



**ASC Administrative
Policy and Procedure**

Standards Development Manual

**Procedures for Developing and Maintaining Standards,
Interpretations, Guidelines, and Technical Reports**

(SD2, ASC02)

Table of Contents

1	General Information	4
1.1	Introduction	4
1.2	Authority	4
1.3	Background	4
1.4	Administrative Assignments.....	5
1.5	Lists and Labels.....	5
1.6	Revisions.....	5
2	Processing a Work Request.....	6
2.1	Code Set Maintenance Request.....	7
2.2	Technical Report Request	7
2.3	Request for Interpretation.....	7
2.4	Other Request for New Development	8
2.5	Other Maintenance Request.....	8
2.6	PRB Reviews Request	8
2.6.1	PRB Approves	8
2.6.2	PRB Disapproves.....	9
2.7	PRB Annual Review.....	9
3	Internal Code List Maintenance	10
3.1	ASC Review Period	10
3.2	CMR Determination	10
3.3	Subcommittee(s) Processes Referred CMRs.....	11
3.4	PRB Publication Determination.....	11
4	New Development – Standards and Guidelines	12
4.1	Subcommittee Develops and Approves Proposed Work Product	13
4.2	TAS Reviews Proposed Work Product.....	14
4.2.1	TAS Recommends for Ballot.....	14
4.2.2	TAS Remands the Proposed Work	14
4.2.3	Subcommittee Resolves TAS Disapproval	14
4.2.4	TAS Considers Subcommittee Resolution	16
4.2.5	TAS Adjudication Panel Decision	16
4.3	PRB Authorizes Ballot.....	17
5	Revisions to Standards and Guidelines	17
6	Ballot	18

6.1	Evaluate Ballot Results	18
6.2	Distribute Ballot Comments	18
6.2.1	Process Technical Comments	19
6.2.2	Process Administrative Comments	19
6.3	Final PRB Review	20
6.4	PRB Approval to Publish.....	21
6.5	PRB Disapproval of Publication	21
6.6	TAS Recommendation	22
7	Technical Report Maintenance	22
7.1	Technical Report Type 1 –Tutorial	22
7.2	Technical Report Type 2 – Reference Model.....	22
7.3	Technical Report Type 3 – Implementation Guide	22
7.4	Technical Report Type 4 – Clarification Paper	23
7.5	Technical Report Development.....	23
7.5.1	Subcommittee Options During Development.....	23
7.5.2	Subcommittee Develops and Approves Draft Technical Report.....	24
7.5.3	TAS Reviews Draft Technical Report	24
7.5.4	Subcommittee Resolves TAS Concerns	25
7.5.5	TAS Resolves Disagreement	25
7.5.6	Final PRB Review	26
8	Corrections after Approval to Publish.....	27
9	Reaffirmation of Work Products	31
9.1	PRB Reaffirms.....	31
10	Withdrawal of an X12 Work Product	32
10.1	Subcommittee Initiates Withdrawal.....	32
10.2	PRB Reviews the Request.....	32
11	Developing an Interpretation Response	32
11.1	Subcommittee Processes the Request.....	33
11.2	Informal Interpretation	33
11.3	Formal Interpretation	33
12	Terminology	34
13	Document History	38

1 General Information

1.1 Introduction

The Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) Steering group (Steering) is responsible for this policy and associated procedures.

Members agree to be bound by these policies and to follow the associated procedures as a condition of membership. Non-members afforded specific collaboration privileges agree to be bound by these policies and to follow the associated procedures as a condition of those privileges.

Suggestions for improvements to this document are welcome. They may be submitted at <http://maintenance-requests.x12.org>.

Staff procedures supporting these policies and procedures are maintained separately. Questions related to the staff procedures may be directed to the Executive Directory at execdir@x12.org.

1.2 Authority

This document details rules of order and standing rules which supplement corporate rules and committee rules. Corporate rules are defined in the suite of corporate policies and procedures identified with the prefix CAP. Accredited Standards Committee rules are defined in the ***Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) Operating Manual (OPM, ASC01)***, and other policies and procedures identified with the prefix ASC. The rules detailed herein shall not duplicate, supersede, contradict, countermand, or overrule corporate or committee rules. The corporate rules and the **OPM** prevail in the case of any inconsistency.

1.3 Background

X12 publishes various products and makes them available to the public via the X12 Store (store.x12.org). Many of these products are maintained by the ASC. A current list of ASC work products is available online at <http://www.x12.org/x12-work-products/>.

The term maintenance encompasses requests for new products and revisions to current products. Maintenance requests are submitted via X12's online request forms. Requests may be presented by the public, X12 members, or a representative of an X12 group. X12 staff vets the request and initiates the appropriate X12 process based on the request. This document details the procedures which apply to maintenance of ASC work products.

X12 also publishes interpretations about ASC work products. These interpretations are based on Requests for Interpretation (RFIs), which may be presented by the public, X12 members, or a representative of an X12 group. X12 staff vets the RFI and initiates the appropriate X12 process based on the referenced work product. This document details the procedures which apply to interpretations of ASC work products.

For the purposes of this document, the term joint development indicates two or more X12 groups will concurrently and collaboratively define a solution or response to a maintenance or RFI request.

1.4 Administrative Assignments

X12 staff has responsibility for the administrative tasks identified in these procedures. The staff's detailed process steps are maintained separately to ensure timely and accurate updates are made to the noted processes.

Administration tasks are identified in this document under the auspices of an overseeing X12 group. Administration has no authority over and does not participate in standards development decisions. Administration is responsible for adhering to X12's approved policies and procedures in all situations.

1.5 Lists and Labels

There are several categories of information, which may be presented in sets or lists. To assist users of this document, a different presentation is used for each category.

- Actions/Tasks are denoted by numbered lists. The tasks do not always have to be performed sequentially.
- Choices/Decisions are denoted by capital letters.
- Lists/Criteria are denoted by bullets.

Note that single items for these categories are not denoted in this manner. In other words, one action is presented in sentence format; two or more actions, which occur at the same step of this procedure, are presented as a list, denoted as indicated above.

1.6 Revisions

The Policy and Procedures Task Group (P&P) is responsible for drafting revisions to this document when revisions are appropriate. Such revisions may be identified by Steering, by P&P, or by any party via <http://maintenance-requests.x12.org>.

P&P reviews this document at least biennially to ensure the policies and procedures are documented in the simplest manner with emphasis on clarity and accuracy.

Following P&P approval of a revised draft, the draft shall be submitted to Steering. Steering shall review the draft and either provide feedback to P&P on the revisions or approve the draft for ballot. The draft shall be considered approved upon majority approval of the associated ballot.

2 Processing a Work Request

Requests related to new products or revisions to current products are submitted online. The term work request encompasses requests submitted via any of X12's online forms, including but not limited to the Work Request (WR) form, Code Maintenance Request (CMR) form, and Request for Interpretation (RFI) form.

There are several administrative steps for processing a work request that precede this committee procedure. Those predecessor steps include, but are not limited to, vetting the request to ensure all necessary information is included, entering the request into the appropriate X12 repositories, assigning tracking numbers, and determination of the appropriate X12 process. Requests related to ASC work products are assigned to the ASC and processed in accordance with these policies and procedures.

Identifying and descriptive information, such as owner, description, purpose, URL, address, etc., related to ID data elements (aka external code lists) as documented in Appendix A of X12.3 is not part of the X12 EDI Standard. Such information is included for reference purposes only and as such, is not subject to ASC control or approval. Therefore, maintenance of such logistics information is not subject to the processes defined herein. External code list details are validated on a regular basis and updated as necessary.

