Cooperative Healthcare Programs for the revamping of the health insurance systems

Posted on May 24, 2018

Introduction

Consumer-governed health insurance cooperatives were created under the Affordable Care Act to increase competition and make insurers more accountable to members. The original essay correctly identifies the ACA marketplaces, nonprofit cooperative plans, and the need to improve choice where insurance markets are concentrated. It describes the program as an uncomplicated success and confuses insurance cooperatives with care-delivery organizations and public payment authorities. The actual record is mixed. Twenty-three Consumer Operated and Oriented Plans received federal loans, several offered comparatively competitive premiums, and enrollment grew quickly, but many failed because of underpricing, rapid growth, inadequate capital, policy changes, and difficult market conditions. Revamping health insurance requires learning from both their member-centered promise and their financial weaknesses. (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, n.d.)

The Traditional Insurance Model

Twentieth-century American healthcare was never one single traditional system, but fee-for-service payment, employer-sponsored insurance, independent physician practice, and nonprofit hospitals were influential features. Insurers often reimbursed each service separately, creating incentives for volume rather than coordination. Employer coverage protected many workers while leaving gaps for people who were unemployed, self-employed, or working for firms without benefits. Public programs expanded through Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Administrative complexity grew as providers negotiated with multiple payers and patients faced different networks, deductibles, and rules. The cooperative idea emerged partly from dissatisfaction with insurer incentives and partly from the desire to introduce member governance into competitive markets.

ACA Marketplaces and Coverage Expansion

The Affordable Care Act created marketplaces where eligible individuals and small employers could compare qualified health plans, receive standardized information, and, when eligible, obtain premium tax credits or cost-sharing support. Marketplaces did not replace private insurance; they organized a regulated channel in which private issuers competed under federal and state requirements. Medicaid expansion operated separately and varied by state. The original essay says people without access to Medicaid or CHIP could purchase coverage beginning in 2013, but marketplace plans generally began

coverage in 2014 after enrollment opened in late 2013. Accurate chronology matters because the CO-OP program was designed as one part of a larger reform involving subsidies, benefit standards, consumer protections, and risk adjustment. (Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 2010)

What an ACA CO-OP Was

An ACA CO-OP was a private, nonprofit, consumer-governed health insurance issuer, not a government public option and not simply a cooperative clinic. Federal loans supported start-up and solvency requirements, while statutory rules limited conversion, political participation, and control by existing insurers. Members were expected to hold meaningful governance authority, allowing plan design and management to respond to enrollees rather than outside shareholders. The goal was to add competition, especially in states with few issuers, and return surplus toward lower premiums, improved benefits, or financial reserves. Governance alone could not replace insurance expertise. A successful cooperative still needed actuarial pricing, provider contracts, claims systems, compliance, capital, reserves, and the ability to manage unexpected medical costs.

Early Performance and Consumer Value

Government Accountability Office analysis found that CO-OP premiums were lower than other issuers in many rating areas during the program's early years, and combined enrollment exceeded one million by mid-2015. This suggests that new nonprofit plans could compete on price and attract consumers. Some cooperatives developed local provider relationships, emphasized preventive care, and used member participation as a distinguishing feature. Rapid enrollment, however, was not automatically evidence of sustainability. If premiums were too low for the health risk of members, every additional enrollee could increase losses. New plans also lacked historical claims data and established administrative infrastructure. Consumer value must therefore be assessed through affordability, access, quality, service, and solvency together. (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2016; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2015)

Why Many CO-OPs Failed

By the beginning of 2016, twelve of the twenty-three CO-OPs had ceased operations, and additional failures followed. Causes differed, but common pressures included optimistic enrollment assumptions, underpriced premiums, weak management systems, costly claims, limited capital, and uncertainty in federal risk programs. Start-up insurers faced fixed administrative costs and needed enough enrollment to spread them, yet rapid growth could create cash and service problems. Reductions in expected risk-corridor payments intensified losses for some plans. State regulators also acted when solvency deteriorated because protecting enrollees and providers required intervention before assets disappeared. The failures demonstrate that nonprofit purpose does not eliminate insurance

mathematics or the need for conservative contingency planning. (Hall & Swartz, 2012)

Risk Adjustment and Market Stability

Health insurance markets face adverse selection because people expecting higher medical costs have stronger incentives to enroll in generous coverage. The ACA uses risk adjustment to transfer funds among plans according to the relative risk of enrollees, reducing incentives to avoid sicker members. The program is complex, and new or smaller issuers may experience volatile transfers when their data, pricing, or membership differ from projections. Reinsurance and risk corridors were temporary early mechanisms with separate purposes. Cooperative reform should not be based on the idea that plans can succeed by enrolling everyone at one average price without adjustment. Stable competition requires accurate data, predictable rules, sufficient reserves, and mechanisms that compensate plans for serving higher-risk populations.

Member Governance

Consumer governance can improve accountability when members receive usable information, elect capable directors, and influence priorities. It can become symbolic when participation is low or boards lack insurance, clinical, financial, and regulatory expertise. Good cooperative design balances democratic representation with professional competence. Directors need fiduciary duties, conflict policies, training, and independent audit. Members should be able to review quality, complaints, executive compensation, network adequacy, and financial performance without being asked to vote on technical matters they cannot evaluate. Governance is most meaningful when it creates channels from member experience to operational change. It should not be used as evidence that a plan is trustworthy regardless of solvency or service quality.

