**ASC Administrative
Policy and Procedure**

ASC Maintenance Request Processing Manual

Procedures for Developing and Maintaining the EDI Standard and Technical Reports

(ASC02)

Table of Contents

1   General Information

1.1   Introduction

The Accredited Standards Committee (ASC) Steering Committee (Steering) is responsible for this policy and associated procedures. X12 members agree to adhere to X12's policies and procedures as a condition of membership. Non-member participants afforded specific collaboration privileges agree to adhere to X12's policies and procedures as a condition of those privileges. Any party may submit a revision suggestion via X12's online Feedback form.

1.2   Authority

X12 maintains corporate rules which define overall corporate policies and procedures. X12 committees are required to establish a committee operating manual and are generally permitted to establish other committee-level rules that apply only to that committee. In some cases, corporate policy is intended to stand-alone and lower-level rules are prohibited. A committee's subordinate groups may be required or permitted to establish group-specific rules that supplement the committee rules except when lower-level rules are prohibited. Supplemental rules must provide more detail or be more restrictive than the higher-level governance. Supplemental rules are not permitted to duplicate, contradict, countermand, supersede, or overrule any higher-level rules. No accommodation is intended or provided to permit a committee or subordinate rule to override a higher-level rule with a more permissive requirement. In the case of any inconsistency between the corporate, committee, and subordinate group rules, the higher-level governance always prevails.

X12's primary organizational policies are established in the *X12 Bylaws (CAP01)* and supplemented by other corporate governance. The ASC's primary committee-specific rules are established in the **ASC Operating Manual (ASC01)**. The committee-specific rules established herein supplement that corporate and committee governance. Unless specifically stated herein, these rules stand alone and cannot be supplemented with additional rules.

1.3   Background

X12 maintains numerous standards and related products and makes them available to the public. A current product list is available online at x12.org/products. A number of these products are maintained by the ASC and this document details the ASC's maintenance-related policies and procedures.

X12 also publishes interpretations related to how its products are implemented and used. Each interpretation is a response to one or more questions posed in a

Request for Interpretation (RFI). Those policies and processes are defined in the ***ASC Request for Information (RFI) Processing Manual (ASC04)***.

Within X12, the term "maintenance" includes activities related to revising existing products and activities related to developing new products. The terms "maintenance request", "data maintenance", and "request" are used interchangeably herein.

1.4 Administrative Assignments

X12 staff is responsible for administrative tasks that support this governance. The staff processes are detailed in internal operations documentation.

1.5 ASC02 Revisions

The Policy and Procedures Task Group (P&P) is responsible for revisions to this document. Revision recommendations may be presented by Steering, P&P, or any party via maintenance-requests.x12.org.

P&P reviews ***ASC02*** at least biennially to ensure the policies and procedures are recorded in the simplest manner with an emphasis on clarity and accuracy.

Following P&P approval of a revised draft, the draft is submitted to Steering with P&P's recommendation for action. Steering reviews the draft and either provides feedback to P&P on the revisions or approves the draft for an ASC committee ballot.

2 Committee Roles Supporting MR Processing

Several subcommittee-level roles, or positions, are critical to ensuring the efficient and effective processing of X12 MRs. Two of these roles, PRB Representative and X12J Representative, are defined within ***ASC Subcommittees and Subordinate Groups (ASC05).*** Each MR will be guided through the MR process by a Project Delegate. Each subcommittee may elect whether to have its X12J Representative serve as Project Delegate for all its MRs or to name other constituents to serve in that role for each MR. Subcommittees may define other supporting roles as necessary to ensure the timely and efficient processing of its MRs.

2.1 Project Delegate

A project delegate works closely with the subcommittee's primary X12J representative and other subcommittee constituents and is responsible for ensuring timely progress on the MR and for following the established policies and process requirements.

Except when the X12J Representative is serving as the subcommittee's project delegate, a subcommittee constituent may not serve as the project delegate for more than five (5) MRs at any one time.

Each project delegate must possess certain knowledge, experience, and skills. Project delegates must meet all the following criteria:
1. Have a solid understanding of the corporate, committee, and subcommittee policies related to ASC maintenance request processing.
2. Have a solid understanding of the X12 MR process.
3. Have a solid understanding of X12 technical requirements, including syntax and semantic requirements, design rules, and other committee guidelines.
4. Have strong interpersonal skills.
5. Have strong written and oral communication skills.

Each project delegate is responsible for the following:
1. Coordinating all subcommittee discussions related to the assigned MR.
2. Scheduling group meetings, coordinating online collaboration, assigning tasks, and monitoring deliverables to ensure timely completion of the MR.
3. Ensuring the group follows all applicable corporate, committee, and subcommittee policies and procedures.
4. Supporting the consensus decisions of the MR development group.

3   Processing a Maintenance Request

Suggestions or requests related to new products and revisions to current products are submitted via one of X12's online forms.

Processing Suggestions, Input, and Feedback (CAP11) defines the corporate governance for organizational and administrative steps that precede or follow this committee-level procedure. The predecessor steps include, but are not limited to, vetting to ensure all necessary information is included, storing information in X12 repositories, assigning tracking numbers, gathering public input, assigning the request to an X12 committee, and initiating the maintenance request (MR). Once a maintenance request is initiated staff determines the maintenance category and assigns a developing subcommittee.