Administration tracks work requests, from submission through publication, withdrawal or disapproval, in a registry to accommodate tracking, research, and institutional memory. To ensure work requests are addressed timely, all work requests must make forward progress annually or the work request shall be withdrawn. See **Section 2.7 PRB Annual Review**.

PRB approval is required before commencement of formal development of a new work product.

2.1 Code Set Maintenance Request

When a code set maintenance request is received:

1. Administration assigns the work request to the Technical Assessment Subcommittee (TAS).

Proceed to **Section 3 Internal Code List Maintenance**.

2.2 Technical Report Request

Because subsequent versions of a technical report are considered new work products, not maintenance, all work requests related to revising published technical reports are considered new development. PRB approval is required before commencement of associated maintenance work. However, steps 1 and 2 below are preliminary steps required to determine if any associated maintenance work will be undertaken, and shall occur before a PRB determination is requested.

1. Administration assigns the work request to an ASC subcommittee.
 - a. If the request is related to a published technical report, Administration assigns the work request to the subcommittee that developed the previous version.
 - b. If the request is unrelated to any published technical report, Administration assigns the request to the subcommittee responsible for the associated work product.
 - c. If Administration cannot determine the appropriate subcommittee assignment, the work request is assigned to the PRB. PRB will then determine the appropriate subcommittee assignment.
2. The assigned subcommittee reviews the work request and votes to determine whether the request will be accepted or denied.
 - a. If denied, the subcommittee chair notifies Administration of the reasons for the denial and Administration notifies the work request submitter.
 - b. If accepted, the subcommittee assigns a project delegate who adds additional information to the work request using the online Work Request form, and notifies Administration that the Work Request is ready for PRB review.
 - c. Administration adds the item to a PRB agenda.

Proceed to **Section 2.6 PRB Review**.

2.3 Request for Interpretation

The process for a request for interpretation is as follows:

1. Administration assigns the work request to the ASC subcommittee with maintenance responsibility for the work product in question. Unless PRB reassigns responsibility, the assigned subcommittee is the developing subcommittee for this request.
2. Administration notifies PRB of the request and the assignment.

3. PRB confirms or reassigns the developing subcommittee.
4. The developing subcommittee's PRB representative assigns a project delegate.
5. Upon request, PRB assigns other subcommittees joint development responsibility (joint subcommittee). Each joint subcommittee must assign a project delegate to oversee the procedural steps within that subcommittee. Joint developers must approve the draft response of the developing subcommittee before the response is considered final.
6. Administration notifies the developing subcommittee's project delegate of the PRB decision.

Proceed to **Section 11 Developing an Interpretation Response**

2.4 Other Request for New Development

For other requests for new development:

1. Administration adds the item to a PRB agenda.

Proceed to **Section 2.6 PRB Review**.

2.5 Other Maintenance Request

For any other type of maintenance request:

1. Administration adds the item to a PRB agenda.

Proceed to **Section 2.6 PRB Review**.

2.6 PRB Reviews Request

PRB evaluates the request and either approves or disapproves development of new work products, following the steps outlined below. PRB evaluation and approval is not required for requests related to revision of published work products.

PRB evaluation criteria:

- Does the requested work product align with the ASC purpose and scope and the purpose and scope of an ASC subcommittee?
- Can a published work product satisfy the stated business need?
- Can a work product under development satisfy the stated business need?

2.6.1 PRB Approves

The process for PRB approval is as follows:

1. PRB authorizes the development.
2. PRB assigns development responsibility to one subcommittee, generally the subcommittee that presented the work request for approval.
3. The developing subcommittee's PRB representative assigns a

- project delegate.
4. Upon request, other subcommittees will be assigned joint development responsibility (joint subcommittee). Each joint subcommittee must assign a project delegate to oversee the procedural steps within that subcommittee.
 5. Administration notifies the developing subcommittee's project delegate of the PRB decision.
 - a. If the request is for a Technical Report
Proceed to **Section 9 Technical Report Maintenance**
 - b. If the request is for an EDI standard or guideline
Proceed to **Section 4 New Development – Standards and Guidelines**
 - c. If the request is for any other work product, PRB shall determine the appropriate procedure as part of their approval.

2.6.2 PRB Disapproves

The process for PRB disapproval is as follows:

1. PRB documents the reason(s) for the disapproval, based upon the criteria listed under **Section 2.6 PRB Review**.
2. Administration updates the registry with the decision and reasons.
3. Any materially affected subcommittee may revise the work request based on the disapproval reasons
Revert to **Section 2.2 Technical Report Requests #2:**
4. Barring a resubmission, Administration closes the work request.

2.7 PRB Annual Review

At least annually, PRB evaluates all open work requests as part of their Fall Standing Meeting agenda, to ensure that work requests are addressed timely and do not stagnate such that the requested work is no longer relevant, pertinent or useful to the requestor or in the scenario described by the requester. Any work request without demonstrable forward progress shall be withdrawn. A new request for the same or similar work may be submitted if the circumstances causing the stagnation change in the future. PRB may, at the discretion of the PRB Chair, review open work requests on a more frequent basis.

PRB evaluation criteria will, at a minimum, include:

- Has any ASC subcommittee, task group, or work group taken formal action on the work request in the preceding 12-month period?
 - Formal action includes active collaboration on a solution to satisfy the request, a vote on revisions related to the request, or active efforts to gather industry input on the request.

- A vote to defer the work shall not count as formal action for this purpose.
- Is the requestor still interested in the requested work being completed? If not, can another champion for the requested work be found within 30 calendar days? The registry will be updated to include the identified champion as the requestor.
- Is there a stalemate between X12 subcommittees preventing forward progress? If so, in the opinion of PRB, can the stalemate be resolved within 90 calendar days such that forward progress can occur?

After consideration of the evaluation criteria and any special circumstances, PRB shall withdraw a work request that does not meet the established criteria for progress.

3 Internal Code List Maintenance

Internal code lists are maintained using the procedures defined in this section. X12 also maintains a separate type of code lists, external code lists, using procedures defined in related X12 policy documents, *External Code Lists (CAP12)*.

A Code Maintenance Request (CMR) is submitted via X12's online CMR form. Requests may be presented by the public, X12 members, or a representative of an X12 group. CMRs are not subject to ballot, instead the outcome is determined based on a review and comment process.

3.1 ASC Review Period

The procedure for the ASC Review period is as follows:

1. Staff administers a 21-day CMR review period.
2. Administration provides TAS with a summary of the CMRs included in the comment period and any associated comments.
3. Administration adds the item to a TAS agenda.

3.2 CMR Determination

TAS is responsible for coordination between the subcommittees and the final determination of each CMR. Other subcommittees may be consulted on specific CMRs, but TAS retains final authority.

Depending on the comments received, TAS may refer a CMR to one or more subcommittees for additional discussion or recommendations. When the CMR is referred to more than one subcommittee, all those subcommittees shall report to TAS before TAS makes a determination on the CMR.

The determination of CMRs occurs in this order:

1. TAS reviews each CMR listed in the summary and chooses one of the following:
 - a. Approves the CMR as submitted.
 - b. Approves the CMR with modifications.
 - c. Accepts withdrawal from the submitter and closes the CMR.
 - d. Disapproves the CMR with reasons and closes the CMR.
 - e. Refers the CMR to one or more subcommittees other than TAS.
2. Administration:
 - a. Processes the TAS decisions.
 - b. Adds due process confirmation of final determination to a PRB agenda.

