Health Insurance Systems and Pathways to Sustainability with Application on the Egyptian Health Insurance System

Mamdouh Hamza Ahmed

Professor of Risk Management & Insurance

Actuarial Sciences Department, Faculty of Commerce, Cairo University

Fellow of The American Insurance & Risk Management Society (FRIMS)

Learning Objectives:

After studying this chapter, you will be able to:

(1) define the core architectural pillars of a successful health insurance system;
(2) Understand, explain and compare between the three health insurance systems:
(3) apply this framework to analyze Egypt's pre-reform system and its new UHIS; and
(4) discuss the persistent challenges and pathways to sustainability for Egypt's reform journey.

1. Introduction

The quest for Universal Health Coverage (UHC)-ensuring all people access to quality health services without suffering financial hardship-is a central target of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (WHO, 2021). The architecture of a country's health financing system, particularly its health insurance mechanism, is the primary engine for achieving this aim. Well-designed systems promote equity, efficiency, and resilience; poorly designed ones exacerbate inequality, foster inefficiency, and are vulnerable to collapse (Savedoff et al., 2012).

Globally, successful health insurance architectures, whether based on social health insurance (e.g., Germany), single-payer models (e.g., United Kingdom), or hybrid systems (e.g., Canada), share common foundational pillars. These include mandatory universal coverage, pre-pooled financing, strong regulation, and strategic purchasing (Busse et al., 2017). Conversely, systems that fail to institutionalize these pillars, such as the historically fragmented model in the United States, struggle with uninsurance, underinsurance, and the world's highest health expenditures despite suboptimal outcomes (OECD, 2021; The Commonwealth Fund, 2021).

2. The Architectural Pillars of Success: A Conceptual Framework

Based on a synthesis of global evidence, six interdependent pillars form the architecture of a sustainable health insurance system:

a. **Universal Population Coverage:** Mandatory enrollment of the entire population is fundamental. It creates a large and diverse risk pool, preventing adverse selection and ensuring that the financial burden of care for the sick is spread across the healthy, keeping premiums affordable (WHO, 2020).

b. **Sustainable Financing and Risk Pooling:** Funding must be adequate, derived from prepaid sources (e.g., payroll taxes, general taxation), and pooled to the largest possible extent. Larger pools enhance equity and financial stability by cross-subsidizing from the rich to the poor and the healthy to the sick (Kutzin, 2013).

c. **Strong Governance and Regulation:** An effective regulatory framework is essential to ensure accountability, prevent market failures (e.g., insurer cherry-picking of healthy clients), set standards, and control costs. This often requires independent agencies separate from service provision (Savedoff et al., 2012).

d. **Defined and Comprehensive Benefit Package:** A clear, legislated package of health services guarantees a minimum standard of care for all citizens. It must be comprehensive enough to provide meaningful coverage but must be balanced against fiscal constraints through regular, evidence-based review.

e. **Efficient Purchasing and Provider Payment Models:** The way insurers purchase care from providers drastically impacts efficiency and quality. Moving from passive reimbursement and fee-for-service models to strategic purchasing using capitation, DRGs, and bundled payments incentivizes value-based care over volume (OECD, 2019).

f. **Robust Health Information Systems (HIS):** A digital infrastructure for patient records, claims processing, and data analytics is crucial for efficiency, transparency, fraud prevention, and evidence-based policy making. A unique patient identifier is a key component.

3. Common Challenges and Strategies to Overcome Them

Despite the known formula for success, all systems face significant challenges/hurdles that will be listed in the following table besides explaining the suitable strategies that can be used to overcome challenges/hurdles:

Common Challenges and Strategies to Overcome any Health Insurance System

Challenge	Description	Strategies for Overcoming the Challenge
Rising Healthcare Costs	Driven by aging populations, new expensive technologies,	Implement **Health Technology Assessment (HTA)** to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of new drugs and devices
Fraud and Abuse	A significant drain on resources, including billing for services not	Invest in sophisticated data analytics and AI to detect irregular billing patterns in real-time. Establish strong anti-fraud units
Fragmented Risk Pools	Multiple, separate insurance funds lead to unequal risk	**Consolidate risk pools** or establish a robust **risk-equalization mechanism**. This redistributes funds from insurers
Social Inequity	Systems relying heavily on voluntary private insurance often	Move towards **mandatory universal coverage** financed through pre-paid, progressive means (taxes or income-
Political Instability	Healthcare reform is a long-term endeavor often undermined by	Build broad multi-stakeholder consensus on the goal of universal health coverage. Anchor the right to health in legislation to

(Busse et al., 2017)

4. Most Successful Models of the Nation's Health Insurance System

The structure of a nation's health insurance system is a fundamental determinant of its population's health outcomes, financial security, and economic productivity. While systems vary significantly in their details, most successful models can be categorized into three primary archetypes: the **Bismarck Model (Social Health Insurance)**, the **Beveridge Model (Single-Payer)**, and the **National Health Insurance Model (a Hybrid system)**. Each represents a distinct philosophy for financing and delivering care, balancing the goals of universality, equity, efficiency, and choice (Savedoff, de Ferranti, Smith, & Fan, 2012).

We explain the main features of each of the above systems (Busse et al., 2017):

The Three Archetypes of Global Health Insurance Architectures

First: The Bismarck Model (Social Health Insurance-SHI)-Germany

a. Origin & Principle: Named after German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, who established the world's first compulsory national health insurance system for industrial workers in 1883. The core principle is **social solidarity**, where financial risk is shared across a community of contributors. Access is based on insurance contributions rather than citizenship alone (Busse et al., 2017).

