REQUEST
For versions 005010 and 005050 of Data Element 756 -- Report Transmission Code
What is the distinction between:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE VALUE</th>
<th>CODE DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Electronic Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is no distinction, is one value preferred over the other?

REFERENCED X12 STANDARDS
The following X12 Standards were reviewed in developing this interpretation:
X12.3 Data Element Dictionary, Versions 005010 and 005050

FORMAL INTERPRETATION
As there is no expanded definition to give further guidance, there is no distinction between the code values “9” and “EM” for Data Element 756 – Report Transmission Code. The Data Element Dictionary provides no guidance as to which is preferred.

FURTHER DISCUSSION
If an X12 version is implemented that supports both of these code values for DE 756 we recommend that users specify which of the two code values are acceptable in the implementation.

In researching the development history we determined that DM 578394 added Code value “9”, Electronic Mail, to DE 756. The DM was approved for ballot in October 1994, published in February 1995, and included in version 003060.

DM 280296 added Code “EM”, E-mail, to DE 756. Originally, DM 280296 did not contain the action to add any codes to DE 756. When the DM was initially reviewed in April 1996, TAS recommended using DE 756 instead of creating new DE 1604. Thus, in June 1996, DM 280296 was approved for ballot as modified, and one of the modifications was to delete proposed DE 1604 and move the 12 proposed codes over to DE 756, including the code “EM” E-mail. DM 280296 was approved for publication in October 1996, and included in version 003070.

In retrospect, it appears that there may have been an oversight when the code list from proposed DE 1604 was added to DE 756, as the equivalent code value was not noted.