Corrections

Following TAS approval of the CMR, the TAS chair may act on behalf of the subcommittee and instruct staff to correct any technical inaccuracies. Technical inaccuracies include semantic rule, syntax rule, or data attribute discrepancies, or non-substantive typographical or grammatical corrections that may have been missed during the CMR approval process. This correction process shall not otherwise be used to circumvent the defined process. The TAS chair shall email such correction instructions to tassecretary@x12.org, copying ascchair@x12.org and prbchair@x12.org. Any questions or concerns related to correction instructions shall be resolved between the TAS chair, PRB chair, Steering chair, and X12 Executive Director. The period for such corrections ends thirty (30) calendar days after the first distribution of the revised code list.

3.3 Subcommittee(s) Processes Referred CMRs

Each subcommittee evaluates any referred CMRs and takes actions as necessary to formulate a subcommittee determination recommendation to be reported at the next TAS meeting. Revert to **Section 3.2 CMR Determination**.

3.4 PRB Publication Determination

If there is disagreement on any procedural aspect related to CMRs, the objecting party must convey this objection to PRB prior to the vote confirming due process.

PRB reviews the CMR process flow to ensure documentation is complete and applicable procedures were followed. If required documentation is missing or incomplete for one or more individual CMRs, PRB may disapprove publication of the specific CMR(s), not the full set. PRB may disapprove publication of the full set of CMRs based on a due process issue with the comment period or another all-encompassing issue.

Following the review, PRB votes to:

- A. Approve publication of the revised code lists.
 - a. Administration processes the approval and publishes the revised code lists.
- B. Disapprove publication of the revised code lists.
 - a. PRB documents the procedural violation.

Revert to **Section 3.2 CMR Determination**

4 New Development – Standards and Guidelines

This chapter defines procedures for the development of work products that require an ASC committee ballot.

At any point, the developing subcommittee may choose to do one of the following:

- A. Withdraw the work request.
- B. Request to have the work request reassigned to another subcommittee.

To do either of the above:

1. The project delegate emails support@x12.org, notifying staff of the subcommittee decision to withdraw or request reassignment of the work request.
2. Administration processes the notice and adds the item to a PRB agenda.
3. PRB accepts withdrawal or reassigns responsibility for the work request.
4. Administration processes PRB's decision.

At any point prior to the PRB vote recommending publication, any X12 member representative may notify the PRB Chair at prbchair@x12.org of any substantive concern significant enough to disrupt the development process. Such a notification must be received prior to the PRB vote recommending publication.

If the PRB agrees that the concerns are substantive enough to disrupt development process, PRB:

1. Notifies the project delegate of the reported concern.
2. Investigates the situation to determine the facts and evaluate the activities and actions.
3. Decides on an action based on the investigation.
 - a. Finds no substantive issue has occurred.
 - b. Finds a due process issues has occurred and remand the work to the appropriate procedural step.
 - c. Finds a technical issue has occurred and remand the work for technical correction.
4. Communicates the decision to the ASC Chair, staff, the project delegate, and the reporting member representative.

4.1 Subcommittee Develops and Approves Proposed Work Product

The developing subcommittee drafts the proposed work product(s), and any associated revisions to existing work product(s), in accordance with policies, procedures, control and guidance documents and design rules applicable to the specific type of work product.

The developing subcommittee may seek technical assistance from TAS during development and may request an informal TAS review to discuss potential technical issues at any time before seeking formal TAS review.

When the developing subcommittee completes the draft work:

1. The project delegate emails support@x12.org, advising that the draft work is ready for subcommittee review and providing the draft work or noting where it resides (example: the proposed work is [Title] in OnlyConnect). The subject of the email must be "WR#### Proposed Work".
Once the draft work is submitted to Administration for processing, the repository becomes the owner of the work. All drafts of the proposed work will be generated from the repository.
2. Administration processes the proposed work product, including editing for common style as necessary.
3. The developing subcommittee votes to send the proposed work product(s) for formal review by TAS. The project delegate is responsible for ensuring timely voting is conducted and the results are reported to administration. If there are joint subcommittees assigned to the work request, they enter their approval or disapproval of the work product(s) as part of the TAS review.
If the subcommittees do not approve the same work product draft, and the differences cannot be resolved between the subcommittees, the developing subcommittee's approved draft will move forward.
4. Once all necessary approvals are registered with Administration, Administration notifies the project delegate and any joint project delegates, the TAS rep of the developing subcommittee and any joint subcommittees, and the TAS chair that the work is ready for subcommittee review/approval and provides the review draft.
5. Administration adds the work request to a TAS agenda.

4.2 TAS Reviews Proposed Work Product

TAS completes a technical review to ensure that the proposed work product(s) conform to the approved purpose and scope, and the control and guidance documents and design rules applicable to the specific type of work product. Based on the technical review, TAS either recommends the proposed work product(s) for ballot or remands the proposed work to the developing subcommittee.

TAS' vote to remand must be based on one of the following:

- Work not aligned with the approved work request.
- Clear violation of control and guidance documents and/or design rules applicable to the specific type of work product.
- TAS recommendation of an alternative technical approach.

4.2.1 TAS Recommends for Ballot

Upon TAS recommendation that PRB approve the proposed work product(s) for ballot.

1. Administration updates the registry based on TAS' decision(s) and places the item on a PRB agenda.

Proceed to **Section 4.3 - PRB Authorizes Ballot**

4.2.2 TAS Remands the Proposed Work

Absent a TAS recommendation to PRB, the work returns to the developing subcommittee for further action.

1. TAS documents the specific technical violation(s) and outlines revisions that would bring the proposed work product into alignment with the approved purpose and scope, or into compliance with control and guidance documents and/or design rules applicable to the specific type of work product, or their alternative technical approach.
2. The developing subcommittee's TAS representative communicates the TAS reasoning to the project delegate for action.
3. Administration updates the Registry based on TAS' decision(s).

4.2.3 Subcommittee Resolves TAS Disapproval

The developing subcommittee considers the specific violation(s) and any recommended revisions documented by TAS. The developing subcommittee chooses one of the options below. When returning to this step from **Section 4.2.4 TAS Considers Subcommittee Resolution**, option B is not a valid choice. Joint developers approve the

resolution of the developing subcommittee before the resolution returns to TAS.

- A. Accept the TAS recommendations.
 1. The developing subcommittee accept the TAS Recommendation(s) and revises the work product(s).
 2. The developing subcommittee votes to approve the revised work product(s) for formal review by TAS.
 3. Once the developing subcommittee approves the proposed re-work for TAS review, the project delegate notifies their TAS representative that the proposed work has been revised and approved and is ready for another TAS review. Joint subcommittees enter their approval or disapproval of the work product(s) as part of the TAS review.
 4. The subcommittee TAS representative emails tassecretary@x12.org to have the item added to the TAS agenda.
 5. Administration adds the item to a TAS agenda.
Revert to Section 4.2 - TAS Reviews Proposed Work Product
- B. Reject one or more of TAS' recommendations with a two-thirds (2/3) approval vote, excluding abstentions. Justification of why the control or guidance document has not been violated is required if the subcommittee opts to reject the TAS finding.
 1. The developing subcommittee must document their rationale for disagreeing with TAS' determination that the work does not align with the approved purpose and scope or conform to control and guidance documents or design rules applicable to the specific type of work product were violated, or disagreeing with TAS' alternative technical approach.
 2. The project delegate of the developing subcommittee emails support@x12.com advising staff that one or more of the TAS recommendations have been rejected, attaching the rationale for the rejection. Joint subcommittees enter their approval or disapproval of the rejection of the recommendation product(s) as part of the TAS review.
 3. Administration distributes the rationale to the TAS Chair, updates the registry and adds the item to a TAS agenda. Proceed to **Section 4.2.4 TAS Considers Subcommittee Resolution.**
- C. Decide to make additional changes to the proposed work product,

which resolves the disagreement between the Subcommittee and TAS.