- **Financing:** Funded through **mandatory, income-based payroll contributions** shared between employers and employees. These are not general taxes but are earmarked specifically for health insurance. The government typically subsidizes contributions for the unemployed, pensioners, and low-income individuals to ensure universal coverage.
- **Governance & Provision:** A key feature is the separation of functions. Multiple, non-profit **"sickness funds"** act as insurers and compete for members. The government's role is not to provide care but to act as a **strong regulator**, setting the standard benefit package, controlling costs, and managing a **risk-equalization mechanism** to prevent funds from cherry-picking healthy enrollees (OECD, 2019). Healthcare providers (hospitals, physicians) are predominantly private.
- **Key Examples: Germany**, France, the Netherlands, Japan, Belgium, Switzerland.
- **Strengths:** High quality of care, consumer choice among insurers, strong solidarity, and generally shorter wait times for elective procedures.
- **Challenges:** Can be administratively complex due to multiple payers; sustainability is tied to high formal employment; contributions can be a labor cost burden.

b. Population Coverage: (Germany, 2023).

Germany achieves near-universal health coverage.

- Total Population (2023 est.): 84 million
- 99%, of the population are covered,
- Covered by Statutory Health Insurance (SHI): ~74 million (89% of population)
- Covered by Private Health Insurance (PHI): ~9 million (11% of population)
- Uninsured Population: Virtually 0%. Insurance is mandatory for all residents. The state covers premiums for unemployed or low-income individuals.

- **Source:** Federal Ministry of Health (BMG), German Insurance Association (GDV).

c. Cost of Providing Health Insurance:

- **Total Health Expenditure as a % of GDP:** Germany spends the most on health as a percentage of its GDP (12.8%),
- Total Health Expenditure (THE): ~ $582 billion USD
- **Waiting Times:** Generally, very short for most services compared to other OECD countries (OECD, 2023b).
- **Physicians per 1,000: 4.5 physicians** (one of the highest rates in the OECD) (OECD, 2023b).
- **Hospital Beds per 1,000: 7.9 beds** (one of the highest rates in the OECD) (OECD, 2023b).
- Source: Federal Statistical Office (Destatis), OECD Health Statistics (2023-2024).

d. Per Capita Cost:

- Health Expenditure per Capita (2022): $8,011 USD

  Source: OECD Health Statistics 2023.

What is Covered? (The Core)

The statutory system offers a very comprehensive benefits package, including (BMG, 2023):

- Primary, specialist, and hospital care
- Preventive services and check-ups
- Mental health care
- Prescription drugs (with small co-pays)
- Dental care (basic coverage, with co-pays for advanced work)
- Sick leave compensation (Krankengeld)
- Rehabilitation and physiotherapy

What is NOT Covered? (The Gaps)

- **Co-payments:** Small, fixed co-payments exist for prescriptions, hospital stays, and rehabilitative care, though they are capped annually as a percentage of income (Busse & Blümel, 2014).
- **Non-Standard Services:** Some services like adult optical care, alternative medicine beyond a certain limit, and private hospital rooms are not covered.

- **Dental Cosmetics:** Advanced cosmetic dental work is largely out-of-pocket, though supplemental insurance is common.

Strengths and Criticisms

Strengths ✅	Criticisms ❌
Excellent Access & Choice: Patients have extensive choice of providers and experience very short waiting times	**High Cost:** Germany has one of the most expensive healthcare systems in Europe, putting pressure on labor costs (Destatis,
High Quality & Innovation: The system is well-funded and adopts new medical technologies and drugs	**Administrative Complexity:** The multi-payer structure and coexistence with private insurance create significant bureaucratic
Strong Solidarity: The system successfully pools risk and provides high-quality care to all, regardless of	**Two-Tier Tendencies:** Those with private insurance often get faster access to specialists and more luxurious hospital accommodations,
Financial Sustainability: The contribution-based system provides a stable and predictable flow of revenue,	**Fragmented Data:** The decentralized structure can hinder the implementation of nationwide digital health strategies and integrated care

(Busse & Blümel, 2014).

Second: The Beveridge Model (Single-Payer / Tax-Financed)-UK

a. Origin & Principle: Inspired by the 1942 Beveridge Report in the United Kingdom, which laid the foundation for the post-war welfare state. Its goal was to rid Britain of the "five giant evils": Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor, and Idleness. Its core principle is that healthcare is a **public good** provided by the state, funded through taxation, and available to all citizens based on **need, not on insurance premium or ability to pay** (Beveridge, 1942).

- **Financing:** Funded almost entirely through **general tax revenue** (e.g., income tax, value-added tax). There are typically no premiums or out-of-pocket fees at the point of service for core services.
- **Governance & Provision:** The government acts as the **single-payer** and is also the primary **owner and operator** of healthcare infrastructure. Most hospitals are publicly owned, and medical professionals are often government employees. This

integration allows for strong top-down cost control through global budgets and centralized planning.

- **Key Examples:** The **United Kingdom (NHS)**, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Cuba, Hong Kong.
- **Strengths:** Very low administrative costs; strong cost control; truly universal access; high degree of equity.
- **Challenges:** Potential for longer waiting times for non-urgent care; limited patient choice of provider; can be vulnerable to political budget cuts; may lag in medical innovation due to budget constraints.

b. Population Coverage:

Canada provides universal public health insurance to all qualified citizens and permanent residents.