Staff tracks the life cycle of each request in a registry to accommodate self-service status inquiries, organizational research, and institutional memory.

Maintenance requests related to the EDI Standard's internal code lists are assigned to the X12J Technical Assessment Subcommittee (TAS) and processed per section **4 Internal Code List Maintenance**.

Maintenance requests related to technical reports and components of the EDI Standard other than internal code lists are processed as described in section **3.1 Notify PRB of the Request**. PRB must approve each maintenance request before any ASC group commences work or analysis on the maintenance request.

Information about external code lists as documented in Appendix A of X12.3 is not part of the X12 EDI Standard. The identifying and descriptive information for these external code lists, such as owner, description, purpose, URL, address, etc., is controlled by the external code list maintainer. Such information is included in X12 products for reference purposes only and is not subject to ASC approval processes. Staff is responsible for maintaining accurate identifying and descriptive information for these external code lists, including regularly validating the information. Staff is also responsible for maintaining accurate identification and descriptive information for any X12 product or URL referenced within another X12 product.

3.1   Notify PRB of the Request

Staff notifies PRB of the maintenance request. PRB performs a high-level evaluation of the appropriateness of the request and initial assignment in relation to ASC purpose and scope statements. This is not an evaluation of the technical or business merits of the request nor a determination that the request will result in any revision. The PRB review criteria are:

- Does the maintenance request align with the ASC purpose and scope?
- Does the maintenance request align with the purpose and scope of an ASC subcommittee?
- Is the maintenance request assigned to the ASC subcommittee with the most relevant material interest in the request?

Each MR is assigned to one developing subcommittee; a project delegate is not assigned at this time. Regardless of any subordinate group delegation within a subcommittee, the subcommittee itself remains officially responsible for the request throughout the maintenance process.
PRB may later reassign development responsibility based on additional information and a majority vote of PRB constituents.

A subcommittee must not commence work on a maintenance request before PRB acceptance of the maintenance request as described below.
1. Staff posts a voting thread (poll) in the PRB iMeet workspace notifying PRB of the maintenance request and its initial assignment. The thread is posted as an electronic ballot open for 5 calendar days. The post states that PRB's acceptance of the request and its assignment will be recorded at the close of the review period unless a comment disputing one of those items is posted in the thread by the close of the review period.
   The PRB chair may call for an abbreviated review period if necessary to

ensure timely assignment. Unless a subcommittee's primary representative posts an objection to the abbreviated review period within 48 hours of notice of the abbreviated review, the abbreviated review period is honored.

2. PRB constituents evaluate each request based on the criteria described above. Any PRB constituent with a concern, question, or dispute related to the initial assignment or the appropriateness of the maintenance request must enter a comment in the voting thread within the review period.

3. If no PRB constituent posts a comment noting a concern, question, or dispute related to the initial assignment or the appropriateness of maintenance request by the end of the review period, the request and assignment are considered accepted.
   a. Staff notes the acceptance in the next PRB minutes.
   b. Staff assigns the developing subcommittee's X12J representative as the initial project delegate.
      i. The developing subcommittee may later opt to replace the X12J representative with another project delegate based on its policies or procedures.
   c. Staff initiates the process defined in section **3.2 X12J Reviews the Assignment** and section **5 The Maintenance Process.** These activities can commence simultaneously or separately.

4. If a PRB constituent posts a comment noting a concern, question, or dispute related to the appropriateness of the maintenance request or the initial assignment by the end of the review period, the PRB discusses the MR.
   a. The PRB chair initiates an iMeet discussion or adds the matter to the next PRB meeting agenda for discussion.
   b. The PRB discussion results in one of the following PRB actions:
      • Revise the maintenance request
      • Reassign development responsibility
      • Reject the MR as not falling within an ASC purpose and scope
   c. Once consensus is reached, the PRB chair directs staff to make any agreed-upon revision(s) to the maintenance request, confirms PRB acceptance or rejection, and justifies any rejection.
   d. Staff updates the registry and notifies the submitter if the maintenance request was rejected.

3.2   X12J Reviews the Assignment

Staff notifies X12J of the maintenance request and the developing subcommittee assignment. Other subcommittees may choose to indicate a material interest in the outcome of the request, such an indication is informational and does not convey any special privileges or responsibilities related to the maintenance request. This review is specific to the developing subcommittee assignment and does not include any evaluation of potential or expected revisions.

1. Staff posts a discussion thread in the X12J iMeet workspace notifying the X12J constituents of the maintenance request and its initial assignment.
2. The X12J representative of each ASC subcommittee reviews the maintenance request within 5 calendar days of the notice and evaluates whether they agree with the developing subcommittee assignment.
    If an ASC subcommittee's X12J representative disagrees with the assignment and believes their subcommittee should be the developing subcommittee, the subcommittee's X12J representative posts a comment in the iMeet thread requesting reassignment within the review period.
3. If a majority of X12J constituents agree with PRB's developing subcommittee assignment, the X12J representative from the developing subcommittee moves the MR forward to the developing subcommittee. Proceed to section **5 The Maintenance Process**.
4. If a majority of X12J constituents disagree with PRB's developing subcommittee assignment, the X12J PRB representative discusses the matter with the PRB chair and requests PRB reconsideration. Return to section **3.1 Notify PRB of the Request**.

3.3   PRB Annual Review

PRB evaluates all open maintenance requests annually, as part of their Fall Standing Meeting agenda, to ensure that maintenance 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.