1. The project delegate of the developing subcommittee emails support@x12.com advising staff that additional revisions are underway and the work will be resubmitted to Administration when the revisions are approved by the subcommittee. Joint subcommittees will enter their approval or disapproval of the revised product(s) as part of the TAS review.
 2. Administration notifies the TAS Chair and updates the registry. Revert to **Section 4.1 - Subcommittee Develops and Approves Proposed Work Product**
- D. Decide to withdraw the work request.
1. The project delegate of the developing subcommittee emails support@x12.com advising staff that the work request is being withdrawn.
 2. Administration notifies the TAS Chair and updates the registry.
 3. Revert to **Section 4.1 - Subcommittee Develops and Approves Proposed Work Product.**

4.2.4 TAS Considers Subcommittee Resolution

Following subcommittee rejection of TAS recommendations, TAS conducts another vote on the proposed work product(s).

1. If TAS accepts the Subcommittee's resolution from **4.2.3 Subcommittee Resolves TAS Disapproval**, then TAS recommends that PRB approve the proposed work product(s) for ballot.
 - a. Administration updates the registry based on the TAS decision(s) and places the item on a PRB agenda. Proceed to **Section 4.3 - PRB Authorizes Ballot**
2. If TAS confirms their original recommendation with a three-quarters (3/4) approval vote, **Proceed to Section 4.2.5 TAS Adjudication Panel Decision.**

4.2.5 TAS Adjudication Panel Decision

The TAS adjudication panel, an adjudication panel composed of only the TAS subcommittee representatives present at that time, decides by a simple majority vote, excluding abstentions, whether to sustain or overrule the TAS position. The panel's decision is final.

- A. If the panel sustains the TAS position.
 - a. The proposed work is remanded again to the developing

- subcommittee.
 - b. The developing subcommittee either accepts the TAS recommendation or withdraws the work.
 - c. Revert to Section 3.1.1.2.3 - Subcommittee Resolves TAS Disapproval.
- B. If the panel overrules the TAS position and recommends PRB approve the proposed work product(s) for ballot.
- a. Administration updates the registry based on the panel's decision and places the item on a PRB agenda.
- Proceed to **Section 4.3 - PRB Authorizes Ballot.**

4.3 PRB Authorizes Ballot

Administration generates the voting history and any other procedural information from the Registry and distributes it to the PRB.

Any complaint or question about a procedural aspect of the proposed work product must be conveyed to the PRB prior to the vote authorizing the work for ballot. Such a complaint must be presented to the PRB chair via email to vicechair@x12.org at least 24 hours before the PRB vote is scheduled to occur.

The PRB does one of the following:

- A. PRB approves the proposed work product for Ballot.
Proceed to **Section 6 Ballot**
- B. PRB disapproves the proposed work product for Ballot due to procedural violations.
 - 1. PRB determines where in the process the procedural violation occurred and instructs the developing subcommittee to revert to that step in the process and resolve the procedural issue(s).
 - 2. Administration updates the registry and notifies the project delegate of the developing subcommittee.

5 Revisions to Standards and Guidelines

Currently, there are no specific policies or procedures that apply only to revisions to standards and guidelines but not to new development of standards and guidelines. Conversely, there are no specific policies or procedures that apply only to new development of standards and guidelines but not to revisions to standards and guidelines. Therefore, the policies, procedures, and instructions contained herein in **Section 4 New Development – Standards and Guidelines** shall apply for revisions as well as new development.

6 Ballot

Administration prepares and distributes the ballot in accordance with the OPM.

A concern from any member's primary representative about the ballot wording or distribution must be submitted via email to support@x12.org before the end of the voting period. Administration will forward such concerns to the PRB Chair, due to time sensitivity the PRB Chair shall act on behalf of the PRB. If the PRB chair agrees that the concerns are substantive enough to invalidate the ballot, the PRB Chair shall notify the ASC chair at ascchair@x12.org and the Executive Director at executivedirector@x12.org of the decision.

6.1 Evaluate Ballot Results

Once the ballot closes, results and comments shall be processed as follows:

1. Administration tallies the ballots in accordance with the OPM.
2. If quorum was not attained,
 - a. Administration invalidates the ballot and notifies the PRB Chair and ASC Chair.
 - b. The ASC Chair and PRB Chair shall determine whether to re-ballot the matter or refer the matter to TAS for a recommendation.
3. If quorum was attained and the ballot was approved:
 - a. Administration places the item on the next PRB agenda.
 - b. Administration generates the voting history and any other procedural information from the Registry and distributes it to PRB.
Proceed to **Section 6.2 Distribute Ballot Comments**
4. If the quorum was attained and the ballot was disapproved:
 - a. Administration notifies the PRB Chair and ASC Chair.
 - b. Administration notifies the project delegate of the developing subcommittee.
 - c. Administration forwards any technical comments to the developing subcommittee project delegate for consideration.
 - d. The developing subcommittee reverts **4.1 Subcommittee Develops and Approves Proposed Work Product**.

6.2 Distribute Ballot Comments

Administration forwards any ballot comments as described below. Supportive comments and other general comments do not require a response. Comments which present a suggestion or request a clarification specifically related to the balloted matter require a response. Comment responses must be approved and sent to the voter within four months of the ballot closing date.

- a. Administration forwards any technical comments to TAS and the developing subcommittee project delegate for evaluation/response.

Proceed to **Section 6.2.1 Process Technical Comments**

- b. Administration forwards any administrative comments (comments unrelated to technical concerns) to the ASC Chair and Executive Director for evaluation/response.

Proceed to **Section 6.2.2 Process Administrative Comments**

6.2.1 Process Technical Comments

Processing technical comments:

1. The developing subcommittee project delegate drafts a response to each technical comment, in accordance with any subcommittee procedures, and provides the response(s) to their subcommittee TAS representative to present for TAS approval at the next TAS meeting.
 - a. TAS must approve a response to technical comments within 3 months of the ballot closing date.
 - b. The TAS Chair must submit the response(s) to Administration at support@x12.org within 3.5 months of the ballot closing date.
 - c. Administration must prepare and distribute the response to the submitter within 4 months of the ballot closing date.
Administration is responsible for monitoring the timeliness of the responses. Administration shall notify the X12 and PRB Chairs if timeliness becomes a concern.
 - d. Both the TAS Chair and the developing subcommittee project delegate must conduct a preliminary review of the technical comments within ten calendar days. If there are any concerns substantive enough to consider invalidating the ballot, the concerns must be emailed to Administration at support@x12.org within the ten-day period. Administration shall immediately notify the PRB Chair and the ASC Chair of the concern(s)

Proceed to **Section 6.3 Final PRB Review.**

6.2.2 Process Administrative Comments

Processing administrative comments:

1. The ASC Chair must conduct a preliminary review of the administrative comments within 15 calendar days. If there are comments substantive enough to consider invalidating the ballot, the ASC Chair will notify Administration and bring the matter to Steering for a formal vote.
 - a. If Steering votes to invalidate the ballot, the ASC Chair shall notify Administration and the PRB Chair of the decision, and the voters shall be notified. No further action shall be taken related to the invalidated ballot. A new ballot on the matter may be issued at a later time.

2. Administration shall draft, and the ASC Chair shall approve, a response to each administrative comment within 15 calendar days.
 - a. Administration shall distribute the response to the submitter within 30 calendar days of the ballot closing date.
3. Proceed to **Section 6.3 Final PRB Review**.

6.3 Final PRB Review

PRB considers any final input and reviews the procedural history to ensure due process was followed. If due process cannot be confirmed based on the information in the Registry, PRB shall disapprove publication of the proposed work.

After PRB approval for ballot and prior to the PRB meeting to consider publication of the proposed work, the developing subcommittee or any joint subcommittees may identify and recommend necessary correction(s) to the proposed work.