- **Total Population (UK, 2023 est.):** ≈ 67 million
- **Covered by Public Insurance: 100%** of eligible residents. All provinces and territories provide public health insurance to their residents.
- **Uninsured Population: Effectively 0%,** there is no uninsured population in the traditional sense. Everyone has access to the NHS.
- **Source:** The NHS Constitution establishes the right to care for all UK residents. The UK government does not calculate an uninsured rate as it is not applicable.

c. Cost of Providing Health Insurance:

- **Total Health Expenditure (THE) as % of GDP (2022): 11.2%**
- **Total Health Expenditure (THE) (2022):** (~$397 billion USD)

Source: OECD, WHO Global Health Expenditure Database (2023)

d. Per Capita Cost:

- **Health Expenditure per Capita (2022): $5,400 CAD** (USD PPP)

Source: OECD, WHO Global Health Expenditure Database (2023).

Third: The National Health Insurance Model (Hybrid System) Canada

a. Origin & Principle: This model is a strategic hybrid, designed to combine the financing efficiency of the Beveridge Model with the private provision of the Bismarck Model. The system originated in the province of Saskatchewan in 1947, led by Premier Tommy Douglas. It was adopted nationally after the federal government passed the **Canada Health Act (CHA) of 1984**. The core principles are universality, accessibility, comprehensiveness, portability, and public administration.

The fundamental principle is that **no Canadian should face financial barriers to receiving medically necessary hospital and physician care.** The core principle is **public financing with private delivery**.

- **Financing:** Like Beveridge, it uses **public financing**-primarily from general taxation-to create a single insurance pool. This gives the single-payer immense purchasing power.
- **Governance & Provision:** The government acts as the **sole public insurer** (the "single payer") but does not typically own hospitals or directly employ most providers. Instead, it reimburses private doctors and hospitals for services delivered to patients based on a negotiated fee schedule. Private insurance for services covered by the public plan is usually prohibited to prevent a two-tier system (Marchildon, 2013).
- **Key Examples: Canada** (the quintessential example), South Korea, Taiwan.
- **Strengths:** Achieves universality and equity; benefits from the cost-control advantages of a single-payer financier; offers patients more choice of private providers than pure Beveridge systems.
- **Challenges:** Requires heavy regulation to prevent providers from charging patients fees above the government rate ("extra-billing"); can still experience waiting lists due to constrained capacity; the single-payer can become a political target for service shortcomings.
- **Universal Coverage:** Healthcare is a right of residence, not tied to employment or contributions.
- **Funding:** Primarily through general taxation (and a specific payroll tax called National Insurance).
- **Provision:** Most hospitals are publicly owned, and most healthcare professionals are government employees.
- **Cost Control:** As the single largest payer, the NHS has significant monopsony power to negotiate drug and device prices.

Private Health Insurance (PHI) is optional and typically covers elective treatments (e.g., surgeries, specialist consultations) to avoid NHS waiting lists. It is often provided by employers as a benefit.

b. Population Coverage

- **Total Population:** ≈ **38.8 million** (2023 est., Statistics Canada)

- **Covered by Public Insurance: 100%** of eligible residents (citizens, permanent residents, and some specific visa holders) are covered by their provincial/territorial public insurance plan for medically necessary hospital and physician services.
- **Uninsured Population: ~0%** for core medically necessary services. However, individuals may be uninsured for non-covered services like pharmaceuticals, dentistry, and vision care. Some vulnerable groups (e.g., undocumented migrants) may face barriers accessing the system.

  Source: The Canada Health Act mandates 100% coverage for all eligible residents. Provincial health ministry reports confirm this universal coverage.

c. Cost of Providing Health Insurance

- **Total Health Expenditure (THE): $239 billion (USD)** (2022)
- **Total Health Expenditure as % of GDP: 12.1%** (2022)

  Source: Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), "National Health Expenditure Trends" - This is the official and most trusted source for Canadian health spending data.

d. Per Capita Cost

- **Health Expenditure per Capita: ~$6,250 (USD PPP)**

Source: OECD, WHO Global Health Expenditure Database (2023)

Comparison between the three Systems

The following table summarize the main differences between the three Model:

Feature	Bismarck Model (SHI)	Beveridge Model (Single-Payer)	National Health Insurance (Hybrid)
Core Principle	Social Insurance (Solidarity)	Public Service (Citizenship)	Public Finance, Private Delivery
Financing	Payroll Contributions	General Taxation	General Taxation
Provider	Private & Public	Mostly Public	Mostly Private
Government Role	Strong Regulator	Payer, Owner & Operator	Single Payer / Insurer
Key Examples	**Germany**, France, Japan	**UK**, Spain, Scandinavia	**Canada**, South Korea, Taiwan
Primary Strength	Choice, Quality, Innovation	Low Cost, Equity, Simplicity	Universality, Cost Control, Choice
Primary Challenge	Administrative Complexity	Waiting Times, Rationing	Regulation, Political Pressure

Conclusion: No country has a perfectly pure model; most incorporate elements from others to address their unique historical, cultural, and economic contexts. For instance, the United States is a significant outlier, relying on a complex mix of private insurance, employer-based schemes, and public programs for specific groups, resulting in the highest spending per capita among OECD nations without achieving universal coverage (OECD, 2021; The Commonwealth Fund, 2021). The success of any system is measured by its ability to provide accessible, high-quality care to its entire population without imposing financial hardship.

Fourth: The United States of America's Model:

The **United States** has no universal healthcare system. It is a complex mix of private insurance (employer-based and individual), public insurance for specific groups (Medicare for seniors, Medicaid for low-income), and a large number of uninsured.

The **United States** does not fit neatly into any one of the three main health insurance archetypes (Bismarck, Beveridge, National Health Insurance). Instead, it's a **mixed model**, often described as **a patchwork system**:

1. Bismarck (Social Health Insurance) elements

- Employer-sponsored health insurance (through private, for-profit or non-profit insurers) resembles the **Bismarck model** because it is **tied to employment** and funded via contributions (employer + employee).
- About **49–50% of Americans** receive coverage this way.