The forward progress evaluation is based on the following criteria:
*   Has any ASC subcommittee, task group, or work group taken a formal action on the maintenance request in the preceding 12-month period?
    o   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.
    o   A vote to defer the work does not count as formal action for this purpose.
*   If the request was submitted more than 18 months prior to the review, is the request still relevant to the requestor? If not, can another champion for the requested work be found within 30 calendar days? If so, the registry is 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?
*   Are there any special circumstances to consider?

Any maintenance request that does not make demonstrable forward progress in the twelve months since the previous annual review is classified as at-risk. PRB has the

option of reassigning developing subcommittee responsibility as part of the at-risk determination. PRB either reassigns developing subcommittee responsibility or cancels any at-risk maintenance request that does not make demonstrable forward progress in the twelve months following the initial at-risk determination. If the maintenance request is cancelled, 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 at-risk maintenance requests more frequently than once per year.

4   Internal Code List Maintenance

Internal code lists are maintained using the procedures defined in this section. X12 also maintains external code lists, which are a separate type of code list, under the Registered Standards Committee (RSC) using procedures defined in ***External Code Lists (CAP12)***.

A Code Maintenance Request (CMR) is submitted via X12's online CMR form. Requests may be presented by the public, by an X12 member representative, or on behalf of an X12 group.

CMRs are not subject to ballot, instead the outcome is determined based on the following review and comment process.

4.1   ASC Review Period

Each CMR is subject to an ASC review period, conducted as follows.
1. Staff administers a 21-day CMR review period.
2. Staff provides X12J with a summary of the CMRs included in the review period and any associated comments.
3. Staff adds finalization of the review period CMRs to an X12J agenda.

4.2   CMR Determination

X12J is responsible for the final determination of each CMR including any necessary coordination between the subcommittees. Other subcommittees may be consulted on a specific CMR, but X12J retains final authority.

Depending on the comments received, X12J may table a CMR and refer the CMR to one or more subcommittees for additional discussion or a recommendation. Each consulted subcommittee evaluates the referred CMR and takes action as necessary to formulate a subcommittee recommendation to be reported at the next X12J meeting. To ensure timely processing of CMRs, X12J acts on the CMR prior to the adjournment of the next scheduled X12J meeting.

The determination of CMRs occurs in this order:

1. X12J reviews each CMR listed in the summary and chooses one of the following actions:
   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 X12J.
2. Staff processes the X12J decisions.
3. Staff adds due process confirmation of finalized CMRs (approvals, disapprovals, and withdrawals) to a PRB agenda.

4.3   Technical Correction after X12J Approval

If a technical inaccuracy is discovered after X12J approval of a CMR, the X12J chair is authorized to act on behalf of the subcommittee and instruct staff to correct the technical inaccuracy. Technical inaccuracies include semantic or syntax rule conflicts, data attribute conflicts, and non-substantive typographical or grammatical errors missed during the CMR determination process.

This correction process can not otherwise be used to circumvent the defined review and determination process. The X12J chair emails correction instructions to tassecretary@x12.org, copying ascchair@x12.org and prbchair@x12.org. Any questions or concerns related to the correction instructions is resolved between the X12J chair, PRB chair, and Steering chair, with the X12 Chief Executive Officer (CEO) as advisor. Such corrections are permitted for thirty (30) calendar days after the first distribution of the revised code list. After that time, a correction must be processed via a new CMR or maintenance request.

4.4   PRB Publication Determination

If there is disagreement on any procedural aspect related to a CMR or a set of CMRs, the objecting party must convey this objection to PRB before the vote confirming CMR 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 CMR, PRB has the option to disapprove the publication of the specific CMR(s), not the full set. PRB may disapprove the publication of the full set of CMRs based on a due process issue with the review period or another all-encompassing issue.

Following the review, PRB takes one of the following actions.
  A. Approves the publication of the revised codes.
      a. Staff processes the approval and publishes the revised code lists.
  B. Disapproves publication of the revised codes based on due process errors.
      a. PRB documents the procedural violation and directs staff on the next step to be taken or refers the CMR back to X12J for resolution.

5 The Maintenance Process

This section defines procedures for maintenance requests related to components of the EDI Standard other than internal code lists and maintenance requests related to technical reports.

5.1 Extraordinary Situations

Although not likely, at any point during the process defined in this section, the developing subcommittee may find itself unwilling or unable to complete the maintenance activities for a specific maintenance request. In such a situation, the subcommittee may choose to ask PRB to take one of the following actions.
  A. Cancel the maintenance request based on a compelling statement of why the request was or has become inappropriate based on the criteria established in section **2.1.1 PRB Evaluates the Request**. A request to cancel the maintenance request is not based on an evaluation of the technical or business merits of the request or any disagreement with the stated need. It must be based on a high-level evaluation of the appropriateness of the request and initial assignment in relation to various X12 purpose and scope statements and products.
  B. Reassign development responsibility to another subcommittee based on the subcommittee's inability to complete the development activities or inability to complete them timely.

To petition PRB to take either action:
  1. The project delegate emails support@x12.org, notifying staff of the request to cancel the maintenance request or to request its reassignment.
  2. Staff processes the notice and informs the PRB chair of the request.
  3. The PRB chair either initiates an iMeet discussion of the request or requests staff add the item to the next PRB agenda.
  4. Following a discussion via iMeet or at a meeting, PRB either cancels or reassigns responsibility for the maintenance request. PRB cannot compel an unwilling subcommittee to continue as the developing subcommittee.
  5. Staff puts the PRB decision into action.