1. After PRB approval for ballot and prior to the PRB meeting to consider publication, the developing or joint subcommittee's project delegate notifies administration at support@x12.org that corrections have been identified, classifying each correction as substantive or non-substantive.
2. Administration notifies the PRB Chair of the recommended correction(s) and the submitted classification(s).
3. The PRB Chair notifies the developing subcommittee's PRB representative of the situation.
4. The PRB Chair schedules an interim meeting, if necessary, and places the matter on the PRB agenda.

At the PRB meeting to consider publication of the proposed work:

1. If the ballot was disapproved, proceed to **Section 6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication**.
2. PRB considers any corrections presented prior to the due process review.
 - a. If there are no corrections to consider, proceed to **Step 3 of this section**.
 - b. If there are no substantive corrections to consider, proceed to **Step 3 of this section**.
 - c. If there are substantive corrections to consider and PRB does not require TAS input to reach a decision, PRB evaluates the substantive corrections.
 - i. If PRB confirms the substantive corrections do not invalidate the ballot and should be applied to the published work product, proceed to **Step 3 of this section**.
 - ii. If PRB determines the substantive corrections should invalidate the ballot, proceed to **Section 6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication**.
 - d. If there are substantive corrections to consider and PRB does require

TAS input to reach a decision:

- i. The PRB Chair defers the matter to an interim PRB meeting and schedules such a meeting.
- ii. The PRB Chair notifies the TAS chair that a TAS recommendation on the matter is required within 30 calendar days.

Proceed to **6.6 TAS Recommendation on Corrections**

- e. Within 35 calendar days of the meeting that resulted in the deferral of the matter, the PRB Chair convenes an interim meeting to consider the TAS recommendation, or in the absence of a recommendation from TAS, to decide the matter based on its own judgement.
 - i. If TAS recommends and PRB confirms the substantive corrections do not invalidate the ballot and should be applied to the published work product, proceed to **Step 3 of this section**.
 - ii. If TAS recommends and PRB confirms the substantive corrections should invalidate the ballot, proceed to **Section 6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication**.
 - iii. If TAS recommends the substantive corrections do not invalidate the ballot and should be applied to the published work product and PRB disagrees, proceed to **Section 6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication**.
 - iv. If TAS recommends the substantive corrections should invalidate the ballot and PRB disagrees, proceed to **Step 3 of this section**.
3. PRB proceeds with due process review.
 - a. If the ballot has not been invalidated and due process is confirmed, proceed to **Section 6.4 PRB Approval to Publish**.
 - b. If the ballot has not been invalidated and due process is not confirmed, proceed to **Section 6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication**.

6.4 PRB Approval to Publish

If PRB approves of publication:

1. PRB votes to approve publication, noting whether any recommended corrections are to be applied prior to publication.
2. Administration updates the registry and takes all actions necessary to publish the approved work product, including application of any noted corrections.

6.5 PRB Disapproval of Publication

If PRB disapproves of publication:

1. PRB votes to invalidate the ballot and remand the work to the appropriate procedural step group based on where the procedural violation occurred.

2. Administration updates the registry and notifies the appropriate chair or project delegate, depending on where the procedural violation occurred.

6.6 TAS Recommendation

Within 30 calendar days, TAS conducts a standing meeting session or convenes an interim meeting to discuss the matter and make a recommendation. As time is of the essence for a pending ballot confirmation, if TAS does not timely make a recommendation, the PRB shall decide based on its own judgement.

1. The TAS Chair notifies the PRB Chair at vicechair@x12.org of the TAS recommendation.

Revert to 6.3 Final PRB Review, step 2.e

7 Technical Report Maintenance

This chapter defines procedures for development and maintenance of Technical Reports. Technical Reports are not subject to committee ballot but are subject to approval by specific subcommittees, depending on the subject matter. Technical Reports are intended to increase consistency in various uses of the X12 family of standards. X12's technical report repository is the official source for draft and final technical reports. All draft and final versions reports shall be generated from the repository.

7.1 Technical Report Type 1 – Tutorial

A Technical Report Type 1 (TR1) is a tutorial that expresses the intended use of a transaction set. It includes guidance on usage of the transaction set and it is intended to encourage uniform implementation. A TR1 is specific to one version/release of the EDI Standard.

7.2 Technical Report Type 2 – Reference Model

A Technical Report Type 2 (TR2) is a reference model. A TR2 can model business processes, computer applications, or business data flows, and is intended to assist in system development.

7.3 Technical Report Type 3 – Implementation Guide

A Technical Report Type 3 (TR3) is an implementation guide that addresses the use of one or more transaction sets for one specific business purpose. A TR3 is intended to facilitate consistent transaction set implementation within an industry or subindustry. More than one TR3 can be developed for a single transaction set, provided each describes the transaction set use for a different business purpose. A

TR3 is specific to one version/release of the EDI Standard.

7.4 Technical Report Type 4 – Clarification Paper

A Technical Report Type 4 (TR4) is developed when the intended purpose of the resulting TR4 does not align with the criteria for any other type of technical report. A TR4 includes clarification on the use, intentions, or components of one or more ASC work product. A TR4 may also describe external standards or activities as related to the ASC work product. A TR4 is specific to one version of a work product.

7.5 Technical Report Development

Technical Reports Type 1, 2, 3 and 4 (technical report) are processed in identical fashion per the procedures in this chapter.

7.5.1 Subcommittee Options During Development

At any point, the developing subcommittee may choose to stop work and do one of the following:

- A. Withdraw the work request.
- B. Request to have the work request reassigned to another subcommittee.

To do either of the above:

1. The project delegate emails support@x12.org, notifying staff of the subcommittee decision to withdraw or request reassignment of the work request.
2. Administration processes the notice and adds the item to a PRB agenda.
3. PRB accepts withdrawal or reassigns responsibility for the work request.
4. Administration processes PRB's decision.

At any point prior to the PRB vote approving publication, any X12 member representative may notify the PRB Chair at prbchair@x12.org of any substantive concern significant enough to disrupt the development process. Such a notification must be received prior to the PRB vote approving publication.

If the PRB agrees that the concerns are substantive enough to disrupt development process, PRB:

1. Notifies the project delegate of the reported concern.
2. Investigates the situation to determine the facts and evaluate the

- activities and actions.
3. Decides on an action based on the investigation.
 - a. Finds no substantive issue has occurred.
 - b. Finds a due process issue has occurred and remands the work to the appropriate procedural step.
 - c. Finds a technical issue has occurred and remands the work for technical correction.
 4. Communicates the decision to the ASC Chair, staff, the project delegate, and the reporting member representative.

7.5.2 Subcommittee Develops and Approves Draft Technical Report

As soon as possible, the project delegate either provides Administration with an initial draft of a new technical report or instructs administration as to the existing technical report which is to be used as the base for the new version.

Administration is responsible for the formatting of the technical report, including the presentation style. Administration loads the base document into X12's tool for technical report development. From this point forward, the tool's repository is the source of truth for the work. All drafts will be generated from the repository.

It is the project delegate's responsibility to ensure that the technical report is accurately represented in the repository.

The developing subcommittee:

1. Develops the draft technical report.
2. Votes to approve the proposed technical report for TAS review.
3. Upon subcommittee approval, the project delegate emails support@x12.org requesting a TAS agenda item for review/approval of the technical report.

Administration:

1. Adds the item to a TAS agenda.
2. Distributes the draft technical report for TAS review.

7.5.3 TAS Reviews Draft Technical Report

TAS completes a technical review to ensure that the draft technical report conforms to the approved purpose and scope, and the applicable control and guidance documents and design rules. Description of business functions, business rules, and business requirements remain under the

jurisdiction of the developing subcommittee and are outside the scope of the TAS review. Based on the technical review, TAS either approves the draft technical report for publication or remands the proposed work to the developing subcommittee.