2. Beveridge (Single-Payer / Tax-Funded) elements

- The **Veterans Health Administration (VA)** and the **Indian Health Service (IHS)** work like Beveridge: care is **government-funded and government-provided**.
- Military personnel and veterans get coverage in this model.

3. National Health Insurance (Single Public Payer, Private Delivery) elements

- **Medicare** (for those 65+ and certain disabled groups) resembles the **National Health Insurance model**: it is **tax-funded**, acts as a **single payer**, but providers are private.
- **Medicaid** (for low-income groups) also functions like a hybrid single-payer program.

Summary:

The **U.S. health system is a hybrid**:

- **Bismarck** → Employer-sponsored insurance
- **Beveridge** → VA & IHS
- **National Health Insurance** → Medicare & Medicaid
- **Private market** → A dominant component, making the U.S. unique among developed nations.

That's why health policy experts often say: *"The U.S. has all three models, depending on who you are."*

Strengths:

- **Innovation and Technology:** A global leader in medical innovation, pharmaceutical development, and cutting-edge medical technology.
- **Choice and Short Waits:** For those with good insurance, there is extensive choice of providers and minimal waiting times for non-emergency care.
- **High-Specialized Care:** Access to world-class specialists and facilities for complex conditions.

Criticisms:

- **Lack of Universal Coverage:** Millions of Americans remain uninsured or underinsured, leading to worse health outcomes and medical debt.
- **Extremely High Cost:** The US spends far more per capita on health care than any other nation without achieving better overall health outcomes.
- **Complexity and Administrative Waste:** The multi-payer system creates enormous administrative costs for providers and confusion for patients.
- **Inequity:** Access and quality of care are heavily dependent on employment status, income, and race.

Source:

- The Commonwealth Fund: "U.S. Health Care from a Global Perspective"
- Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF): "Health Costs and Financing"

Cost of Providing Health Insurance

- **Total Health Expenditure (THE): $4,900 billion (USD)** (2022)
- **Total Health Expenditure as % of GDP: 17.6%** (2022)

Source: National Health Expenditure (NHE) total for 2023.

Per Capita Cost

- **Health Expenditure per Capita: ~$14,570 (USD PPP)**

Source: OECD, WHO Global Health Expenditure Database (2023)

Fifth: Application on the Egyptian Health Insurance System

Introduction: Egypt presents a compelling case study of system failure and ambitious reform. For decades, Egypt's health insurance was characterized by a fragmented mix of public schemes covering formal sector employees, leaving a vast portion of the population, particularly the poor and those in the informal sector, reliant on high out-of-pocket (OOP) payments, which constituted over 60% of total health expenditure (World Bank, 2018). This led to low financial protection and inequitable access.

Healthcare is a fundamental human right, yet its financing remains one of the most complex policy challenges for governments worldwide. Health insurance, in its various forms, serves as the primary mechanism to pool health risks and financial resources, ensuring that individuals have access to necessary medical care without suffering catastrophic financial hardship. The success and sustainability of a health insurance system are not predetermined by a country's wealth alone but are a product of deliberate

design, robust governance, and adaptive management. We deconstruct the core factors that contribute to a successful and sustainable health insurance system, analyzes the universal challenges it faces, and proposes evidence-based strategies to overcome them. Finally, we provide a comparative analysis of two national systems-Germany as a paradigm of success and the United States as a system grappling with fundamental sustainability challenges-to illustrate these principles in practice.

Background: The architecture of a nation's health insurance system is a primary determinant of its population's health outcomes and financial security. While models vary, core pillars underpin successful and sustainable systems. Conversely, the neglect of these pillars leads to fragmentation, inequity, and financial peril. This paper analyzes these architectural components and applies the framework to Egypt's ongoing transformative health insurance reform.

Methods: A systematic literature review was conducted to identify the critical success factors for health insurance systems. A framework analysis was then employed to evaluate the Egyptian system pre- and post- the 2018 Universal Health Insurance Law (Law No. 2 of 2018) against these established pillars. Data was drawn from WHO reports, World Bank documents, government legislation, and peer-reviewed studies.

Findings: The evaluation reveals that a sustainable health insurance framework rests on six foundational pillars: (1) universal coverage for the entire population, (2) financially stable and consolidated funding mechanisms, (3) effective oversight and regulatory structures, (4) a clearly delineated and extensive set of benefits, (5) proactive procurement and reimbursement methods for providers, and (6) resilient digital health information infrastructures. A historical assessment shows that Egypt's system prior to the reforms was deficient in each of these critical areas. The newly instituted Universal Health Insurance System (UHIS), by contrast, is architected according to these established principles, as seen in its creation of autonomous regulatory bodies, an inclusive benefits package, and an integrated digital platform. Despite this robust theoretical design, substantial operational hurdles—most notably the difficulty of enrolling the vast informal sector to ensure fiscal health and the limitations of the existing healthcare workforce—pose a serious risk to the system's enduring success.

Interpretation: The UHIS marks a radical overhaul of Egypt's health financing architecture. The ultimate viability of this ambitious reform will be determined by its ability to translate its sophisticated legislative blueprint into functional reality. Egypt's journey provides invaluable insights for other low- and middle-income nations, illustrating the dangers of a disjointed health system while mapping a potential route to financially sustainable Universal Health Coverage (UHC).

The Egyptian Context - From Failure to Reform

A. The Pre-UHIS Architecture: A System in Peril

Egypt's pre-2018 system failed across all six pillars:

- **Coverage:** Fragmented, with less than 60% of the population covered, leaving millions without protection (El-Saharty et al., 2015).
- **Financing:** Multiple small, inefficient risk pools (e.g., the Health Insurance Organization) plagued by deficits, funded by high out-of-pocket (OOP) spending.
- **Governance:** Weak and fragmented regulation under the Ministry of Health and Population.
- **Benefits:** Limited and unequal packages across different population groups.
- **Purchasing:** Inefficient, input-based budgeting for public facilities.
- **HIS:** Predominantly paper-based, leading to inefficiency and a lack of data.