A second extraordinary situation is invoked at any point during the process defined in sections 4 through 6 herein if any X12 member representative notifies the PRB chair at prbchair@x12.org of any substantive concern significant enough to disrupt the development process. Such notification must be received before the PRB vote recommending publication.

If the PRB agrees that the concerns are substantive enough to disrupt the 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, project delegate, and reporting member representative.

5.2   Subcommittee Considers the Request

The developing subcommittee considers the business case or justification for the request and any related public input then conducts the analysis necessary to decide to draft a proposal to satisfy the request or to disapprove the request. The subcommittee either names its project delegate for the MR at this point or names the project delegate in **5.4 Subcommittee Develops Proposed Revisions.**

The developing subcommittee, or its subordinate group delegated responsibility for the request, begins its deliberation based on the position that any presented business case or justification represents a legitimate business need. A disapproval decision must be based on compelling evidence that the requested revision does not represent an accepted best practice, would "break" X12's syntax or semantic rules or definitions, or would otherwise negatively impact the EDI Standard. An assessment that the current install base would or might be inconvenienced if the requested revision were to be implemented is not grounds for disapproving an otherwise sound request.

Once the analysis and evaluation are complete, the developing subcommittee either votes to disapprove the request or develops the associated revision proposal. Herein the term "proposed revisions" includes both revisions to currently published products and the entire content for new products.

In the case of disapproval, proceed to **5.3 Subcommittee Disapproves the Request**. Otherwise, proceed to **5.4 Subcommittee Develops Proposed Revisions**.

5.3   Subcommittee Disapproves the Request

If the developing subcommittee acts to disapprove the request, the following occurs:

- The project delegate records the date and results (disapproval) of the subcommittee ballot in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not included in the maintenance request system.
- The project delegate updates the maintenance request system with a statement of the subcommittee's reason(s) for disapproving the request. This statement is the basis for the response to the submitter noted in section **5.3.1 PRB Reviews the Disapproval**.
- The project delegate informs the subcommittee's X12J representative of the disapproval.

5.3.1 PRB Reviews the Disapproval

PRB reviews the developing subcommittee's decision to disapprove the maintenance request as follows:

- Staff notifies PRB of the developing subcommittee's disapproval via a new iMeet voting thread (poll). The motion and voting options are based on the reason for the disapproval and any suggestion from the developing subcommittee.
- PRB constituents have five (5) calendar days from the date the poll is posted to post their vote on the matter.
- When the voting period ends, the PRB chair confirms the outcome of the PRB ballot and the final determination on the status of the MR.
- Staff updates the maintenance request system to reflect the date of the PRB decision, the decision, and notes that quorum was achieved.
- If the disapproval is confirmed, staff notifies the submitter of the disapproval and the reason(s) therefore.

5.4   Subcommittee Develops Proposed Revisions

If the subcommittee did not name its project delegate for the MR in **5.2 Subcommittee Considers the Request,** it names the project delegate at this step in the process**.**

The developing subcommittee drafts instructions for the proposed maintenance according to policies, procedures, control and guidance documents, and design rules applicable to the specific product being revised or developed. This includes confirming the products listed in the impact assessment and documenting each

proposed revision to each impacted product. These instructions are documented in the maintenance request's impact assessment.

The developing subcommittee drafts instructions for the proposed maintenance according to policies, procedures, control and guidance documents, and design rules applicable to the specific product being revised or developed. This includes confirming the products listed in the impact assessment and documenting each proposed revision to each impacted product. These instructions are documented in the maintenance request's impact assessment.

Per section **1.2 Authority** above, an ASC subcommittee may establish a subcommittee-specific workflow defining its specific steps. However, any subcommittee-level governance must be clear, concise, and structured to avoid bureaucracy and ensure the subcommittee's development process facilitates the corporate timeliness parameters. For the most part, a subcommittee's supplemental workflow should accommodate a six (6) month timeline; for a complex request, the timeline may extend to nine (9) months.

Depending on the products impacted, the developing subcommittee may need to collaborate with another subcommittee or delegate responsibility for part of the impact and revision analysis to another subcommittee. This cross-subcommittee work must be completed in a cooperative and timely manner. The developing subcommittee retains responsibility for ensuring the maintenance request progresses timely. If at any time the request ceases to move forward timely, the project delegate cooperatively works with their subcommittee chair, the other subcommittee's chair, the ASC chair, X12J chair, and others as necessary to resolve the issue(s) or create an alternative path forward to ensure the maintenance request is not stalled.

The developing subcommittee may seek technical assistance from X12J or X12C during development and may request an informal X12J or X12C review to discuss potential technical issues at any time. In one case, the project delegate works with the subcommittee's X12J representative who coordinates the collaboration between the subcommittee and X12J. In the other case, the project delegate coordinates with the X12C chair. In either case, staff assists with the coordination as requested.

Once the developing subcommittee completes instructions for the proposed revisions as described in the sub-sections below and finalizes the impact assessment, the project delegate composes a brief, high-level, "in English" summary of the benefit to be achieved via implementation of the revisions identified to satisfy the maintenance request and enters it in the maintenance request system. This brief statement should not exceed three sentences and will be the basis for X12 informational and educational materials and change summaries. Staff may adjust the

statement later to address grammar, consistency, or other stylistic matters. Once the summary statement is entered, the project delegate is responsible for ensuring a subcommittee ballot is conducted timely.

