



- We can provide a flag in the ISX.
- We may not satisfy some customers.
  - Some are not partner-aware.
- We will continue to publish X12.3 along with X12.31.
- X12.31 will be the alternate.
- We have a set of tools the industry continues to use.
- We can change ISA but it has not changed in 27 years.
- We need the wire to say Standard version.
- We view this from the trading partner standpoint, not the translator.
- We provide tools without specifying how to use them.
- Hard to satisfy some users.
- DoD is not unusual.
  - Many still use 4010.
- X12.6 needs to be changed.
- We failed for 10 years to pass something to support common practice.
- Prefix before ISA can identify version.
- Processing instructions are not part of X12.
- DoD defines code list version in the Implementation Guides.
- Multiple ways to identify version says we are doing something weird.
- ISX is an elegant solution.
- 75% of the transactions do not follow current X12 Standards.
- 4010 is most commonly used.
- Of course 5010 is mandated for healthcare.
- RFI-2207 Steve fixed a typo, remains approved by C
- RFI-2212 N has, in response to our previous request, prepared a response.
  - Deborah has mailed that to us.
  - Alan will put it in imeet.
  - We will discuss and approve tues.
- RFI-2225 – Deborah will get back to us.
- 999-tr3 comment period activity held by N
  - Jerry from N will be in C tues 10am to present comments and N's suggestions on changes to the TR3.

- **Recess Meeting 11:04**
-

**X12C Standing Meeting Minutes**  
**Full Subcommittee Session**  
**Monday September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017**  
**2:00pm – 3:00pm**

*Go to meeting Information Included at the end of the agenda.*

Please send an email to [Lisa@ybr.net](mailto:Lisa@ybr.net) with the Subject Line: "Working Session" to have your attendance recorded.

---

---

**Agenda:**

- **Welcome**      **2:00**
- **Attendance**
  - Peter Pruyne**
  - Steve Bass**
  - Gary Beatty**
  - Deborah Brown**
  - Stephanie Fetzer**
  - Rachel Foerster**
  - Becky Kimmick**
  - Frank Napoli**
  - Hasam**
  - Max-Gerd Retzlaff**
  - Steven Rosenberg**
  - Merri-Lee Stine**
  - Jim Taylor**
  - Alan White**
  - John Zdanowski (Caterpillar)**
  - Zuabaire**
- **Working Items**
  - DM018117
    - We want to "unversion" X12.3.
    - How does the receiving party know the version?
    - DoD does not want to touch anything.
    - A character prior to the ISA segment might identify X12.31 (or we might call it X12.3C).
    - We are working through the details.
    - The element length is an issue.
      - An element may not accommodate the X12.3C length.
    - Designate X12.3C with a processing instruction or by trading partner agreement.
    - We define a designator for the Master Code List.
    - Assume using current code list.
    - There will be an option to identify an older code list.
    - ISX can identify the version item.
    - This will work with Standards Version 3070.
    - ISX supports a version identifier.
    - We move forward on two separate paths, though ISX and X12.3C can be used together.
    - Acceptance depends on tolerance for complexity.
    - Version 4010 says use codes in the Implementation Guide.

- This is not stated in the Standards.
- The proposed changes will not necessarily affect trading partners but will affect network providers.
- The ISX is lost by the time we get the payload.
- We can't cater to every need.
- A straw poll showed that there was no objection to pursuing the ISX and X12.3C solutions.

- **Recess Meeting**      **3:06**
-



- Concern is focused on changes to CTX.
- This is an X12C transaction set.
- We need to review entire document.
- X23N uses a spreadsheet to summarize changes.
- The TR3 has not changed.
- X12C has not seen the document.
- Put it out for public review?
- We have the expectation that it will be inspected for technical correctness before public review.
- X12N claim “insignificant” changes were made to the 999 TR3.
- 7030 went out for public comment.
- 5010 was wanting.
- Prepare the TR3 for the Winter Session.
- The document is not in OnlyConnect per X12N procedures.
- Documents are entered in OnlyConnect after they are approved.
- We cannot look at the document as a whole.
- We need to see the changes in the context of the entire document.
- The changes will be entered into OnlyConnect in late November.
- There is no way for X12C to provide feedback in X12N’s process if only isolated changes are brought to X12C.
- Why cannot the workgroup use OnlyConnect to develop changes?
- A strategic decision was made by X12C to use OnlyConnect to join the rest of the X12 community.
- Other subcommittees are publishing TR3s that use OnlyConnect.
- Why are we getting a spreadsheet when we expect a full document?
- We will not have time review the document.
- Coordination between subcommittees is a problem.
- How do we deal with the time commitment?
- XML Paper
  - When do we talk about this with other subcommittees?
  - We have pushback from X12J: the XML was not socialized with other subcommittees.
  - Lisa disagrees.
  - It was discussed in Steering.
  - X12I and X12F were not informed about Forward Codes.
  - No, this was also discussed in Steering.
  - Steven Rosenberg saw it on our agenda.
  - Lisa published the agenda early – one month prior to the Standing Meeting.
  - Maybe much too early.
  - Send X12J notice of Forward Code review.
  - Some want it sooner.

- X12I wants to be in the room to reject it.
- X12J will have the opportunity at 2:00 PM.
- We want XML and Forward Codes out the door this evening.
- XML was approved yesterday.
- Minor changes were made and typos were corrected.
- Rachel moved to approve the updated XML document.
- Jim seconded.
- There are other changes to remove.
- Note a comprehensive list.
- No further discussion.
- No abstains.
- No nays.
- Unanimous ayes.
- The update document is approved.
- RFI 2212
  - Rachel moved to approve response.
  - Steve seconded.
  - No further discussion.
  - No abstains.
  - No nays.
  - Unanimous ayes.
  - The response was approved.
- Lisa's DM task list was reviewed.
- RFI 2225
  - Need to specify order.
  - There are multiple lines in the same segment.
  - Has to be in order in book.
  - Transactions do not have to follow that order.
  - Rachel moved to approve the response.
  - Jim seconded.
  - No further discussion.
  - No abstains.
  - No nays.
  - Unanimous ayes.
  - The response was approved.

- **Recess Meeting 11:46**

---