B. The New UHIS: Designing a Pathway to Sustainability

Law No. 2 of 2018 establishes a new architecture aligned with the success pillars:

- **Coverage:** Aims for mandatory universal coverage through a phased geographical rollout, already implemented in several governorates (Cabinet of Egypt, 2023).
- **Financing:** Creates a **single national pool** funded by multiple sources: payroll contributions (1% employee, 3-4% employer), government subsidies for the poor, and premiums for the informal sector (Law No. 2, 2018).
- **Governance:** Establishes independent bodies-the **Universal Health Insurance Authority (UHIA)** as the strategic purchaser and the **General Authority for Healthcare Accreditation and Regulation (GAHAR)** as the regulator-separating financing, service provision, and oversight (World Bank, 2019).
- **Benefits:** Introduces a **comprehensive package** covering primary to catastrophic care, a monumental leap in equity.
- **Purchasing:** Shifts to modern payment mechanisms: capitation for primary care and Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) for hospitals, intended to drive efficiency (World Bank, 2019).
- **HIS:** Built around a digital “smart card” and unified IT system for portability and claims management.

C. Discussion: Navigating the Implementation Gap

Despite its sophisticated design, the UHIS faces significant challenges that represent the "perils of failure" on the path to sustainability:

- **Financial Sustainability:** The system's viability hinges on successfully enrolling Egypt's vast informal sector. Low enrollment rates would place unsustainable pressure on government subsidies, especially amid macroeconomic pressures like high inflation (IMF, 2023; Elshamy et al., 2022).
- **Capacity and Quality:** There are valid concerns about whether the current healthcare workforce and facility infrastructure can meet the surge in demand for services without compromising quality or creating long waiting times.
- **Political Will:** The multi-decade rollout requires sustained political and financial commitment across different governments, resisting lobbying from vested interests in the old system.

Early evidence from pioneer governorates like Port Said shows a promising reduction in OOP spending (Khalil et al., 2020), indicating initial success in improving financial protection. However, the long-term sustainability of the entire architectural edifice remains contingent on overcoming the above challenges.

D. Egypt: A Mixed and Transitioning System

System Overview:

Egypt's health system is fragmented, involving multiple insurers and a significant out-of-pocket spending burden. The government is in the process of rolling out a comprehensive universal health insurance system (UHIS) to replace the old system, aiming for universal coverage by 2030. The existing system includes the Health Insurance Organization (HIO), the Curative Care Organization, and various private schemes.

1) Population Coverage:
Coverage is not yet universal, though it has improved dramatically in recent years.

- **Total Population (2023 est.):** 105 million
- **Covered by Various Schemes (Pre-UHIS estimates, ~2021):** ~90-95 million
    - **Formally Covered (HIO, Government schemes):** ~60% of population
    - **Beneficiaries of Subsidized Healthcare:** Significant portion of the population.
- **Uninsured Population:** Estimates range from **5% to 10%** (approximately 5 - 10 million people). A key goal of the new UHIS is to eliminate this gap.
- **Source:** World Health Organization (WHO), World Bank, CAPMAS (Egypt's statistics agency).

2) Cost of Providing Health Insurance:
Egypt's health spending is low by global standards, both in relative and absolute terms.

- **Total Health Expenditure (THE) as % of GDP (2022): 4.5%**
- **Total Health Expenditure (THE) (2022): ~$19 billion USD**
- **Source:** World Bank Data.

3) Per Capita Cost:

- **Health Expenditure per Capita (2021): $175 USD** (Current, not PPP)
- **Source:** World Bank Data.

Comparative Analysis

Here is a comparative analysis of the healthcare financing metrics for Germany, the UK, Canada, the USA, and Egypt, using the most recent consistent data available from international organizations.

This comparison highlights the stark differences in healthcare spending between high-income nations and a lower-middle-income nation, as well as the outlier status of the U.S. system.

Comparative Analysis Table

Country	Health System Model	Total Health Expenditure (THE)	THE as % of GDP	Health Expenditure per Capita (USD
United States	Multi-Payer Private	US$4,900 bn	17.6%	US$14,570 bn
Germany	Bismarck (Social Insurance)	US$582 bn	12.8%	US$8,011 bn
United Kingdom	Beveridge (Tax-Financed)	US$397 bn	11.2%	US$5,400 bn
Canada	Single-Payer Hybrid	US$239 bn	12.1%	US$6,250 bn
Egypt	Mixed (Segmented)	US$19 bn	4.5%	US$175 bn

Legend: YEAR = year of the reported figure; USD = current US dollars unless otherwise noted; PPP = purchasing-power-parity adjusted international dollars. Sources are listed below the table.