5.4.1 Reviewing the Impact Assessment

Each maintenance request assigned to a developing subcommittee includes an initial impact assessment prepared by staff as part of the advance analysis of the request. The initial impact statement records the X12 products thought to be impacted by the maintenance request and, if appropriate, the individual references within each product that may be subject to revision. When the developing subcommittee completes its work, the final impact analysis contains the detailed instructions for revisions based on the maintenance request and is the basis of all votes on the maintenance request from this point forward. The final impact analysis is also the basis for revisions based on an eventual PRB approval to publish, should approval be the outcome of section **6 Committee Ballot**.

The developing subcommittee reviews the initial impact assessment prepared by staff. At this time, or at any point during the maintenance process prior to section **5.6 X12J Reviews Proposed Revisions**, the project delegate revises the impact statement as necessary for completeness and accuracy, including adding additional impacted products or instances and updating proposed instructions and other notes.

5.4.2 Developing Proposed Revisions

The developing subcommittee finalizes the maintenance request's impact assessment by completing instructions for all proposed revisions. The final impact assessment clearly articulates all required revisions to each X12 product impacted by the maintenance request. The impact statement serves as supporting information for balloting and publisher instructions for any approved maintenance request. The project delegate adds a benefit statement describing how the revision(s) will positively impact implementers and trading partners. Together, the business justification (aka business case) and benefit statement inform the change documentation (aka change log or difference reporting) made available to implementers and other materially interested parties.

5.5 Subcommittee Ballot on Proposed Revisions

Once the developing subcommittee has completed its activities related to the maintenance request, a subcommittee ballot is conducted.

The project delegate and staff coordinate as follows:

1. The project delegate emails support@x12.org, courtesy copying the subcommittee's primary X12J representative, advising that the maintenance request is ready for subcommittee ballot and requesting a final version of the impact assessment, the MR's benefit summary statement, or both as supporting material for the ballot.
2. Staff updates the maintenance request system as necessary.
3. Staff provides the project delegate with the requested supporting material for the developing subcommittee's ballot on the maintenance request.
4. The project delegate reviews the supporting material for accuracy and completeness.

If the subcommittee conducts a meeting vote on the maintenance request:

1. The project delegate coordinates with the subcommittee chair on the ballot logistics.
2. When voting is complete, the project delegate records the date and results of the subcommittee ballot in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded. The project delegate also notifies staff of the results.

If the subcommittee conducts an electronic vote on the maintenance request:

1. The project delegate coordinates ballot details with the subcommittee chair.
2. The committee chair requests that staff administer a subcommittee ballot on the maintenance request.
3. When voting is complete, staff records the decision date and the results of the subcommittee ballot in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded. Staff also notifies the project delegate and subcommittee chair of the results.

If the maintenance request is disapproved, the proposed revisions are remanded to the subcommittee for additional review, revert to **5.5 Subcommittee Develops Proposed Revisions**.

If the maintenance request is approved, the proposed revisions move forward to X12J for technical review.

1. The project delegate provides a courtesy notice of the approval to the subcommittee's X12J representative.
2. Staff notifies the X12J chair and constituents that the maintenance request has been moved forward by the developing subcommittee and provides the supporting material included in the subcommittee's ballot for X12J review.
3. Staff adds the maintenance request to the next X12J agenda, initiating the activities defined in section **5.7 X12J Reviews Proposed Revisions**.

5.6   X12J Reviews Proposed Revisions

It is each X12J constituent's responsibility to review the maintenance request and proposed revisions for technical accuracy in a timely manner. The X12J constituents who represent an ASC subcommittee either speak on behalf of their subcommittee unilaterally or they coordinate a subcommittee-level review of the MR and proposed revisions so they can speak on behalf of the subcommittee at the next X12J meeting.

X12J completes a technical review of the proposed revisions and acts on the matter at their next scheduled meeting.

The purpose of the X12J technical review is to ensure that the proposed revisions materially meet the technical parameters of the maintenance request approved by PRB and adhere to the control standards and design rules applicable to the specific product(s) being revised. Based on the technical review, X12J votes to either recommend the proposed revisions for ballot or to remand the proposed revisions to the developing subcommittee for additional action. The X12J chair is responsible for ensuring these activities are conducted in a timely manner, usually within three months of receipt of the proposed revisions.

A vote to remand must be based on one of the following technical issues and must include a detailed explanation of the specific technical issue(s) and a remedy that would resolve the technical issue(s).

- The proposed revisions are not aligned with the technical parameters of the approved maintenance request.
- The proposed revisions constitute a clear violation of applicable control standards and/or design rules.

Once X12J acts on the maintenance request:

- Staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.
- If X12J votes to recommend the proposed revisions for ballot, the proposed revisions are moved forward to PRB for due process review per **Section 5.10 PRB Authorizes Ballot**.
- If X12J votes to remand the proposed revisions to the developing subcommittee for additional action, proceed to **5.7 X12J Remands the Proposed Revisions**

If the X12J constituents are unable to achieve a majority decision on action to advance the work or action to remand the work after a good-faith effort, the X12J chair mediates to cooperatively resolve the differences between the X12J constituents. If

the X12J chair's efforts do not result in a resolution, the X12J chair recommends PRB approve a committee ballot so the ASC constituents can resolve the matter with a direct vote. In this situation, the proposed revisions are moved forward to PRB for due process review per section **5.11 PRB Authorizes Ballot**.