TAS' vote to remand must be based on one of the following:

- Work not aligned with the approved work request.
- Clear violation of applicable control and guidance documents and/or design rules applicable to the specific type of technical report.
- TAS recommendation of an alternative technical approach.

Upon TAS' vote to recommend publication:

1. Administration updates the registry and places the item on a PRB agenda.

Proceed to **Section 7.5.6 Final PRB Review**

Upon TAS' vote to remand to the developing subcommittee:

1. Administration updates the registry.
2. The developing subcommittee's TAS representative notifies the Project Delegate of the TAS determination and next steps.

Proceed to **Section 7.5.4 Subcommittee Resolves TAS Concerns**

7.5.4 Subcommittee Resolves TAS Concerns

The developing subcommittee considers the TAS technical concerns and takes one of the following actions:

- A. Decides to revise the proposed Technical Report.
Revert to **Section 7.5.2 - Subcommittee Develops and Approves Draft Technical Report**
- B. Votes by at least a two-thirds (2/3) majority to not revise the proposed Technical Report as recommended by TAS
 - a. The Project Delegate notifies the subcommittees TAS representative of the decision.
 - b. The subcommittee TAS rep notifies TAS of the vote.

7.5.5 TAS Resolves Disagreement

Following subcommittee rejection of TAS findings, TAS conducts another vote on the proposed Technical Report(s).

If TAS does not confirm the original recommendation with a three-

quarters (3/4) approval vote (in other words, if TAS accepts the Subcommittee's proposed Technical Report(s) as presented), then the proposed Technical Report(s) move to PRB for approval to publish. Proceed to **Section 6.4 PRB Approval to Publish**

If TAS confirms the original recommendation with a three-quarters (3/4) approval vote, an adjudication panel composed of only subcommittee TAS representatives present at that time, decides by a simple majority vote, excluding abstentions, whether to sustain or overrule the TAS position. This panel's decision is final.

Based on the results of the TAS adjudication panel vote, one of the following occurs:

- A. Sustains TAS position. Upon majority approval, the proposed Technical Report is remanded again to the subcommittee. The subcommittee either accepts TAS' recommendation or withdraws the work.

Revert to **Section 7.5.4 Subcommittee Resolves TAS Concerns**

- B. Overrules TAS position. Absent majority approval, the subcommittee decision is accepted and the proposed Technical Report moves to PRB for approval to publish. Administration updates the registry and adds the item to the PRB agenda.

7.5.6 Final PRB Review

PRB considers any final input and reviews the procedural history to ensure due process was followed. If due process cannot be confirmed based on the information in the Registry, PRB shall disapprove publication of the technical report. If due process is confirmed, PRB shall approve publication of the technical report.

After PRB approval to publish and prior to publication, the developing subcommittee may identify and recommend necessary correction(s) to the technical report. In such cases,

1. The developing or joint subcommittee's project delegate notifies administration at support@x12.org that corrections have been identified, classifying each correction as substantive or non-substantive.
2. Administration notifies the PRB Chair of the recommended correction(s) and the submitted classification(s).
3. The PRB Chair notifies the developing subcommittee's PRB representative of the situation.
4. The PRB Chair schedules an interim meeting, if necessary, and

places the matter on the PRB agenda.

At the PRB meeting to consider the corrections:

1. If there are no substantive corrections to consider, proceed to **Step 4 of this section**.
2. If there are only substantive corrections that are directly tied to the business process described in the technical report to consider, PRB evaluates the substantive corrections.
 - a. If PRB confirms the corrections do not necessitate the technical report be remanded to a prior procedural step, proceed to **Step 4 of this section**.
 - b. If PRB ascertains that the technical report needs to be remanded to a prior procedural step, PRB withdraws the approval to publish.
Revert to the prior procedural step.
3. If there are substantive corrections related to applicable control and guidance documents and/or design rules, PRB withdraws the approval to publish.
Revert to Section 7.5.3 TAS Reviews Draft Technical Report
4. Staff applies the approved corrections, updates the registry, and takes all actions necessary to publish the technical report.

8 Corrections after Approval to Publish

Rarely, content issues are discovered after a work product has been approved as described in **Section 6 Ballot** or **Section 7 Technical Report Maintenance** that would negatively impact implementers or create a barrier to successful implementation. In such cases, it may be in the best interest of both the X12 organization and current and future implementers to address the problem quickly and efficiently. Evaluation of such content issues is limited to three periods following approval, prior to the work product being available in the store, after the work product is in the store but prior to any distribution of the work product, or within 60 calendar days of the first distribution of the work product. Content issues identified more than 60 calendar days after the first distribution of the work product are not correctable via these correction procedures but instead shall be treated as normal maintenance to the work product.

This section defines the conditions and processes generally governing such corrections. However, it is acknowledged and noted that detailed quantification of every possible content issue scenario is impossible and as such, the spirit of these conditions and processes shall be honored in any scenario not specifically detailed herein. Within 7 calendar days of notification of such a content issue, the ASC chair, PRB chair, and Executive Director shall evaluate any reported content issues and come to agreement on the type of issue it represents. Further evaluation of the content issue will proceed as

described herein.

Three types of content issues can be discovered, technical issues, non-technical substantive issues, and non-technical non-substantive issues. A description and examples of each type are included below, however the included information is not intended to represent a comprehensive list of potential issues, it is for clarification of intent.

Technical issues include those related to data attributes, syntax requirements, or semantic requirement. For example, approving a new three-character code for a two-character data element.

Non-technical substantive issues include usage instructions or situational rules that are technically accurate but do not reflect the actual needs of the intended implementers situational rules. For example, a comment on a date data element telling implementers to send an identification number in the date field or a TR3 situational rule stating that a data element is required for a certain business use when in fact that data element is not applicable for that business use.

Non-technical non-substantive issues such as grammatical errors, formatting issues, and other items not related to the technical accuracy of the published work.

Technical inaccuracy in the approved work product is of grave concern as the consequences of publishing technically inaccurate work are significant, for both X12 and implementers. In some cases, it is possible to correct the technical inaccuracy without negatively affecting the intended solution. In the above example, replacing the new 3-character code with a technically accurate 2-character code solves the technical issue without negative consequences.

Non-technical substantive issues, are most often related to inaccurate instructions related to a data element, segment, or transaction set. It is not likely that such issues can be corrected without additional member representative input although such correction may rarely be possible.

Technical inaccuracies and non-technical substantive issues shall be processed as follows.

1. The PRB chair shall act on behalf of the PRB.
2. The TAS chair shall act on behalf of TAS.
3. The ASC chair shall act on behalf of the ASC stakeholders.
4. Within 5 days of determination of the type of issue, Administration shall provide an assessment of the content issue, including a recommendation to the ASC, PRB, and TAS chairs.
5. The ASC, PRB, and TAS chairs shall evaluate the assessment and any supporting documentation necessary to reach a decision.