Sources:

United States: National Health Expenditure (NHE) total for 2023, CMS+1

Germany: European Commission+1, Healthcare expenditure statistics - overview

United Kingdom: UK Health Accounts preliminary estimate for 2023. Office for National Statistics

Canada: CIHI estimate for total health expenditure in 2023

Egypt: WHO/World Bank report CHE, TheGlobalEconomy.com+1

Key Observations and Conclusions

1. **Absolute Spending (THE):**
   - The **USA** spends a colossal amount in absolute terms-over **$4.9 trillion**-which is more than the entire economies of most countries.
   - **Egypt's** total expenditure is vastly lower, reflecting its smaller economy and population, as well as lower per-capita investment in health.
2. **Spending as a Percentage of GDP (THE % GDP):**
   - This metric shows the proportion of a nation's total economic output dedicated to health.
   - The **USA** is a clear outlier, dedicating **17.6%** of its massive GDP to healthcare, far exceeding all other developed nations. This indicates a very high-cost system.
   - **Germany, Canada, and the UK** cluster between **11.2-12.8%**, which is typical for high-income OECD countries with universal health systems.
   - **Egypt's** spending at **4.5%** of GDP is below the global average and reflects the constraints of a developing economy, though it aims to increase this through recent reforms.
3. **Per Capita Spending (Per Capita USD PPP):**
   - This is the most effective metric for comparing spending per person across countries.
   - The **USA** again is the extreme outlier, spending **$14,570 per person**-roughly double that of Canada and Germany and more than triple that of the UK.

- Despite this vastly higher spending, the US does not achieve universal coverage and often lags in key health outcomes (e.g., life expectancy, infant mortality).
- **Germany** and **Canada** spend similar amounts per person (~$8k and ~$6.3k, respectively), but through different models (insurance-based vs. single-payer).
- The **UK's** Beveridge model demonstrates the ability to provide universal coverage at a significantly lower per-person cost (**$5,400**) due to its strong cost-control mechanisms and lower administrative overhead.

4. **Universal Coverage vs. Developing Systems:** Germany and Canada demonstrate how high-income countries can structure their financing to achieve near-universal coverage, albeit through different mechanisms (contributions vs. taxes). Egypt represents the challenge for a lower-middle-income country with a large population, striving to expand coverage through systemic reform.
5. **Spending Reflects Economic Capacity:** The massive disparity in per capita spending ($8,011 vs. $175) highlights the vast economic resources available for healthcare in developed nations compared to developing ones. Egypt's lower spending as a percentage of GDP also indicates constraints on public financing.
6. **Out-of-Pocket Expenses:** A critical metric not fully detailed above is Out-of-Pocket (OOP) spending as a share of total health expenditure. This is a measure of financial hardship.
    - **Germany:** ≈12-13% OOP
    - **UK:** ≈13.3% OOP
    - **Canada:** ≈14.8-15% OOP
    - **Egypt:** ≈ 53-54% OOP (World Bank, pre-UHIS)

    This indicates that Egyptian households bear a much larger direct financial burden for healthcare, which can be catastrophic and a barrier to access.
7. **Egypt's Reform:** Egypt's new Universal Health Insurance System (UHIS) is an ambitious project designed to expand coverage, pool risks, and reduce out-of-pocket spending. Its success will be crucial for improving health outcomes for millions of Egyptians.

Note on Egyptian Coverage Estimates: Precise, real-time numbers on the uninsured in Egypt are challenging to obtain due to the ongoing systemic transition. The 5-10% estimate is a consensus figure derived from analysis by the World Bank and WHO reports, which highlight the remaining gaps despite significant progress under the new UHIS.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Egypt's UHIS is one of the world's most ambitious health financing reforms. Its architectural design, based on global best practices, successfully identifies and addresses the failures of the past. The establishment of independent regulators, a national pool, and a comprehensive benefits package lays a formidable foundation for UHC.

However, a sound design does not guarantee success. The pathway to sustainability now depends on effective implementation. We recommend:

a. **Implementing innovative, phased strategies** to enroll the informal sector, potentially through micro-insurance products and targeted awareness campaigns.

b. **Strengthening cost-control mechanisms** through empowered HTA and robust negotiation for pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

c. **Launching a parallel national investment strategy** in human resources for health and public health infrastructure to match the increased demand.

d. **Fostering independent monitoring and evaluation** to continuously assess the system's performance on equity, efficiency, and financial protection metrics.

The Egyptian experiment offers an invaluable real-time lesson for other nations: that the path to UHC requires both a blueprint of sound architectural principles and the unwavering political and operational commitment to build it.

Final Conclusion (Rephrased)

Establishing a viable and enduring health insurance system is a formidable undertaking, demanding not only a coherent vision but also the political will to see it through and significant technical capacity. A synthesis of global evidence suggests a consistent pathway to success: nations should aim for **universal coverage** funded by **mandatory, pre-paid contributions** that are **consolidated into large risk pools**. This foundation must be reinforced by **proactive purchasing strategies** and **rigorous cost-containment measures**, all operating within a framework of **transparent governance** supported by **robust data systems**. Although the specific architecture of any system must be adapted to a nation's unique socio-economic and historical landscape, the core objectives of **equity, efficiency, and social solidarity** are non-negotiable. The comparative analysis of international models—learning from the coordinated success of systems like Germany's as much as from the costly fragmentation evident in the United States—offers an essential guide for countries committed to safeguarding their populations' health and economic security.

An Analysis of Systemic Failure in the U.S. Health Insurance System

Labeling the U.S. health insurance system as a outright "failure" oversimplifies a deeply entrenched and complex issue. A more precise characterization is that it is plagued by **enduring, structural deficiencies** which, despite the nation's unparalleled health expenditures, consistently yield inferior outcomes relative to other affluent countries.

The root of this underperformance lies in its fundamental architecture. Rather than a unified system, American healthcare is a **disjointed amalgamation** of competing models and payers. It is this profound **lack of integration and coordination** that stands as a primary driver of its most critical shortcomings.

The following analysis delineates these core failures, substantiated by empirical data and cross-national comparisons.

1. The Problem of Affordability and Cost

The most glaring failure is the extreme cost of healthcare in the U.S., which burdens individuals, employers, and the government.