5.7   X12J Remands the Proposed Revisions

If X12J votes to remand the proposed revisions to the developing subcommittee for further action, the following steps are completed.

1. X12J creates a detailed explanation of the specific technical issue(s) and recommends a remedy that would resolve each technical issue.
2. Staff records the X12J explanation and recommendation in the maintenance request system.
3. The developing subcommittee's X12J representative communicates the X12J reasoning to the project delegate, initiating the activities defined in **5.8 Subcommittee Considers X12J's Explanation**.

5.8   Subcommittee Considers X12J's Explanation

The developing subcommittee considers X12J's explanation of the technical issues and alternative suggestion and acts on the matter. The subcommittee is not obligated to follow the X12J recommendation. After considering the information, the developing subcommittee makes revisions per the X12J assessment or prepares counter-arguments to rebut the X12J assessment and conducts a subcommittee ballot on the matter. The subcommittee may choose to revise some items and rebut others by conducting separate ballots on the items. A subcommittee decision to rebut the X12J assessment must be approved by a two-thirds supermajority. Depending on the type of ballot executed, either the project delegate or staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting whether quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.

If the subcommittee's proposed revisions are revised based on the X12J assessment, the revised proposed revisions move back to X12J for technical review. Revert to section **5.7 X12J Reviews Revised Proposed Revisions**.

If the subcommittee votes to rebut the X12J assessment with counter-arguments:
1. The subcommittee creates a detailed rebuttal of the specific technical issues, remedies, or alternative suggestions documented in X12J's explanation.
2. The subcommittee's project delegate enters the rebuttal into the maintenance request system and provides a courtesy copy of the rebuttal to the subcommittee's X12J representative.
3. Staff distributes the rebuttal to the X12J chair and X12J constituents.

4. Staff adds the maintenance request to a X12J agenda, proceed to **5.10 X12J Considers Subcommittee Resolution.**

5.9   X12J Considers Subcommittee Resolution

Following subcommittee rebuttal of X12J recommendations, X12J conducts another vote on the proposed work product(s).

If X12J accepts the Subcommittee's rebuttal:
*   X12J votes to recommend that PRB approve the proposed maintenance request for ballot.
*   Staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.
*   Staff places the item on a PRB agenda, proceed to section **5.10 PRB Authorizes Ballot**

If X12J confirms their technical disapproval with a three-quarters (3/4) approval vote, the stalemate is resolved via the committee ballot on the matter. The committee ballot materials must fully describe the stalemate so that the ASC constituents can decide the matter directly. Proceed to section **5.10 PRB Authorizes Ballot**.

5.10 PRB Authorizes Ballot

Staff creates a report of the maintenance request's voting history and any other procedural information from the maintenance request system and distributes it to the PRB constituents via iMeet.

Any complaint or question about a procedural aspect of the proposed work product must be conveyed to the PRB before the vote authorizing the maintenance request 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.

PRB takes one of the following actions:
A. PRB confirms due process and approves the maintenance request for ballot. Proceed to **Section 6 Committee Ballot**
B. PRB finds a procedural violation has occurred and determines where in the process the procedural violation occurred. PRB instructs the developing subcommittee to revert to that step in the process and resolve the procedural issue(s).

Staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.

If the request was remanded, staff notes the details in the maintenance request system and notifies the project delegate of the decision and next steps.

6 Committee Ballot

Staff prepares and distributes a committee-level technical ballot per the *X12 Bylaws (CAP01)* and the *ASC Operating Manual (ASC01)*.

Any member's primary representative with a due process concern related to the ballot wording or supplemental materials must notify staff of the concern via an email to support@x12.org before the end of the voting period. Staff forwards such concerns to the PRB chair, due to time sensitivity the PRB chair acts on behalf of the PRB. If the PRB chair agrees the concerns are substantive enough to invalidate the ballot, the PRB chair notifies the ASC chair at ascchair@x12.org and the X12 CEO at ceo@x12.org of the decision, and the ballot is invalidated.

6.1 Evaluate Ballot Results

Once the ballot closes, results and comments are processed as follows.

1. Staff tallies the ballots according to corporate and committee policies and records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.
2. If quorum was not attained:
   a. Staff invalidates the ballot and notifies the PRB chair and ASC chair.
   b. The ASC chair and PRB chair determine whether to re-ballot the matter. At the officer's discretion, they may choose to request feedback or a recommendation on next steps from one or more X12 subcommittees.
3. If quorum was attained and the ballot was approved:
   a. Staff places the item on the next PRB agenda.
   b. Staff creates a report of the maintenance request's voting history and any other procedural information from the maintenance request system and distributes it to the PRB constituents via iMeet.
   c. Proceed to section **6.2 Distribute Ballot Comments**
4. If the quorum was attained and the ballot was disapproved:
   a. Staff notifies the PRB chair and ASC chair.
   b. Staff notifies the project delegate of the developing subcommittee.
   c. Staff forwards any technical comments to the developing subcommittee project delegate.
   d. The developing subcommittee reverts to section **5.4 Subcommittee Develops Proposed Revisions**.

