

# MERCER

Human Resource Consulting

July 30, 2002

## **Pivot Points:**

*Employer and Plan Solutions  
Most Likely to Moderate Costs*

### **Arnold Milstein MD, MPH**

National Health Care Thought Leader, Mercer Medical  
Director, Pacific Business Group on Health  
[arnold.milstein@mercer.com](mailto:arnold.milstein@mercer.com)

# Starting Gate Observations

- Aging and biomedical tech collide with  $1.2\sigma$
- Purchasers seek better, less costly care
- Purchasers can't afford angry enrollees
- Primary purchaser tools are incentives for consumers and suppliers
- What is most likely to succeed?



# #1 Focus of Incentives for Consumers



**Selection of  
plans**



**Add selection of  
providers,  
care management,  
and treatments**

***Focus on biggest remaining sources  
of total annual cost variation***

## #2 Bases of Comparing Costliness



**Biggest  
discounts  
or lowest  
unit prices**



**Best total  
longitudinal  
efficiency  
(AKA “TCO”)**

***e.g. Pitney-Bowes, UHC, BHCAG, PBGH***

### #3 Who Keeps Savings from High Yield, Capital-intensive Re-engineering?



**Purchaser  
(mostly)**



**Shared by  
purchaser  
& supplier**

***Focused on early supplier adopters***



## #4 Cost Insulation for Highest Risk Consumers



**Unconditional**

**Conditional**

***Out-of-pocket limits that exclude higher co-pay or co-insurance tiers when more efficient, high quality options are available; or positive incentives for highest risk consumers.***

# How Much Do Pivot Points Matter?

## Consumer Engagement Approach

## Est. Premium Trend Offset

- |  |         |
|--|---------|
| ■ Ungearred plan (PCA)                               | 7%-8%   |
| ■ Geared plan x 3<br>w/positive incentives           | 10%-15% |
| ■ Geared plan x 3<br>w/negative incentives           | 15%-25% |
| ■ If “critical mass” tips<br>supplier re-engineering | >30%    |