- **Highest Spending, Worst Value:** The U.S. spends a far larger share of its wealth on health care than any other country.
  - **Total Health Expenditure (% of GDP): 17.3%** (OECD Average: ~9.2%) (OECD, 2023).
  - **Health Expenditure per Capita: $12,555** (The next highest countries, Germany and Switzerland, spend about $7,700) (OECD, 2023).
- **High Administrative Costs:** The complex, multi-payer system with hundreds of private insurers involves massive overhead.
  - **Administrative costs** account for **8%** of total healthcare spending in the U.S., compared to a range of 1-3% in countries with simplified, single-payer systems like Canada (Himmelstein et al., 2020). This represents hundreds of billions of dollars spent on billing, marketing, and profit, not on care.

Result: These sky-high costs translate directly to higher premiums, deductibles, and copayments for Americans, making care unaffordable even for the insured.

2. The Problem of Coverage Gaps and the Uninsured

Despite the Affordable Care Act (ACA) significantly reducing the number of uninsured, millions remain without coverage.

- **Uninsured Population:** In 2022, **27.6 million** non-elderly Americans (approximately **10.2%** of the population) were uninsured (Keisler-Starkey & Bunch, 2023).
- **Why the Gap Persists:**
  - **The Medicaid "Gap":** The ACA intended to cover all low-income adults by

expanding Medicaid. However, a Supreme Court ruling made expansion optional for states. As of 2024, **10 states have not expanded Medicaid**, leaving an estimated **1.9 million people** in a "coverage gap" – they earn too much to qualify for traditional Medicaid but not enough to qualify for ACA marketplace subsidies (KFF, 2023).

- **Unaffordable Plans:** For those not receiving subsidies, especially the middle-class, marketplace plans can be prohibitively expensive due to high deductibles and premiums.
- **Immigration Status:** Many undocumented immigrants are ineligible for public coverage and most marketplace plans.

Result: Millions of Americans avoid seeking care due to cost, leading to worse health outcomes and financial ruin when emergency care is needed.

3. The Problem of Underinsurance and Medical Debt

Having insurance does not guarantee financial protection. **Underinsurance** is a massive failure.

- **High-Deductible Plans:** Many employer-sponsored and marketplace plans have very high deductibles (often thousands of dollars), meaning patients must pay huge amounts out-of-pocket before insurance kicks in.
- **Medical Debt:** This is a uniquely American problem on a massive scale.
  - **Data:** An estimated **100 million Americans** (41% of adults) have some form of healthcare debt (Lopes et al., 2022).
  - Medical debt is a leading cause of personal bankruptcy in the United States.

Result: People with "good" insurance can still face financial catastrophe from a medical emergency. They often skip necessary tests, medications, or follow-up visits because they can't afford the out-of-pocket costs.

4. Perverse Complexity and Administrative Overhead

A defining and crippling feature of the U.S. healthcare landscape is its overwhelming administrative complexity, which imposes significant burdens on both providers and patients.

- **A Multi-Payer Labyrinth:** Providers operate within a bewildering ecosystem of countless insurance plans. Each payer maintains its own unique protocols for coverage, billing codes, and prior authorization mandates, forcing medical practices to maintain extensive administrative staff solely to navigate this bureaucracy.

- **The Burden of Prior Authorization:** The common insurer requirement for pre-approval of treatments, while intended as a cost-control measure, frequently functions as a barrier to timely care. This process generates immense paperwork for clinicians and can dangerously delay access to necessary services.
- **The Scourge of "Surprise Billing":** Patients often face financially catastrophic bills after receiving care from an out-of-network specialist—such as an anesthesiologist or radiologist—within a hospital that is itself in their insurance network. Despite recent legislative efforts to mitigate this practice, it continues to pose a serious risk to patients' financial security.

Consequence: This entire layer of administrative intricacy generates no clinical benefit. Instead, it fuels frustration among stakeholders and is a primary contributor to the exorbitant administrative overhead that uniquely burdens the American system.

5. The Paradox of Poor Health Outcomes

Despite allocating a larger share of its economy to healthcare than any other nation, the United States consistently fails to achieve commensurate population health results. The return on this massive investment is strikingly poor, with the system delivering outcomes that lag behind those of peer countries that spend considerably less.

- **Lower Life Expectancy:** U.S. life expectancy at birth is **76.4 years** (2023), lower than the OECD average of **80.3 years** and far below countries like Japan (84.5), Canada (82.3), and Germany (81.0) (OECD, 2023; Arias et al., 2023).
- **Higher Preventable Mortality:** The U.S. has a higher rate of death from preventable causes (e.g., complications of diabetes, bacterial infections) than its peers (OECD, 2023).
- **Higher Maternal and Infant Mortality:** The U.S. has the highest maternal and infant mortality rate among comparable high-income countries (Gunja et al., 2023).

Result: The system fails at its most basic goal: keeping the population healthy, despite spending unprecedented amounts of money.

Summary: The Root Cause of the "Failure"

The core failure is that the U.S. system is not designed for universal, affordable coverage. It is a **hybrid system** built on a for-profit private insurance model, with public programs (Medicare, Medicaid) filling some gaps.

- **Profit Motive:** Private insurers have a fiduciary duty to shareholders to generate profit. This creates an inherent conflict: maximizing profit often involves denying claims, restricting networks, and avoiding enrolling sick people.
- **Fragmentation:** The lack of a unified system prevents the U.S. from having the

negotiating power that single-payer systems have to control drug and hospital prices.

- **Employment-Based Tie:** Tying health insurance to employment creates instability. Losing a job can mean losing health coverage, precisely when it is most needed.

In essence, the U.S. system fails to achieve the primary goals of a health insurance system: **universal access, affordability, and equity.** It excels at generating revenue for stakeholders (insurers, pharmaceutical companies, some hospital systems) but underperforms in providing cost-effective care for its citizens.