6.2   Distribute Ballot Comments

Staff processes any ballot comments as described below. Comments that accompany a disapproval vote require a response, which the voter must receive within four months (approximately 16 weeks) of the ballot closing date. Staff is responsible for monitoring the timeliness of responses and notifies the ASC and PRB chairs if timeliness becomes a concern.

If any ballot comments describe a concern that might be cause for the ballot to be invalidated, staff immediately notifies the ASC and PRB chairs of the concern(s). If, in the opinion of the ASC and PRB chairs, the concern(s) are likely valid and may require the ballot be invalidated, the ASC chair brings the matter to Steering for formal action. If Steering acts to invalidate the ballot, the ASC chair notifies staff of the decision, and an announcement of the invalidation is distributed to all committee constituents. No further action is taken related to the invalidated ballot. A new ballot on the matter may be issued later, depending on the specifics of the situation.

If there are any ballot comments based on a technical issue or concern, they are processed per section **6.3 Process Technical Comments**.

If there are any administrative comments (any comment not based on a technical concern), they are processed per section **6.4 Process Administrative Comments**.

6.3   Process Technical Comments

Any ballot comment based on a technical issue or concern are processed as follows:
1. Staff notifies the developing subcommittee's project delegate and X12J representative of the technical comment(s).
2. The developing subcommittee's project delegate and X12J representative draft a response to each technical comment.
3. The developing subcommittee's X12J representative presents the draft response(s) for action via an iMeet thread or at the next X12J meeting.
4. X12J must approve a response to each technical comment within 14 weeks of the ballot closing date.
5. Staff prepares the formal response and distributes it to the voter within 4 months of the ballot closing date.

6.4   Process Administrative Comments

Any ballot comment based on an issue or concern not related to a technical matter is processed as follows:
1. Staff notifies the ASC chair and X12 CEO of the comment(s).
2. The ASC chair and X12 CEO draft a response to each administrative comment.

3. Staff prepares the formal response and distributes it to the voter within 4 months of the ballot closing date.

6.5   Final PRB Review

After the committee ballot on the maintenance request closes, PRB reviews all activity since it approved the committee ballot on the maintenance request to ensure due process was followed.

If due process is confirmed:
1. PRB votes to approve publication of the revisions described in the maintenance request.
2. Staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.
3. Staff takes all actions necessary to finalize and publish the approved revisions.

If due process is not confirmed:
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. Staff records the date and results of the vote in the maintenance request system, noting for the record that quorum was achieved. The voting tallies are not recorded.
3. Staff notifies the project delegate of the invalidation and instructs the project delegate on next steps.

7   Late-Stage Corrections

Infrequently, content, style, or formatting issues are discovered after PRB approval for a committee ballot on a maintenance request and publication of the revisions approved via the maintenance request. Such issues are handled as detailed in this section.

7.1   Minor Corrections

At any time during the period between PRB approval for a committee ballot on the maintenance request and PRB's final confirmation of due process, staff or an X12 member representative may identify a minor mistake in a revision proposed on the maintenance request. If such a minor mistake is noted during the defined period, the developing subcommittee's project delegate notifies staff of the mistake and suggestions a remedial action via email to support@x12.org. Staff obtains concurrence that the mistake is minor and should be corrected from the ASC, PRB, and developing subcommittee chairs. If concurrence is given, staff corrects the minor mistake as a general housekeeping action at the next opportunity. Examples

of minor errors include misspellings, grammatical errors, and formatting issues. An error that affects the contents of an EDI message or the conditions under which content is transmitted between trading partners is never considered minor and is not addressed or corrected via these housekeeping steps.

7.2   Corrections after Committee Ballot Approval

At any time during the period between PRB approval of a committee ballot on the maintenance request and PRB approval to publish, the developing subcommittee or X12J may identify an error in a revision proposed on the maintenance request.

Upon identification of such an error, the developing subcommittee's project delegate or the X12J chair notifies staff at support@x12.org and the subcommittee's PRB representative that one or more errors have been identified, classifying each as substantive or not, and providing a suggested remedial action.
1. Staff apprises the ASC and PRB chairs of the situation.
2. The PRB chair initiates discussion of the matter via iMeet or at a meeting.

Following discussion, PRB acts on the matter as follows:
1. If the ballot has concluded and was disapproved, no further action is needed**.**
2. If the ballot has not concluded, PRB considers the error(s) and recommendation as part of its due process review.
   a. If the error is not technical in nature, PRB decides whether the error should be corrected prior to publication or later via a separate maintenance request. This decision must be made within fourteen (14) calendar days. PRB then provides appropriate instructions on the matter to staff and the developing subcommittee's project delegate.
   b. If the error is technical in nature, PRB consults with the X12J chair acting on behalf of the X12J subcommittee on the matter and decides whether the error should be corrected before publication or later via a separate maintenance request. This decision must be made within twenty-one (21) calendar days. PRB then provides appropriate instructions on the matter to staff and the developing subcommittee's project delegate.
   c. If the error is technical in nature, and the X12J chair chooses not to act on behalf of the X12J subcommittee on the matter, the error must be corrected later via a separate maintenance request. This decision must be made within fifteen (14) calendar days. PRB then provides appropriate instructions on the matter to staff and the developing subcommittee's project delegate.

