X12C Standing Meeting Minutes
Full Subcommittee Session
Monday June 5th, 2017
10:00am – 11:00am

Go to meeting Information Included at the end of the agenda.
Please send an email to Lisa@ybr.net with the Subject Line: “Full Subcommittee Session” to have your attendance recorded.

Agenda:

- Welcome 10:00
- Attendance
  - Peter Pruyne
  - Steve Bass
  - Gary Beatty
  - Deborah Brown
  - Kent Chadwick
  - Frank Napoli
  - Max-Gerd Retzlaf
  - Jim Taylor
  - Alan White

- Working Items
  - Agenda Items
    - DMs
      - DM 049107
        Satisfy end users that want new codes but do not want to change version
      - DM 018117
        Creates a technical solution to provide, within a single transaction instance, multiple code versions or code versions defined outside the version identified within the EDI control segments used in that single transaction instance
      - DM 020117
        Creates a Guideline for Code Set Version Flexibility
        Emphasis will be on code versioning.
    - RFIs
      - RFI 2170 - Invalid use of AK905 Rejection
      - RFI 2205 - Clarification on ISA02 and ISA
      - RFI 2207 - Segment Delimiters
      - RFI 2212 - Language Characters in 837
  - RFI 2170
    - X12C is primary.
    - X12N has approved X12C’s response:
      Based upon the information presented, the error message in the AK9 segment is not correct. There is no error in GS/GE segments presented.
    - X12C has already approved this response.
The CTX business unit is not required for every error reported on the 999 transaction. The 2100 Business Unit Identifier CTX situational rule states - "Required when the error reported in this IK3 loop is within a business unit and the business unit identifier is known by the submitter of the 999. If not required by this implementation guide, do not send." As such the 2100 CTX is not required if the error exists outside the defined position used for the transaction or if the submitter of the 999 is unable to associate the error’s location to a specific instance of the defined business unit. In the 999 acknowledgment for Healthcare Insurance (005010X231), the 2100 CTX Business Unit Identifier defines a data element that can be used as a reference point to more quickly locate an error within a file. The data element and the level which is used for this reference point is defined based on the type of transaction that was submitted. The business unit identifiers for each guide are listed in the table below. The business unit for each guide is the loop which contains the business identifier and all nested loops. In some instances, such as the 835 the business unit would be the entire transaction. In other cases, a transaction can contain multiple business units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loop-ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Claim Inquiry Reference Identification</td>
<td>2000 TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Subscriber Trace Number or Dependent Trace Number</td>
<td>2000C TRN02 or 2000D TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Subscriber Trace Number or Dependent Trace Number</td>
<td>2000C TRN02 or 2000D TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Healthcare Provider Identification Code</td>
<td>2100 NM109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Patient Identification Code</td>
<td>1000D NM109 or 1000C NM109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Claim Status Tracking Number</td>
<td>2200D TRN02 or 2200E TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Claim Status Tracking Number</td>
<td>2200D TRN02 or 2200E TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Subscriber Name Identification Code</td>
<td>2010C NM109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Organization Summary Remittance Assigned Number or Individual Remittance Assigned Number</td>
<td>2000A ENT01 or 2000B ENT01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>834</td>
<td>Subscriber Identifier</td>
<td>2000 REF02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>Reassociation Trace Number</td>
<td>Header TRN02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>Claim Submitter’s Identifier</td>
<td>2300 CLM01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

- X12C has no problem with this response.

**RFI 2205**

- Adding a syntax note was suggested.
- Reference X12.6.
- ISA elements are fixed field and always padded.
- Mike had suggested that there was no character but “white space”.
- ISA02 and ISA04 may be blank.
- It was noted that no other subcommittee has an interest in this RFI.
- Where do other subcommittees have the opportunity to express an interest in the RFIs?
- Emails are sent every Friday identifying RFIs.
The ISA has fixed-length fields.
- Blanks represent missing data.
- X12.5 has explicit mention in the BNF referencing no information.
- We had not pointed out why it was OK.
- Proposed response:

All-space values in ISA02 or ISA04 are valid in an ISA segment.

