to the current commission structure of their group plans.

Finally, plan sponsors should be aware of the for-profit nature of private exchanges and ensure that they are advised by experts that are unbiased with respect to the use of private exchanges.

In certain circumstances, public or private exchanges present plan sponsors with interesting opportunities for healthcare delivery. It will be important to be well informed and well-advised to best evaluate what value they can provide.
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