7.3   Corrections after Approval to Publish

Rarely, content issues that would negatively impact implementers or create a barrier to successful implementation are discovered after the revisions identified on a maintenance request have been approved for publication. In such cases, it may be in the best interest of the X12 organization and current and future implementers to address the problem quickly and efficiently. Evaluation of content issues is limited to three periods following approval,

- Before the revised product is published and available
- After the revised product is published and available but before any implementer having access to the revised product
- Within sixty (60) calendar days of the first access to the revised product.

Content issues identified more than 60 calendar days after the first distribution of the work product are not correctable via these procedures but are instead treated as normal maintenance in a future maintenance cycle.

This section defines the conditions and processes that generally govern such corrections. However, it is acknowledged that detailed quantification of all possible content issue scenarios is impossible and as such, the spirit of these conditions and processes must be honored in any scenario not specifically detailed herein.

Within five (5) calendar days of notification of such a content issue, the ASC chair, and PRB chair evaluate the reported content issue(s) and agree on whether each issue is a technical issue, a non-technical substantive issue, or a non-technical non-substantive issue. A description and examples of each type of issue are included below; however, the 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, notes, or situational rules that are technically accurate but do not reflect the intended implementers business needs. 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.

7.3.1 Technical and Non-technical Substantive Issues

Technical inaccuracy in final products is of grave concern as the consequences of publishing technically inaccurate products 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 also of grave concern and 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 are processed as follows.

1. A representative panel considers the facts of the matter, the interests of various parties, the implications and potential impact of various next actions, and other pertinent information and decides on the matter. The representative panel consists of
   a. The PRB chair acting on behalf of the PRB
   b. The X12J chair acting on behalf of X12J
   c. The ASC chair acting on behalf of the ASC stakeholders
   d. The X12 CEO acting on behalf of X12
2. Within five (5) days of the determination of the type of the issue(s), staff provides an assessment of the issue(s), including a recommendation to the panel.
3. Within seven (7) days the panel decides on the matter from among the following options or another similar option.
   a. If the content issue(s) will be corrected in the revised product, the X12J chair confirms the correction(s) to be applied. Staff applies the correction(s) and notifies any customer who accessed the tainted product of the situation, the correction, and any next steps.
   b. If the issue will not be corrected and implementers do not yet have access to the tainted product, the panel determines whether to invalidate the ballot or proceed with publication without correction of the error(s) and provides appropriate instructions on the next steps to staff.
   c. If the issue will not be corrected and implementers already have access to the tainted product, the panel ensures a maintenance request addressing the error is submitted within ten (10) days,

that an RFI, best practice paper, or other work-around instructions
are published as soon as possible, clarifying what implementers
should do until the next version of the product is published, that
implementers who have accessed the tainted product are notified
of the situation and any next steps, and that anyone who
accesses the tainted product in the future is notified of the
situation and expected remediation.

4. Once the matter is resolved,
    a. The ASC chair informs Steering of the situation
    b. The X12J chair ensures the X12J review process is enhanced to
       ensure similar technical issues are identified timely in the
       maintenance process
    c. The PRB chair informs PRB of the situation
    d. Staff updates the maintenance request system to ensure the
       details of the matter are accurately recorded.

7.3.2 Non-technical Non-substantive Issues

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

Non-technical, non-substantive issues are processed as follows.

1. The PRB chair acts on behalf of the PRB.
2. The ASC chair acts on behalf of the ASC stakeholders.
3. Within five (5) days of the determination of the type of the issue(s),
   staff provides an assessment of the issue(s), including a
   recommendation.
4. The ASC and PRB chairs evaluate the assessment,
   recommendation, and any supporting documentation necessary to
   decide whether the tainted product will be corrected or whether the
   matter will be addressed in the next version of the product via a
   maintenance request or housekeeping activity.
5. Once a decision is reached, the ASC chair provides appropriate
   instructions on the next steps to staff
6. Once the matter is resolved,
    a. The ASC chair inform Steerings of the situation
    b. Staff updates the maintenance request system to ensure the
       details of the matter are accurately recorded.

8   Terminology

To ensure consistent use of terms, definitions, and acronyms across X12 products and activities, X12 maintains the **Wordbook**, a comprehensive corporate glossary. The included terms are either proprietary to X12, cite definitions published by another authority, or represent common terms and definitions that are relevant to X12's work. The terms and definitions defined in the **Wordbook** must be used in X12 products when applicable, without modification or revision. The **Wordbook** can be referenced online at wordbook.x12.org

9   Document History

New versions are effective on the approval date unless otherwise stated in the approval.

Date	Description
09/16/2024	V6: Pilot completed, separated RFI policies and processes into ASC04, removed the outdated lists and labels section, and made minor grammatical changes.
08/27/2021	V5p5: Revisions for clarity based on pilot experience.
10/30/2020	V5p4: Process clarifications based on pilot activities.
07/31/2020	V5p3: Minor corrections to sections 2, 4, 7, and 8.
07/20/2020	V5p2: Correct the typo in section 2.2.
01/30/2020	V5p: Biennial review – add a process for revising an RFI response and other revisions based on member representative feedback and revisions to support the consolidation of X12's maintenance processes (aka Pilot 3 or ARC). This is a pilot version to guide the proof-of-concept pilot for ARC. Revision to support the pilot will be applied without an associated committee ballot. The subcommittee will ballot the pilot procedures when the pilot is completed.
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.