X12C recognizes a minor apparent conflict about this validity in our reference documents. X12C will undertake data maintenance to address this issue.

**Additional Information:**

ISA elements 02 and 04 are fixed in length with identical minimum and maximum lengths. Spaces are inserted to meet the minimum length in an AN data element. With the associated code 00 in ISA01 or ISA03, an all space value in ISA02 or ISA04 indicates no information.

X12.5, Section 4.4.1, makes explicit mention of the combination of a code 00 being paired with "no_information" which is defined ten spaces for ISA02 and ISA04.

- Frank moved to approve response.
- Alan seconded.
- No further discussion.
- No Abstains.
- No Nays.
- Unanimous Ayes.
- Motion passes.

- **Recess Meeting** 11:05
X12C Standing Meeting Minutes
Full Subcommittee Session
Tuesday June 6th, 2017
11:00pm – 12:00pm

Go to meeting Information Included at the end of the agenda.
Please send an email to Lisa@ybr.net with the Subject Line: “Full Subcommittee Session” to have your attendance recorded.

Agenda:

• Welcome 11:00
• Attendance
  Peter Pryne
  Steve Bass
  Gary Beatty
  Deborah Brown
  Kent Chadwick
  Stephanie Fetzer
  Frank Napoli
  Max-Gerd Retzlaf
  Jim Taylor
  Alan White
  Sylvia Williams

• Working Items
  o DMs 049107, 018117,020117
    ▪ Forward Codes.
    ▪ What can we do here?
    ▪ We are seeking inputs.
  o DM 061308
    ▪ Refer to X12.6 for Unique Identifiers.
  o DM 042316
    ▪ This is Gary’s DM
  o DM 019117
    ▪ Done.
    ▪ The TR2 is fully approved.
    ▪ The TR2 may be offered for free.
  o RFI 2207 – Segment Delimiters
    ▪ The last question is addressed in X12.5 appendix.
    ▪ First question: Is it necessary to negotiate what delimiters are used?
    ▪ This is a business decision.
    ▪ X12C is silent on this.
    ▪ What is sent in the ISA segment defines the delimiters.
    ▪ There is no way to make others accept these delimiters.
    ▪ The Companion Guide should specify delimiters for business partners.
    ▪ There are two paths:
      • Our position from our technical documents.
      • Best practices.
    ▪ X12C seeks input from additional discussions.
This is characterized by best practices.
Refer to X12.5, Version 5.
Implementation considerations are not part of the Standards.
Refer to RFI #28: Use of Carriage Return Line Feed.
This RFI refers to Version 4010.
Consider the lengthy interpretation of the RFI.
If I send it and the Receiver rejects it, is that legal?
  • Yes, this would be legal.
There is disagreement here.
Is it necessary?
  • No.
The Sender must negotiate with the Receiver.
  • Use TA25 for a rejection.
We do not say that the Receiver must accept any legal data sent.
There is no presumption that the Receiver must accept.
The Implementation Guide can restrict what is sent.
Trading Partner agreements are outside the X12 Standards.
There is no answer to this question in the Standards.
X12.5, Appendix A.3.1 speaks about Carriage Return/Line Feed.
It is at the discretion of the Sender.
Proposed Response:

To the final question regarding CR/LF: these characters are recognized as valid for use in EDI interchanges at the discretion of the sender, as noted in X12.5 section 4.3 and section A.3.1. This issue has arisen before, please see RFIs 28 and 669 at http://rfi.x12.org/ for additional information.

Recommendation:
To the question of negotiation between trading partners: Trading partners agreements lie outside the X12 Standard.

Deborah moved to approve the response.
Frank seconded.
No further discussion.
No abstains.
No nays.
Unanimous ayes.
Motion passes.
We will hold RFIs pending X12N's response.