Provider Contracting and Care Coordination

An insurer cooperative can negotiate provider contracts and encourage coordinated care, but it should not be confused with a provider cooperative or accountable care organization. The insurer manages premiums, networks, claims, and risk. Providers deliver care and may participate through contracts or integrated arrangements. Cooperation can reduce fragmentation when primary care, specialists, hospitals, pharmacies, and community services share information and incentives appropriately. Excessive consolidation can instead raise prices and limit choice. Payment reform may use capitation, shared savings, bundled payment, or quality incentives, but each method can encourage undertreatment or gaming if poorly designed. Member-centered coverage must monitor both access and outcomes rather than assuming that coordination automatically lowers cost.

Administrative Simplification

The original essay suggests that one national authority could negotiate all provider payment and remove administrative waste. Standardization can reduce burden through common eligibility data, electronic claims, prior-authorization rules, provider directories, and quality measures. Centralizing every negotiation, however, would create major legal, political, and operational questions. Prices vary by labor market, hospital concentration, specialty, and cost of living. A more realistic cooperative strategy is shared infrastructure. Multiple nonprofit plans or purchasing groups could use common technology, analytics, pharmacy negotiation, and compliance services while retaining local governance. Shared services can lower fixed cost, but contracts must protect data, preserve accountability, and prevent a vendor from becoming an unregulated source of market power.

Networks and Rural Access

Competitive premiums are not meaningful when a plan lacks accessible clinicians or hospitals. Rural and underserved areas may have few providers, making network negotiation difficult for a small insurer. A cooperative can build trust locally and invest in telehealth, primary care, transportation, or community health workers, but it cannot create specialists instantly. Network adequacy standards should examine travel time, appointment availability, language, disability access, and essential community providers. Narrow networks can reduce premiums by negotiating selectively, yet they may also disrupt continuity or expose patients to unexpected out-of-network bills. Member governance should make these trade-offs visible and create rapid correction when directory information or access promises prove inaccurate.

Affordability beyond Premiums

The original essay treats family insurance as inclusive regardless of finances. Even subsidized coverage can remain difficult because deductibles, copayments, excluded drugs, and out-of-network care affect actual access. A cooperative should measure total household cost and the percentage of members delaying care. Benefit design can reduce cost sharing for high-value services and medications while preserving protection against catastrophic expense. Premiums must still cover expected claims and administration. Artificially low prices that lead to insolvency harm members when plans close and providers remain unpaid. Sustainable affordability combines subsidies, accurate pricing, reserve requirements, cost control, and benefit design. No organizational form can provide unlimited care without a credible financing mechanism.

A Stronger Cooperative Model

A future cooperative model should begin with adequate capital, conservative actuarial assumptions, experienced leadership, and staged growth. It should use independent stress tests for enrollment, claims, risk-adjustment transfers, provider price changes, and policy uncertainty. Member governance should be paired with technical committees and transparent performance dashboards. Shared services can reduce administrative cost, while local partnerships can improve care coordination and trust. Regulators need timely data and authority to require corrective action before a crisis. Federal policy should avoid changing core financing rules after plans set premiums whenever possible. The aim is not to recreate the original program exactly but to preserve nonprofit, member-centered competition while correcting the conditions that made many start-ups fragile.

Other Cooperative Approaches

Health reform can use cooperation without creating a new insurance carrier. Purchasing cooperatives can aggregate small employers or individuals, provider cooperatives can share infrastructure, and community organizations can coordinate navigation and prevention. Public options, Medicaid buy-ins, nonprofit insurers, and regulated private plans represent different structures with different risks. A cooperative is most useful when member control solves an identified governance problem and the organization can reach sufficient scale. It should not be selected because the word sounds equitable. Policy evaluation must compare administrative cost, market power, access, quality, financial risk, and public subsidy across alternatives. Multiple models may coexist because state markets differ substantially.

Conclusion

Consumer-operated health insurance plans offered a serious attempt to combine nonprofit purpose, member governance, and marketplace competition. They expanded choice in some areas and often entered with competitive premiums, but many failed because start-up insurance requires capital, accurate pricing, operational capacity, and stable risk policy. The lesson is not that cooperation is impossible or that private markets alone will solve access. It is that governance values must be supported by financial discipline. A revised cooperative strategy should use adequate reserves, professional management, shared infrastructure, transparent member participation, network monitoring, and realistic growth. Health insurance can become more accountable to communities, but inclusion is sustainable only when the system can pay claims reliably and adapt before warning signs become insolvency.

References

1. U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Private Health Insurance: Federal Oversight, Premiums, and Enrollment for Consumer Operated and Oriented Plans in 2015*. GAO-16-326, 2016.
2. U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Private Health Insurance: Premiums and Enrollment for New Nonprofit Health Insurance Issuers Varied Significantly in 2014*. GAO-15-304, 2015.
3. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan Program regulations and oversight materials.
4. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, § 1322.
5. Hall, Mark A., and Katherine Swartz. “Health Insurance CO-OPs.” *Commonwealth Fund*, 2012.