

## Providing Estimated vs. Actual Tag at 867 Header Level

There are is no clear cut solution to the business requirement of tagging an entire 867 as estimated vs. actual. The UIG and CUBR do not appear to address that question. Inquiries are being made on this issue.

Here are a few possible solutions, with some associated issues:

### Use BPT04 element

Only X12 codes found that are viable are:

AG for actual

ZZ for estimated (actual definition is mutually defined)

BPT04 currently used in Arizona to differentiate between usage and intervals. So, if the coding applies only for one of these two, can we make it work.

For example, if this applies only to interval reads, we could define AG as interval actuals and ZZ as intervals estimated.

UIG does not have these 2 codes in their list.

*Would work if it applies to either intervals or usage reads only. And, codes would be submitted to UIG.*

### Use BPT07 element

No X12 codes that could represent our needs.

UIG has only one code, "F" for final customer transaction.

*Would work if new codes submitted to X12, and UIG.*

### Use BPT09 element

Has special purpose for 867s coded as cancelled or corrected in UIG.

Arizona standard uses it for DASR number on historical 867s.

*Would work fine for original only, as currently defined. Values would be "actual" or "estimated", no codes.*

### Use MEA01 element (in header)

Codes and element not in UIG list/IG.

*Would work with X12 codes AN(period actual), and EN(period estimated). Codes and element would need to be submitted to UIG.*

### Use MEA07 element (in header)

Codes and element not in UIG list/IG.

*Would work with X12 codes "22"(actual), and "46"(estimated). Codes and element would need to be submitted to UIG.*

Note: Any of these solutions, obviously, require Arizona 867 revisions...