• Recess Meeting 12:08
X12C Standing Meeting Minutes
Full Subcommittee Session
Wednesday June 7th, 2017
12:00pm – 1:00pm

Go to meeting Information Included at the end of the agenda.
Please send an email to Lisa@ybr.net with the Subject Line: “Full Subcommittee Session” to have your attendance recorded.

Agenda:

- **Welcome** 12:00

- **Attendance**
  - Peter Pruyne
  - Pete Anderson
  - Steve Bass
  - Gary Beatty
  - Deborah Brown
  - Kent Chadwick
  - Stephanie Fetzer
  - Frank Napoli
  - Max-Gerd Retzlaf
  - Jim Taylor
  - Alan White
  - Sylvia Williams

- **Working Items**
  - RFI 2212 – Language Characters in 837
    - C is primary.
    - The symbols are about pronunciation, not spelling.
    - Forget the special characters.
    - Send alpha.
    - Many are stuck with the old versions.
    - Migrate up if you want to send special characters.
    - Cannot send them if stuck in 4030.
    - Can do it in later versions.
    - This is a request for information regarding this Standard.
    - They are asking about a TR3.
    - How does one request information regarding a TR3?
    - The Standards cannot construct an email address.
    - Is this to be resolved in the Trading Partner Agreement?
      - No.
    - We do not encourage folks to send non-compliant transmissions.
    - Is this to be supported in the Standards or Implementation Guide?
    - Why have we not heard this before?
    - Proposed response:

      In response to the question can I send a Ñ or Ú, no, these characters cannot be sent in this version of the X12 Standard.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that you send the equivalent character without the diacritical marks. E.g. PEÑA would be sent as PENA.

- Jim moved to approve response.
- Stephanie seconded.
- Further discussion.
  - Frank would like to see this mentioned in Version 7030 or 7050.
  - This may be appropriate if and when we get a new HIPAA.
  - It is not implemented.
  - 7030 does not have features to fix this.

- No further discussion.
- Pete Anderson abstains.
- No nays.
- Unanimous ayes.
- Motion passes.

DM 049107

- Forward codes were addressed 10 years ago.
- The DoD has been very vocal about it.
- It is not OK for us to say that recognize the practice.
- There has been a lot of pushback on this matter.
- We wrote a white paper on the subject offering several paths.
- The white paper should have gone to X12J, but apparently did not.
- We established the ISX segment.
- The release character and character set have been approved.
- We have a DM for a TR2.
- We have a DM for a guideline.
- X12N and X12M want to allow codes from future versions in older versions of the Standards.
- DoD wants the practice sanctioned by X12.
- Some want a master version.
  - Changes to code list would be handled within the master version.
- We have DMs 018117 and 020117 on this subject as well.
- A piece of the work is yet to be completed.
- Peter indicated he would withdraw DM 049107.
- A guideline carries more weight.
- We move from white paper to guideline.
- X12N has not supported our solutions thus far.
- We could fork the old version opened for maintenance.
- We have technical approaches.
- We are unable to get people to agree.
- We have a menu of solutions.
- Under 018117 we have 20 solutions.
- We offer a menu of plausible technical approaches.
- Let people get happy.
- The white paper offers a matrix of technical solutions.
- We have a high-level solution.
- We need an organizational plan in the next 60 days.
- Give X12 members choices.
- Expand characters allowed in an ID?
  - This is a bad idea.
- People pick their own IDs and think they mean something.
- X12N is addressing the definition of the ID data type.
- Steve Rosenberg is concerned.
- There are examples.
- ID data type faults with an error code is needed.
- People think that there are internal code lists, but there is not.
- Support making a new data type.

  - DM 043317
    - Jim moved to approve DM 043317
    - Stephanie seconded.
    - No further discussion
    - Max abstains.
    - No nays.
    - Unanimous ayes.
    - Motion passes.

- Recess Meeting 1:15