- a. If the content issue will not be corrected and the work product is not yet available in the X12 Store or has not yet been distributed, the ASC, PRB, and TAS chairs shall determine whether to invalidate the ballot or proceed with publication.
 - i. If the ballot is to be invalidated:
 1. The matter shall be remanded to PRB for assignment to the appropriate process step
 2. Administration shall be notified that the work product is to be considered as though it was not balloted.
 - ii. If publication is to proceed:
 1. The TAS chair shall be responsible for submitting a work request to address the issue in the next version of the work product.
 2. The PRB chair shall be responsible for entering a related RFI to ensure that an X12 position on the content issue and any potential work-around can be formalized and available to implementers as soon as possible.
- b. If the content issue will not be corrected and the work product has been distributed:
 - i. The TAS chair shall be responsible for submitting a work request to address the issue in the next version of the work product.
 - ii. The PRB chair shall be responsible for entering a related RFI to ensure that an X12 position on the content issue and any potential work-around can be formalized and available to implementers as soon as possible.
 - iii. Administration notifies any customer who received a copy of the tainted work of the issue and the pending RFI.
 - iv. Administration creates a distribution notice of the issue which shall accompany future distributions of the work product.
- c. If the content issue will be corrected:
 - i. The TAS chair confirms the correction to be applied to the work product.
 - ii. Administration applies the correction to the work product.
 - iii. Administration notifies any customer who received a copy of the tainted work product of the correction and how to obtain the corrected product.
6. The ASC chair shall communicate the situation to Steering at the next opportunity.
7. The TAS chair shall be responsible for communicating the situation to TAS with the intention of ensuring that the TAS review process is enhanced to ensure that TAS subsequently catches any similar technical issue.
8. The PRB chair shall communicate the situation to PRB at the next opportunity
9. Administration updates the registry so that the work request reflects the identified

issue and resolution.

While non-technical, non-substantive issues are not necessarily a barrier to implementation, X12 work products typically have a long life-cycle and correcting known issues prior to significant dissemination of the work product may prevent significant costs and inefficiencies over time.

Non-technical, non-substantive issues shall be processed as follows.

1. The PRB chair shall act on behalf of the PRB.
2. The ASC chair shall act on behalf of the ASC stakeholders.
3. Within 5 days of determination of the type of issue, Administration shall provide an assessment of the issue, including a recommendation to the ASC and PRB chairs.
4. The ASC and PRB chairs shall evaluate the assessment and any supporting documentation necessary to reach a decision.
 - a. If the work product is not yet available in the X12 Store or has not yet been distributed, the content issue shall be corrected.
 - i. The ASC and PRB chairs confirm the correction to be applied to the work product.
 - ii. Administration applies the correction to the work product.
 - b. If the work product has been distributed and the content issue will be corrected.
 - i. The ASC and PRB chairs confirm the correction to be applied to the work product.
 - ii. Administration applies the correction to the work product.
 - i. Administration notifies any customer who received a copy of the tainted work product of the correction and how to obtain the corrected product.
 - c. If the work product has been distributed and the content issue will not be corrected.
 - i. The PRB chair shall be responsible for submitting a work request to address the issue in the next version of the work product.
 - ii. The PRB chair shall be responsible for entering a related RFI to ensure that an X12 position on the content issue is documented and available to implementers as soon as possible.
 - iii. Administration notifies any customer who received a copy of the tainted work of the issue and the pending RFI.
 - iv. Administration creates a distribution notice of the issue which shall accompany future distributions of the work product.
5. The ASC chair shall communicate the situation to Steering at the next opportunity.
6. The PRB chair shall communicate the situation to PRB at the next opportunity.
7. Administration updates the registry so that the work request reflects the identified issue and resolution.

9 Reaffirmation of Work Products

ASC work products shall be reaffirmed or withdrawn as follows.

1. Reaffirmation of X12's American National Standards for EDI (ANS) shall be conducted as described in Section 10 of the OPM.
2. Reaffirmation is not required for versions of the EDI Standard.
3. Published Guidelines, Design Documents, and Technical Reports shall be reaffirmed or withdrawn every 5 years in accordance with **Section 9.1 PRB Reaffirms**, based on the publication date.
4. Interpretations shall follow the lead of their underlying publication, when the underlying publication is withdrawn, the Interpretation shall be automatically withdrawn.

9.1 PRB Reaffirms

Annually, as part of their Winter Standing Meeting agenda, PRB shall ensure X12's publication library is current and relevant.

Reaffirmation criteria:

- Does the published document reflect X12's current policies, procedures, and activities?
 - Is the published document actively referenced by X12 members, X12 implementers, X12 redistributors, or other X12 stakeholders?
 - Administration will provide information related to known use when such is available.
 - Has the published document been replaced or superseded by a more current or relevant version?
1. Approximately 60 days prior to the opening date of the Winter Standing Meeting, administration shall distribute a list of all publications that need to be reaffirmed to the PRB, noting that the assigned owner of each publication should be prepared to make a reaffirmation recommendation to PRB at the Winter Standing Meeting.
 2. Administration shall add reaffirmations to the PRB Winter Standing Meeting agenda.
 3. The PRB shall act on the reaffirmation list at a PRB session of the Winter Standing Meeting. The PRB Chair shall be responsible for ensuring all reaffirmation publications are either affirmed or withdrawn within 90 days of the Winter Standing Meeting.

10 Withdrawal of an X12 Work Product

At any time, the responsible subcommittee may decide, or PRB may direct, that a work product be withdrawn. Regarding a ballot approved in section 10.2 below, a vote to disapprove withdrawal shall only be considered as a valid disapproval if a comment demonstrating a verifiable requirement to use the work product in its current form is submitted with the disapproval. A disapproval for any other reason shall be counted as an abstention. If withdrawal of an ANS is approved, Administration shall complete any ANSI required steps.

10.1 Subcommittee Initiates Withdrawal

When a subcommittee initiates withdrawal:

1. The responsible subcommittee names a delegate to shepherd the withdrawal through the process.
2. The delegate completes the appropriate request form.
3. The responsible subcommittee approves the withdrawal request.
4. The delegate submits the withdrawal request to support@x12.org
5. Administration processes the request.

10.2 PRB Reviews the Request

The PRB reviews the withdrawal request and does one of the following:

- A. Approves the propose withdrawal.
Proceed to **Section 6 Ballot**
- B. Approves the proposed withdrawal for Ballot.
Revert to **Section 10.1 Subcommittee Initiates Withdrawal**
- C. Refers the request back to the subcommittee with comments.
Revert to **Section 10.1 Subcommittee Initiates Withdrawal**

11 Developing an Interpretation Response

An interpretation is an official clarification of a work product developed in response to a submitted inquiry. An interpretation enhances understanding of the work product and facilitates proper use of the work product. Interpretations are available to the public through an online tool.

There are two types of Interpretations, formal and informal. Formal interpretations are approved at several organizational levels and result in a formal response from the ASC Chair. Informal interpretations are subject to one or more subcommittee approval processes and result in a response from the subcommittee(s).

Interpretations are not the appropriate vehicle for requesting a revision to a work product. An RFI that is determined to be a request for a revision will be closed and the submitter will be notified that they need to submit a work request via X12's online WR or CMR form.

If the response to an inquiry results in a determination of a need to revise a work product, a work request must be submitted via X12's online WR or CMR form. The work request may be submitted by the X12 group that created the RFI response or by the RFI submitter.

11.1 Subcommittee Processes the Request

At any time during the development process, the project delegate may work with Administration to contact the submitter for additional information or clarification.

- A. If the request is for an informal interpretation:
Proceed to **Section 11.2 - Informal Interpretation**
- B. If the request is for a formal interpretation:
Proceed to **Section 11.3 - Formal Interpretation**

11.2 Informal Interpretation

The process for an informal interpretation is as follows:

1. The developing subcommittee develops and approves a response.
2. The project delegate enters the response in the RFI portal.
3. Administration distributes the response to the project delegates for any joint subcommittees.
4. Any joint subcommittees review and vote on the response.
 - a. If all joint subcommittees approve the response, it is the final response to the request.
 - b. If any joint subcommittees disapprove the response, the project delegates for each subcommittee attempt to resolve the issue(s) causing the disapproval.
 - c. If the subcommittees cannot all approve the same response after negotiations, the interpretation is reclassified as a formal interpretation.
Proceed to **Section 11.3 - Formal Interpretation**
5. Administration updates the status and assignment in the portal.
6. Administration notifies the submitter that the response is posted and available for review.

