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Prohibiting pre-existing condition exclusions for children under nineteen is one of the significant reforms in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This provision took effect after September 23, 2010. On June 28, 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Treasury (Internal Revenue Service), and the Department of Labor (Employee Benefits Security Administration) published interim final regulations implementing the PPACA provision on disallowing pre-existing condition exclusions for dependents.

The regulations apply to new group plans (including self-insured plans) and new individual health insurance plans. They also apply to "grandfathered group health plans and group health insurance coverage but do not apply to grandfathered individual health insurance coverage that was in existence on March 23, 2010." The interim final regulations clarify that, until the PPACA rules on pre-existing condition exclusions take effect, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) rules related to such exclusions apply.

The PPACA amended Section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA) to prohibit such pre-existing condition exclusions both for "specific benefits associated with a preexisting condition" and "complete exclusion from such plan or coverage, if that exclusion is based on a preexisting condition." Therefore, the two provisions combined can be read to prevent plans from imposing preexisting condition exclusions on children under nineteen, beginning six months after enactment.

HHS has clarified that grandfathered child-only plans issued on the individual health insurance market are exempt from these regulations.

Prohibiting pre-existing condition exclusions for children under nineteen is one of the significant reforms in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA). This provision took effect after September 23, 2010. On June 28, 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Treasury (Internal Revenue Service), and the Department of Labor (Employee Benefits Security Administration) published interim final regulations implementing the PPACA provision on disallowing pre-existing condition exclusions for dependents.

The regulations apply to new group plans (including self-insured plans) and new individual health insurance plans. They also apply to "grandfathered group health plans and group health insurance coverage but do not apply to grandfathered individual health insurance coverage that was in existence on March 23, 2010." The interim final regulations clarify that, until the PPACA rules on pre-existing condition exclusions take effect, the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) rules related to such exclusions apply.

The PPACA amended Section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA) to prohibit such pre-existing condition exclusions both for "specific benefits associated with a preexisting condition" and "complete exclusion from such plan or coverage, if that exclusion is based on a preexisting condition." Therefore, the two provisions combined can be read to prevent plans from imposing preexisting condition exclusions on children under nineteen, beginning six months after enactment. HHS has clarified that grandfathered child-only plans issued on the individual health insurance market are exempt from these regulations. Despite this exemption, prior law and provisions in the PPACA prohibit these plans from cancelling or choosing not to renew coverage if a child with a pre-existing condition is already covered by the grandfathered plan.

The provision protecting children from exclusion from health coverage due to pre-existing conditions addresses a critical gap in coverage. It represents an important requirement imposed by the PPACA to prohibit denying coverage to a segment of the population that otherwise would be excluded. The PPACA requires coverage of adults with pre-existing conditions as well. The provision applies to group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual coverage and takes effect in 2014.

Initially, there was some confusion over how the provision preventing exclusions of children with pre-existing conditions would apply to grandfathered plans. The language of the provision prohibits pre-existing condition exclusions related to children under 19, and therefore, would apply to such exclusions in grandfathered plans. The language alone essentially makes the PPACA’s changes to “the provisions of section 2704 of the Public Health Services Act” effective as to “enrollees under 19 years of age” “6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.”

The Amendment to section 2704 provides that “a group plan and a health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage may not impose any preexisting condition exclusion with respect to such plan or coverage.” Therefore, the two provisions combined can be read to prevent plans from imposing preexisting condition exclusions on children under nineteen, beginning six months after enactment. HHS has clarified that grandfathered child-only plans issued on the individual health insurance market are exempt from these regulations. Despite this exemption, prior law and provisions in the PPACA prohibit these plans from cancelling or choosing not to renew coverage if a child with a pre-existing condition is already covered by the grandfathered plan.

The precise language of the PPACA does not require plans to guarantee coverage to children with preexisting conditions at this point. In fact, the provision does not set up a universal requirement that all group, grandfathered, and individual plans that fall within the scope of this directive cover dependents with preexisting conditions. A plan would not be subject to this requirement if it does not offer any dependent coverage, since dependent coverage is not required by the provision or by the PPACA. If no dependent coverage is offered, it does not need to be offered to dependents with preexisting conditions.
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The PPACA provision still provides critical coverage for a population that was often denied coverage, despite having members with health conditions and economic dependencies that increased their need. At least 20,000 children with preexisting conditions whose applications for coverage were formerly denied will now have health insurance. It is a moral victory of health reform that such a provision was passed and will immediately take effect.

Beginning in 2014, the PPACA also guarantees issue, bans preexisting condition exclusions and prohibits group health plans and issuers of group and individual health insurance from establishing rules for eligibility (including continued eligibility) based on health status-related factors, including health status, medical condition, medical history, and genetic information. To make these significant and critical modifications while preserving components of the current health insurance system, Congress had to include a “Requirement to Maintain Minimum Essential Coverage.” This PPACA requirement stipulates that, except in certain specified circumstances. Individuals acquire coverage for themselves and dependents or pay a monetary penalty. One of the main arguments advanced by plan issuers against guaranteeing coverage by law is that it creates an adverse selection problem if it is not offset by a requirement to purchase health insurance. If health insurance is guaranteed, individuals will tend only to purchase insurance when necessary, such as when long term care or chronic illness requires it. This possibility complicates the process by which issuers manage the risk pool to sustain their businesses. By requiring the purchase of health insurance, the risk pool is enlarged to include more healthy individuals, which results in lower premiums for all beneficiaries.

Thus, the minimum coverage requirement was a necessary component of the PPACA’s regulatory scheme. The pre-existing condition exclusion provisions, which undeniably address an important need, had to be paired with a requirement to maintain minimum coverage. The requirement creates sustainable and responsible policy choices in light of the adverse selection problem and forgives much-needed compromise among stakeholders to pass comprehensive health care reform, including substantial reform measures directed toward the insurance industry.

For similar reasons, certain exceptions had to be made to the provision prohibiting preexisting condition exclusions for children under nineteen, since it is effective prior to the minimum coverage requirement. One exception to the provision is if the dependent has an option of obtaining coverage through his or her own employer-sponsored health plan. Issuers in the individual health insurance market are permitted to restrict enrollment of children under nineteen to specific open enrollment periods consistent with state law. Additionally, if states choose to impose open enrollment requirements, they are not preempted by federal law. Recently, the Secretary of HHS has clarified these exceptions. Specifically, insurers may not discriminate against children with pre-existing conditions by enrolling only healthy children for coverage outside the open-enrollment periods.

Contrary to the objectives of the provision, some insurance companies have decided to stop selling child-only policies altogether. Since this practice is not currently against federal law, the Secretary of HHS has encouraged states to protect and promote options for children with pre-existing conditions. For instance, California passed a law that would prohibit insurers that fail to offer child-only coverage from providing policies on the individual market for a five-year period. Other states have allowed middle income families to buy into CHIP at “a full but fair premium.” CMS will work with states to adopt this option. The PPACA also created the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan (PCIP), which will provide another insurance option “for eligible children with pre-existing conditions who have been uninsured for at least six months.” A few plans are offering to “bridge the gap” in coverage that may occur for some dependents if they turn 26 before 2014.

Although the PPACA’s ban on pre-existing condition exclusions for children includes some exceptions, the provision addresses a critical coverage gap and represents an important reform made by this comprehensive health care legislation. The provision seems on track to achieve its purpose of covering a substantial number of dependents with preexisting conditions. Ultimately, the provision marks a
significant victory for health reform and a step toward ensuring that all Americans can obtain health coverage irrespective of health status.
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