References

1. Arias, E., Tejada-Vera, B., & Kochanek, K. D. (2023). *United States Life Tables, 2021*. National Vital Statistics Reports. National Center for Health Statistics.
2. Gunja, M. Z., Gumas, E. D., & Williams II, R. D. (2023). *Mirror, Mirror 2023: Reflecting Poorly — Health Care in the U.S. Compared to Other High-Income Countries*. The Commonwealth Fund.
3. Himmelstein, D. U., Campbell, T., & Woolhandler, S. (2020). Health Care Administrative Costs in the United States and Canada, 2017. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 172(2), 134–142.
4. Keisler-Starkey, K., & Bunch, L. N. (2023). *Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2022*. U.S. Census Bureau.
5. KFF (Kaiser Family Foundation). (2023, November 1). *The Coverage Gap: Uninsured Poor Adults in States that Do Not Expand Medicaid*.
6. Lopes, L., Kearney, A., Montero, A., & Hamel, L. (2022, June 14). *Health Care Debt in the U.S.* KFF.
7. OECD (2023). *Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
8. OECD (2023). *OECD Health Statistics 2023*. OECD Publishing.
9. (OECD, 2021; The Commonwealth Fund, 2021).
10. Beveridge, W. (1942). *Social insurance and allied services*. HM Stationery Office.
11. Busse, R., Blümel, M., Knieps, F., & Bärnighausen, T. (2017). Statutory health insurance in Germany: A health system shaped by 135 years of solidarity, self-governance, and competition. *The Lancet, 390*(10097), 882–897.
12. Cabinet of Egypt. (2023). *Prime Minister: The universal health insurance system is applied in 11 governorates so far* [Press release].
13. El-Saharty, S., Awad, F., & Kanaan, M. (2015). *Egypt health policy review*. World Bank Group.
14. Elshamy, A., Elshiekh, H., & Al-Shorbagy, N. (2022). Health financing policy in Egypt: A path to universal health coverage. *The Lancet, 399*(10330), 1125–1126.
15. International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Arab Republic of Egypt: 2023 Article IV consultation*. IMF Country Reports.
16. Khalil, M., et al. (2020). Early assessment of Egypt's universal health insurance law: A focus on financial protection. *Value in Health Regional*

Issues, 22, S12.

17. Kutzin, J. (2013). Health financing for universal coverage and health system performance: Concepts and implications for policy. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 91*, 602–611.
18. *Law No. 2 of 2018, Promulgating the Universal Health Insurance Law*, The Official Gazette, Egypt. (2018).
19. Marchildon, G. P. (2013). *Health systems in transition: Canada* (2nd ed.). University of Toronto Press.
20. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Health at a glance 2019: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
21. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Health Statistics 2021*. OECD Publishing.
22. Savedoff, W. D., de Ferranti, D., Smith, A. L., & Fan, V. (2012). Political and economic aspects of the transition to universal health coverage. *The Lancet, 380*(9845), 924–932.
23. World Bank. (2019). *Project appraisal document: Egypt - Transforming Egypt's healthcare system program* (Report No. PAD2960).
24. World Health Organization. (2020). *Global spending on health: Weathering the storm*. World Health Organization.
25. **Bupa (2022).** *Healthier Nation Index Report*. Bupa. [This report is based on annual customer and market research conducted by the leading private insurer].
26. **NHS England (2024, January 11). NHS Waiting List Figures*. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/rtt-waiting-times/
27. **OECD (2023).** *Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/7a7afb35-en
28. **Office for Health Improvement & Disparities (OHID) (2023).** *Public Health Expenditure Tables: 2022*. UK Government. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/public-health-expenditure-in-england-2022-to-2023
29. **Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2023).** *UK Population Estimate*. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/population

andmigration/populationestimates

30. **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Library:**
    a. Data: Health expenditure as a percentage of GDP, health expenditure per capita (in USD PPP).
    b. Link: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/data/oecd-health-statistics_health-data-en
    c. Usage: Provided core comparative metrics for Germany and Canada. Egypt is not an OECD member and is not included in this database.
31. **The World Bank DataBank:**
    a. Data: Health expenditure as a percentage of GDP, health expenditure per capita (current USD), and general population figures.
    b. Link: https://data.worldbank.org/
    c. Usage: Provided key data points for all three countries, especially crucial for Egypt. Served as a primary source for Egyptian health expenditure figures.
32. **World Health Organization (WHO) Global Health Observatory:**
    a. Data: Insights into health system financing, coverage, and out-of-pocket expenditure trends.
    b. Link: https://www.who.int/data/gho
    c. Usage: Provided context and supplementary data on health system structures and financial protection metrics (e.g., out-of-pocket spending).
    d. WHO/World Bank report CHE, TheGlobalEconomy.com+1
    e. CIHI estimate for total health expenditure in 2023
    f. UK Health Accounts preliminary estimate for 2023. Office for National Statistics
    g. European Commission+1, Healthcare expenditure statistics – overview
    h. National Health Expenditure (NHE) total for 2023, CMS+1
33. **The Commonwealth Fund:** "International Health Care System Profiles" for profiles on Germany, Canada, the UK, and the USA.

34. **The King's Fund:** "The NHS: How does it work and how is it changing?" for analysis of the UK's NHS.
35. **Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF):** "Health Costs and Financing" for data and analysis on the US healthcare system.
36. **World Bank:** "Egypt's Universal Health Insurance Law: A Step Toward Universal Health Coverage" for information on Egypt's reform efforts.
37. **World Health Organization (WHO) Regional Office for Europe:** "Health Systems in Transition" profiles for detailed reports on European systems like Germany and the UK.