11.3 Formal Interpretation

The process for developing a formal interpretation is as follows:

1. The developing subcommittee develops and approves a response within six months.
2. The project delegate enters the response in the RFI portal.
3. Administration places the item on the TAS agenda and distributes the response to the ASC Chair.
4. The ASC Chair reviews the response and makes any presentation or wording recommendations in the RFI portal.

5. The TAS representative(s) of any joint subcommittees present the response to their subcommittee for approval.
6. The TAS representatives report on their subcommittee's disposition.
 - a. If all joint subcommittees approve the response, it is the final response to the request.
 - b. If any joint subcommittees disapprove the response, the project delegates for each subcommittee attempt to resolve the issue(s) causing the disapproval.
 - c. If the subcommittees cannot all approve the same response after negotiations, TAS votes to determine the final response.
7. Administration updates the portal.
8. Administration places the item on the PRB agenda.
9. PRB verifies due process. As part of this verification, a materially affected objecting party may convey a procedural objection for PRB consideration.
10. If PRB finds due process issues:
 - a. PRB remands the response to the appropriate step of this section.
 - b. Administration updates the portal.
11. If PRB confirms due process:
 - a. Administration updates the portal.
 - b. Administration prepares and distributes the formal response to the submitter.

12 Terminology

To ensure consistency across the organization, X12 terms and their approved definitions are maintained in an extensive, stand-alone corporate reference, referred to as the **Wordbook**.

For convenience, the terms below, which are used herein, have been extracted from the current Wordbook at the time of publication. The current version of the **Wordbook** shall prevail in the event of any difference with this extracted information.

Accredited Standards Committee (ASC)

The X12 committee responsible for developing, maintaining, and interpreting EDI standards eligible for submission as American National Standards or UN/EDIFACT International Electronic Data Interchange Standards.

ASC Operating Manual

The Accredited Standards Committee's (ASC) primary policies and procedures document. ANSI accreditation is based on these policies and procedures.

Synonyms: ASC01, OPM

Ballot

A motion submitted to a set of X12 members. X12 supports various types of formal ballots including, corporate, committee, subcommittee, constituent and participant ballots. X12 also supports an informal ballot, the straw poll.

Chair

The person who presides over meetings, makes administrative decisions, and generally leads an X12 group or committee.

Committee

A group operating under the authority and oversight of a board, consisting of one or more individuals elected or appointed by an organization to consider, study, investigate, or act on assigned matters. Only committee members and invited guests may be present during a committee's deliberations in meetings. Members may not generally make motions to limit debate. Within X12, committees are formed by the Board to facilitate efficient and effective completion of specific objectives.

Maintenance

Updates to X12 work products, which includes both new development and revisions to existing work products.

Maintenance Process

The procedural steps for updating X12 work products. The associated procedural steps include tracking the request through the process, evaluating the request, deciding to implement or deny the request, and if indicated, designing, approving, and implementing a technical solution.

Meeting

A synchronous assembly for the purpose of conducting business, the assembly may be a single session or a series of related sessions in a pre-defined period of time. Meetings may be conducted virtually (for example, via teleconference or webinar) or at a physical location (for example, at a hotel or other conference facility) or simultaneously virtually and at a physical location.

Standards Development Meeting

A meeting called for the purpose of conducting standards development activities. There are two types of standards development meetings, Standing and Interim.

Interim Meeting

A periodic meeting of one or more X12 groups held between Standing meetings as necessary to accommodate work load and publication schedules. Interim meetings are called by a group's elected leaders and may be scheduled at regular intervals or

as one-time sessions. The group shall convene for one or more sessions during an Interim meeting.

Standing Meeting

A periodic meeting held at defined intervals as determined by the Board. All X12 committees and subcommittees shall convene for one or more sessions during each Standing Meeting.

Session

A single assembly of a group during a Standing Meeting.

Member

An entity that has completed an application, paid the applicable dues and been granted X12 membership for a specific period. This term is used only in reference to X12 membership. Recognized participants of specific committees, subcommittees or other subordinate groups who have met the requirements for specific privileges within that group shall be referenced as stakeholders or constituents.

Synonym: X12 Member

Member Representative

An individual who participates in X12 activities on behalf of an X12 member. There are three types of named member representatives; primary, alternate, and designated.

Procedures Review Board (PRB)

The ASC group that ensures due process is followed within the ASC.

Procedures Review Board Representative (PRB Rep)

A designated subcommittee constituent assigned primary responsibility for representing the subcommittee on the ASC PRB and for communications between the subcommittee and the PRB.

Purpose and Scope

The assignment or authorized work of an X12 group.

Synonyms: Purpose and Scope Statement, P&S, P&SS

Rules of Order

An organization's rules of order govern parliamentary matters. X12 defines rules of order at 4 organizational levels, corporate, committee, subcommittee, and subordinate group.

Corporate Rules of Order

Policies and procedures governing parliamentary matters that apply across the

organization.

Committee Rules of Order

Policies and procedures governing parliamentary matters that apply to X12 committees. Committee Rules of Order are subordinate to, and cannot contradict or overrule, the Corporate Rules.

Staff

A group of X12 and contracted staff members, managed by the Executive Director, who have duties and perform tasks necessary to run the X12 organization, including business and standards development matters.

Synonyms: Administration, X12 Staff

Standing Rules

An organization's administrative governance, including all matters not related to parliamentary procedure. X12 defines rules of order at 4 organizational levels, corporate, committee, subcommittee, and subordinate group.

Stakeholder

An X12 member that has met the requirements for specific privileges within an X12 group. Such requirements may be based on meeting attendance, collaboration participation, self-designation, or other criteria.

Steering Committee

The elected & appointed leaders who oversee the Accredited Standards Committee (ASC).

Subcommittee

An ad hoc or standing group operating under the authority and oversight of a committee. All attributes of the committee apply to subcommittees except that they are formed, governed, and supervised at the committee level instead of the organization level.

Task Group (TG)

A subordinate group that facilitates or supports the establishing group's work.

Technical Assessment Subcommittee (TAS)

The ASC subcommittee that develops X12 design rules and guidelines and verifies that ASC Standards and associated products adhere to approved design rules, guidelines and syntax rules.

Synonyms: X12J

Technical Assessment Subcommittee Representative (TAS Rep)

A designated ASC subcommittee constituent assigned primary responsibility for

representing the subcommittee to TAS and for communications between the subcommittee and TAS.

Work Request

A form used to submit a recommendation for any new X12 work product or any revision to an existing X12 work product. The form may be submitted by a member of the public, an X12 member, or an X12 group.

Work Group (WG)

A subordinate group established by a task group or subcommittee to support the task group or to facilitate efficient and effective completion of standards development tasks. Work groups report to a task group.

X12 Product

An output derived from the direct effort of X12 members or X12 staff. May refer to drafts, published, withdrawn, or obsolete works.

Synonyms: X12 Artifact, X12 Product, Product, Deliverable

13 Document History

New versions of this document are effective on the approval date, unless otherwise stated in the approval.

Date	Description
05/31/2018	V4: Biennial review - reordered sections, revised to simplify instructions and processes, converted to new standard format & naming convention.
01/17/2015	V3: Revised to improve consistency, clarity, and process efficiency.
04/21/2011	V2: Significant revisions to OPM and SD2 to synchronize the documents, increase consistency, and reflect organizational changes.
07/22/2005	V1: Revisions related to Interpretations.